

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



Trente-et-unième session du Comité pour les animaux
En ligne, 31 mai, 1, 4, 21 et 22 juin 2021

Questions spécifiques aux espèces

ADDENDUM AU DOCUMENT INTITULE ANGUILLES (*ANGUILLA SPP.*)

1. Le présent document a été préparé par le Secrétariat.
2. Cet addendum informe de l'évolution de la situation depuis la publication du document AC31 Doc. 22 sur les *Anguilles (Anguilla spp.)* en mai 2020, relatif à la mise en application des Décisions 18.197 to 18.200.

Application des Décisions 18.197, 18.198 et 18.199, paragraphes a) et e)

3. Le Secrétariat a créé un questionnaire à remplir par les États de l'aire de répartition de l'ensemble des anguillidés (*Anguilla spp.*) afin de faciliter le rassemblement des informations recherchées, en vertu de la Décision 18.197 (s'adressant aux États de l'aire de répartition des anguillidés) et de la Décision 18.198 (s'adressant aux États de l'aire de répartition d'*Anguilla spp.* non inscrites à la CITES et actifs dans le commerce international) et de permettre au Secrétariat d'en faire le rapport au Comité pour les animaux et au Comité permanent comme indiqué au paragraphe e) de la Décision 18.199. Ce questionnaire a été mis à disposition en Annexe 2 de la Notification aux Parties [No. 2021/018](#) du 8 février 2021.
4. Au moment de la rédaction (avril 2021), les 27 Parties suivantes avaient répondu au questionnaire de l'Annexe 2 de la Notification aux Parties No. 2021/018 : l'Algérie, l'Australie, le Canada, la Croatie, Cuba, la République Tchèque, le Danemark, la République dominicaine, l'Estonie, la Finlande, la Grèce, l'Irlande, le Japon, la Malaisie, le Mexique, le Maroc, les Pays-Bas, la Nouvelle-Zélande, la Norvège, la Slovaquie, la République de Corée, l'Espagne, la Suède, la Tunisie, l'Ukraine, la Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande du nord, et l'États-Unis d'Amérique. Sur les 27 Parties ayant envoyé leurs réponses, 16 Parties sont des États de l'aire de répartition d'*A. anguilla*, une possède une population introduite d'*A. anguilla*, et les dix autres sont des États de l'aire de répartition d'au moins une espèce d'*Anguilla* non-inscrite à la CITES.
5. Sur les 16 États de l'aire de répartition d'*A. anguilla* et la Partie ayant une population introduite, le Royaume-Uni a indiqué avoir émis des avis de commerce non-préjudiciable pour le commerce des espèces en question et le Maroc a indiqué que l'émission d'un avis de commerce non-préjudiciable était en cours. Dix Parties n'ont pas émis d'avis de commerce non-préjudiciable suite à une recommandation de l'Union-Européenne (UE) à ses États membres préconisant des quotas d'exportation nuls. Les autres États de l'aire de répartition ont donné comme raison de la non-émission d'avis de commerce préjudiciable les éléments suivants : manque de données propres aux espèces ; absence d'exportations ; exportations n'ayant pas excédé les quotas.
6. La majorité des 27 Parties ayant répondu au questionnaire ont indiqué avoir élaboré un plan de gestion partiel ou complet (18 Parties finalisé ; 6 en cours de développement), un plan de suivi pour les anguillidés (17 finalisés ; 4 en cours de développement), d'évaluation des stocks (13 finalisés ; 7 en cours de développement), et/ou un mécanisme de traçabilité (15 finalisés ; 6 en cours de développement). Au total 18 Parties ont indiqué avoir mis en place des restrictions de pêche et/ou du commerce des civelles, dont 14 avec des mesures strictes et quatre des restrictions limités.

7. Conformément à la Décision 18.199, paragraphe e), une synthèse des réponses à la Notification est présentée en Annexe 1 du présent addendum.

Application de la Décision 18.199, paragraphe b)

8. Le paragraphe b) de la Décision 18.199 charge le Secrétariat de rassembler des informations sur la biologie de l'*A. anguilla* en collaboration avec des experts, y compris le Groupe de spécialistes des anguillidés de l'Union internationale pour la conservation de la nature (IUCN/SSC), en vue de déterminer si la phase de vie des civelles (alevins) peut être considérée comment ayant "de faibles chances d'arriver à l'âge adulte".
9. À la suite des consultations avec les experts, il a été établi que du fait du manque de données collectées sur des échelles spatiales et temporelles pertinentes il n'était pas possible de calculer le taux de mortalité naturelle des alevins d'anguilles. Ainsi, la question de savoir si la phase biologique des civelles (alevins) peut être considérée comment ayant "de faibles probabilités de survie jusqu'à l'âge adulte" a été considérée comme complexe et peu concluante.
10. Certains rapports suggèrent que les anguilles ont un taux de mortalité naturel inférieur à de nombreuses autres espèces de poisson, mais ces taux dépendent d'un grand nombre de facteurs. La valeur utilisée par Dekker (2000) : la valeur du taux annuel de mortalité instantanée à 0.14 an^{-1} suivant le peuplement, est fréquemment citée comme référence. Depuis, après l'examen d'un éventail de valeurs (Dekker, 2015), la valeur 0.1 a été appliquée au plan de gestion suédois des anguilles pour les stocks d'anguille en Suède.
11. Les taux de mortalité naturelle sont réputés dépendre des différentes étapes du cycle de vie auquel la mortalité est mesurée. Bevacqua et al. (2011) signale que la mortalité des anguilles est assez élevée en début de vie par rapport aux stades suivants (0.20 à 8.5 ans^{-1} chez les jeunes, 0.02 à 0.9 ans^{-1} pour les individus de taille moyenne, et 0.007 à 0.33 an^{-1} pour les femelles de grande taille). Cependant le modèle utilisé pour calculer ce taux de mortalité ne tient pas compte de la mortalité pré-installation dans leur habitat. Par exemple, dans l'avis de commerce non-préjudiciable du Royaume-Uni, un taux de mortalité instantané à la colonisation de $0.00915 \text{ jour}^{-1}$ est utilisé comme référence pour calculer le taux de conversion des anguilles. Beaulaton et Briand (2007) ont appliqué une valeur similaire de 0.01 jour^{-1} de mortalité naturelle.
12. Certaines études font référence à une mortalité naturelle dépendante de la densité aux étapes post-introduction dans l'habitat plutôt qu'à une valeur fixe (à savoir : Vøllestad and Jonsson, 1988; De Leo et Gatto, 1996; Lobón-Cervía et Iglesias, 2008; Bevacqua et al., 2011; Aprahamian et al., 2019), mais les données relatives à la densité des civelles dans les estuaires sont souvent limitées. Bevacqua et al. (2011) a également démontré que le taux de mortalité naturelle variait selon les conditions du milieu (température de l'eau), du sexe et de la masse corporelle, avec des chiffres différents par tranche d'âge.

Application de la Décision 18.199, paragraphes c), d), et e)

13. Pour faciliter la compilation des informations recueillies auprès des Parties dans le cadre de la Décision 18.199, paragraphe c), et permettre au Secrétariat d'en référer au Comité pour les animaux et au Comité permanent comme indiqué au paragraphe e) de la Décision 18.199, un second questionnaire a été ajouté en Annexe 3 de la Notification aux Parties [No. 2021/018](#). Ce questionnaire vise à recueillir auprès des Parties des informations concernant les niveaux actuels ou les nouvelles tendances du commerce de spécimens d'*Anguilla* spp. et s'adresse aux Parties qui sont des pays d'origine, de transit ou de destination des anguillidés citées au paragraphe 3 ci-dessus.
14. Les informations recueillies en réponse à ce questionnaire serviront de base à l'étude prévue à la Décision 18.199, paragraphe d). Cette étude examinera les niveaux d'échanges et leurs structures, en particulier pour les anguilles vivantes destinées à l'aquaculture, ainsi que les sources d'approvisionnement ; permettra d'identifier les disparités entre celles-ci ; et servira à formuler des recommandations pour une gestion plus efficace des captures et du commerce des anguilles à l'avenir. La Société Zoologique de Londres (ZSL) a été mandatée pour conduire cette étude dont les résultats devraient être communiqués lors de la 74ème session du Comité permanent. Une synthèse des conclusions préalables de la Société Zoologique de Londres, y compris une synthèse des réponses au questionnaire, est présentée en Annexe 2 du présent addendum.
15. Au moment de la rédaction de cet addendum (avril 2021), les 25 Parties suivantes ont répondu à l'Annexe 3 de la Notification aux Parties No. 2021/018 : l'Algérie, l'Australie, le Canada, la Croatie, Cuba, la République Tchèque, le Danemark, l'Estonie, la Finlande, la Grèce, l'Irlande, le Japon, le Mexique, le Maroc, les Pays-Bas, la Nouvelle-Zélande, la Norvège, la République de Corée, Singapour, la Slovaquie, l'Espagne, la

Suède, la Tunisie, le Royaume-Uni et les États-Unis d'Amérique. Vingt-deux réponses concernaient des États de l'aire de répartition de dix sur les seize espèces d'anguillidés concernées, et deux réponses concernaient des États ne relevant pas des aires de répartition, bien que l'un d'entre eux soit un pays ayant introduit l'anguille européenne (la Slovaquie).

16. Concernant l'étude visée au paragraphe d) de la Décision 18.199, la Société Zoologique de Londres et ses consultants indépendants sont en train de se mettre en contact direct avec les États de l'aire de répartition des anguillidés et autres parties prenantes pour obtenir des informations et un appui en lien avec le questionnaire. La Société Zoologique de Londres pourra faire part des progrès accomplis si le Comité pour les animaux venait à mettre en place un groupe de travail sur les anguilles en cours de session.
17. Étant donné que l'étude finale figurant dans la Décision 18.199, paragraphe d) ne sera pas disponible à temps pour être examinée par le Comité pour les animaux avant la 19^{ème} session de la Conférence des Parties (CoP19), le Secrétariat propose de soumettre pour examen lors de la CoP19 les décisions préalables suivantes :

19.AA À l'adresse du Secrétariat

Le Secrétariat devra soumettre une étude sur les niveaux d'échanges et leurs structures, en particulier pour les anguilles vivantes destinées à l'aquaculture, ainsi que les sources d'approvisionnement ; l'identification des disparités entre celles-ci ; et formuler des recommandations préalables pour une gestion plus efficace des captures et du commerce des anguilles à l'avenir, à l'attention du Comité pour les animaux et du Comité permanent, selon le cas.

19.BB À l'adresse du Comité pour les animaux

Le Comité pour les animaux devra :

- a) si requis, étudier tout rapport soumis par les Parties concernant l'émission d'avis de commerce non-préjudiciable pour le commerce de l'anguille européenne et leur apporter des conseils et orientations selon les besoins ; et
- b) prendre connaissance de l'étude visée à la Décision 19.AA et toute nouvelle information fournie par le Secrétariat, et émettre les recommandations appropriées pour examen lors de la 20^{ème} session de la Conférence of the Parties.

19.CC À l'adresse du Comité permanent

Le Comité permanent devra examiner tout conseil ou recommandation émanant du Comité pour les animaux concernant la Décision 19.AA et formuler des recommandations si nécessaire.

Application de la Décision 18.200, paragraphe b)

18. La définition de l'élevage en ranch d'après le glossaire CITES est " Élevage en milieu contrôlé¹ d'animaux prélevés à l'état d'œufs ou de juvéniles dans la nature, où la probabilité de leur survie jusqu'à l'âge adulte est très faible". Elle stipule également que "Dans le contexte de la CITES, cette expression s'applique principalement aux populations d'espèces animales inscrites à l'Annexe I ayant été transférées à l'Annexe II conformément à la résolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP15) parce qu'elles ne sont plus en danger et pour qu'elles puissent bénéficier de ce type de gestion. Pour contrôler adéquatement le commerce des spécimens de ranch, leurs parties et produits sont identifiés grâce à une méthode de marquage uniforme approuvée par la Conférence des Parties, qui peut différer d'une espèce à l'autre. Les crocodiliens sont actuellement les seules espèces élevées en ranch – principalement pour leur peau."
19. Les termes de la définition ne sont pas très utiles dans le cadre des méthodes de production utilisées pour les anguilles car elles ne peuvent pas se reproduire en captivité. Les systèmes de d'élevage possibles vont des lagunes intérieures où les anguilles grandissent sur place, aux systèmes où des civelles grandissent à

¹ *Milieu manipulé pour produire des animaux d'une espèce donnée ; un tel milieu comporte des barrières physiques empêchant que des animaux, des œufs ou des gamètes de cette espèce y soient introduits ou en sortent et présente des caractéristiques générales pouvant inclure, sans que la liste soit exhaustive, abris artificiels, évacuation des déchets, soins, protection contre les prédateurs et nourriture fournie artificiellement.*

distance de leur lieu de capture. Le Comité pour les animaux peut envisager d'étudier ce qu'apporterait l'application du code de source R aux anguilles d'élevage et à quelles méthodes de production.

Recommandations révisées

20. En vue de la mise en application de la Décision 18.200, le Comité pour les animaux est invité à :

- a) mettre en place un groupe de travail en session sur les anguilles et de lui confier le mandat suivant :
 - i) étudier les informations des paragraphes 9 à 12 du présent addendum et la synthèse des réponses au questionnaire en Annexe 2 de la Notification aux Parties N° 2021/018 ;
 - ii) réfléchir à l'utilisation possible du code de source R (élevage en ranch) pour les spécimens d'*A. anguilla* relevant des systèmes d'élevage en aquaculture ;
 - iii) examiner les décisions préalables du Secrétariat au paragraphe 17 du présent addendum et identifier dans les Décisions 18.197 à 18.202 les autres éléments qui mériteraient d'être mis à jour ou approfondis ; et
 - iv) proposer au Comité pour les animaux des recommandations à l'attention du Comité permanent et de la Conférence des Parties ;
- b) étudier les recommandations préalables du groupe de travail en session ; et
- c) envisager de charger le Président du Comité pour les animaux, les responsables conjoints en charge de cet élément à l'ordre du jour ainsi que le Secrétariat d'en dresser le compte-rendu à la 19ème session de la Conférence des Parties.

SYNTHÈSE DES RÉPONSES DES PARTIES À L'ANNEXE 2 DE LA NOTIFICATION 2021/018
À LA RECHERCHE D'INFORMATIONS SUR L'ÉTAT, LA GESTION,
ET LE COMMERCE DES ANGUILLES (*Anguilla spp.*)

1. Vingt-sept Parties ont répondu au questionnaire de l'Annexe 2 de la Notification aux Parties No. 2021/018 : l'Algérie, l'Australie, le Canada, la Croatie, Cuba, la République Tchèque, le Danemark, la République dominicaine, l'Estonie, la Finlande, la Grèce, l'Irlande, le Japon, la Malaisie, le Mexique, le Maroc, les Pays-Bas, la Nouvelle-Zélande, la Norvège, la Slovaquie, la République de Corée, l'Espagne, la Suède, la Tunisie, l'Ukraine, le Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande du nord, et les États-Unis d'Amérique.
2. Dix-huit Parties ont mis en place des plans de gestion pour les anguillidés (le Canada, la Croatie, la République Tchèque, le Danemark, l'Estonie, la Finlande, la Grèce, l'Irlande, le Japon, la Malaisie, les Pays-Bas, la Nouvelle-Zélande, la République de Corée, l'Espagne, la Suède, la Tunisie, le Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande du nord, et les États-Unis d'Amérique). Sur ces 18 Parties, huit sont des États membres de l'Union Européenne (UE) avec des plans de gestion conformes au règlement N° 1100/2007 du Conseil (la Croatie, la République Tchèque, l'Estonie, la Finlande, la Grèce, les Pays-Bas, l'Espagne, et la Suède). La Slovaquie, qui est également un État membre, est cependant exempt de fournir un plan de gestion en vertu du règlement N° 1100/2007 du Conseil car ses bassins versants ne sont pas considérés comme des habitats naturels de l'anguille européenne (*Anguilla Anguilla*). Six Parties ont des plans de gestion partiels ou en cours d'élaboration (l'Algérie, l'Australie, Cuba, le Maroc, la Norvège et la Slovaquie). Deux Parties n'ont aucun plan de gestion pour les espèces d'anguillidés (la République dominicaine et l'Ukraine). Le Mexique n'a pas communiqué d'informations sur son plan de gestion actuel.
3. Dix-sept Parties ont mis en place un programme de suivi pour les anguillidés (le Canada, la Croatie, la République Tchèque, le Danemark, l'Estonie, la Finlande, l'Irlande, le Japon, la Malaisie, les Pays-Bas, la Nouvelle-Zélande, la Norvège, la République de Corée, l'Espagne, la Suède, la Tunisie, et les États-Unis d'Amérique). Parmi ces 17 Parties, huit sont des États membres de l'Union Européenne dont les programmes de suivi se conforment au règlement N° 1100/2017 (la Croatie, la République Tchèque, le Danemark, l'Estonie, la Finlande, l'Irlande, les Pays-Bas, et la Suède). Quatre pays ont des programmes de suivi partiels ou en cours d'élaboration (l'Algérie, l'Australie, le Maroc et le Royaume-Uni). Cinq Parties n'ont pas de programmes de suivi pour les espèces d'anguillidés (Cuba, la République dominicaine, la Grèce, la Slovaquie, et l'Ukraine). Le Mexique n'a pas communiqué d'informations sur son programme de suivi actuel.
4. Treize Parties ont mis en place une évaluation des stocks pour les anguillidés (l'Algérie, l'Australie, la République Tchèque, le Danemark, l'Estonie, la Finlande, l'Irlande, les Pays-Bas, la Nouvelle-Zélande, l'Espagne, la Suède, la Tunisie, et les États-Unis d'Amérique). Parmi ces 13 Parties, huit se conforment au cadre du Conseil international pour l'exploration de la mer (CIEM), du Comité scientifique, technique et économique de la pêche (CSTEP), et du Comité consultatif scientifique des pêches (CCSP) (la République Tchèque, le Danemark, l'Estonie, la Finlande, l'Irlande, l'Espagne, et la Suède). Deux Parties appartiennent également au CIEM, CSTEP et CCSP, cependant ils ont indiqué ne pas avoir d'évaluation des stocks (la Croatie et la Grèce). Sept Parties ont un système d'évaluation des stocks partiel ou en cours de développement (le Canada, le Japon, le Mexique, le Maroc, la Norvège, l'Ukraine et le Royaume-Uni). Sept Parties n'ont pas de système d'évaluation des stocks pour les espèces d'anguillidés (la Croatie, Cuba, la République dominicaine, la Grèce, la Malaisie, la Slovaquie et la République de Corée).
5. Quinze Parties ont mis en place un mécanisme pour garantir la traçabilité au niveau national/international des anguillidés (l'Algérie, le Canada, la Croatie, Cuba, la République Tchèque, le Danemark, la Finlande, la Grèce, la Malaisie, le Maroc, les Pays-Bas, la Norvège, l'Espagne, la Suède, et le Royaume-Uni). Parmi ces 15 Parties huit se conforment à la législation de l'UE (Règlement sur le contrôle) et le règlement INN sur la pêche illicite, non déclarée et non réglementée et la traçabilité internationale (la Croatie, l'Estonie, le Danemark, la Finlande, la Grèce, l'Irlande, les Pays-Bas et la Suède). Six Parties ont des mécanismes de traçabilité partiels ou en cours de développement (la République dominicaine, l'Estonie, l'Irlande, le Japon, la Nouvelle-Zélande, et la Slovaquie). Quatre Parties n'ont pas de mécanismes de traçabilité pour les espèces d'anguillidés (l'Australie, la République de Corée, l'Ukraine, et les États-Unis d'Amérique). Le Mexique n'a pas communiqué d'informations sur le mécanisme de traçabilité mis en place pour les anguillidés.

6. Vingt-quatre Parties ont répondu concernant l'émission d'avis de commerce non-préjudiciable). Sur les 24 réponses, une Partie a mis en place des avis de commerce non-préjudiciable pour l'anguille européenne (*Anguilla anguilla*) (le Royaume-Uni). Vingt-trois Parties n'ont pas d'avis de commerce non-préjudiciable pour l'anguille européenne (l'Algérie, l'Australie, le Canada, la Croatie, la République Tchèque, le Danemark, l'Estonie, la Finlande, la Grèce, l'Irlande, le Japon, la Malaisie, le Maroc, les Pays-Bas, la Nouvelle-Zélande, la Norvège, la Slovaquie, la République de Corée, l'Espagne, la Suède, la Tunisie, l'Ukraine, et les États-Unis d'Amérique). Parmi ces 23 Parties, deux n'ont pas d'avis de commerce non-préjudiciable par manque de données propres aux espèces concernées (l'Algérie et la Croatie). Dix Parties n'ont pas d'avis de commerce non-préjudiciable conformément à la recommandation du Groupe d'examen scientifique de l'UE, à savoir: aucune exportation pour tous les États membres de l'Union Européenne, (la Croatie, la République Tchèque, le Danemark, l'Estonie, la Finlande, la Grèce, l'Irlande, les Pays-Bas, la Slovaquie et la Suède). Sept Parties n'ont pas d'avis de commerce non-préjudiciable pour des raisons propres au pays (le Maroc, la Nouvelle-Zélande, la Norvège, la République de Corée, l'Espagne, la Tunisie, et l'Ukraine), et cinq Parties ont répondu en déclarant qu'ils n'avaient pas d'avis de commerce non-préjudiciable car ils ne font pas partie des États de l'aire de répartition des anguilles européennes (l'Australie, le Canada, le Japon, la Malaisie, et les États-Unis d'Amérique).
7. Sur les 27 réponses, 18 Parties ont mis en place des restrictions pour la capture et/ou le commerce des civelles, quatre Parties ont répondu n'avoir pas mis en place de restrictions pour les civelles (le Danemark, l'Estonie, la Malaisie, et la Slovaquie). Sur les 18 Parties qui ont répondu avoir mis en place des restrictions sur la capture et/ou le commerce des civelles, 14 Parties ont pris des mesures strictes de restrictions de la capture et/ou du commerce des civelles (l'Algérie, la République Tchèque, la Grèce, l'Irlande, le Maroc, les Pays-Bas, la Nouvelle-Zélande, la Norvège, la République de Corée, la Suède, la Tunisie, l'Ukraine, le Royaume-Uni, et les États-Unis d'Amérique), et quatre Parties ont établi des restrictions limitées sur la capture et le commerce (la Croatie, la République dominicaine, la Finlande et l'Espagne).

A. CONSERVATION STATUS AND MANAGEMENT**A1:** Is your country a range State of anguillid eels? If “Yes”, please indicate which species occur in your country

Algeria	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>
Australia	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla australis</i>• <i>Anguilla bicolor</i>• <i>Anguilla marmorata</i>• <i>Anguilla obscura</i>• <i>Anguilla reinhardtii</i>
Canada	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla rostrata</i>
Croatia	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>
Cuba	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla rostrata</i>
Czech Republic	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>
Denmark	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>
Dominican Republic	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla rostrata</i>
Estonia	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>
Finland	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>

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

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

A2: Do management plans/mechanisms exist for some, or all of, the anguillid species in your country? Please explain your answer and where possible provide details including links, references, collaborations, etc.

Algeria	<p>Partially or under development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation of a research project on the evaluation of the biomass of the European eel in Algeria.
Australia	<p>Partially or under development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management of two species of Anguillid eel (<i>A. australii</i> and <i>A. reinhardtii</i>) is undertaken by state fisheries management agencies. • Some fisheries have management plans, one fishery has a management plan under development. • Details on the eel fisheries in each harvesting state are in the links below. Management plans can be found in the assessment report for each fishery. • Assessment reports for the eel fisheries are published on the Department's website: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Queensland: http://www.environment.gov.au/marine/fisheries/qld/eel-fishery - New South Wales: http://www.environment.gov.au/marine/fisheries/nsw/estuary - Victoria: http://www.environment.gov.au/marine/fisheries/vic/eel - Tasmania: http://www.environment.gov.au/marine/fisheries/tas/freshwater-eel
Canada	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management of American Eel in Canada is multi-jurisdictional involving five administrative regions of Fisheries and Oceans Canada (Ontario and Prairie, Gulf, Maritimes, Newfoundland and Labrador, and Quebec) and the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. <p>Commercial Fisheries for Yellow and Silver American Eel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Ontario, the commercial fishery of eel has been closed since 2004. - In Quebec, the eel fishery is conducted in the St. Lawrence Estuary and there are no longer any commercial fisheries upstream of Lac St. Pierre. - Multispecies commercial licences that allow eel catches in Lac St-Pierre to Orleans Island.

- In the Gulf Region, the fisheries are managed under Integrated Fisheries Management Plans (IFMPs) for each area office in Prince Edward Island, Gulf of New Brunswick, and Gulf Nova Scotia (2007-2010).
- Licenced areas vary from single watershed, to multiple watersheds, and various proportions of coastal areas.
- Licence holders are restricted to the type of gear that is set out in their licence.
- Logbooks are mandatory as per their licence conditions.
- In Newfoundland and Labrador Region, licenced areas vary from single watersheds, to multiple watersheds, and various proportions of coastal areas; sites are restricted and specified on river systems; fishers are not permitted to move from their designated site; site locations are noted by latitude and longitude coordinates in licence conditions; and transferring sites is not permitted on river systems, unless the fish harvester meets stringent criteria.
- In Maritimes Region, the commercial fishery has limited entry (no additional licences since 1993).
- Licence holders are restricted to the area (typically county), type of gear and seasons set out in their licences.
- Eel catches are more regulated by water temperature than by official seasons.
- Commercial fishing locations are virtually in all inland and tidal waters with most of the landings occurring from May to November.

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.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> American eel had a significant role in the 1999 Supreme Court of Canada Marshall Decision which confirmed that aboriginal people had a treaty right to catch and sell fish in order to earn a moderate livelihood. As a result of the Marshall Decision, communal commercial licences are issued to First Nations organizations for participation in the general commercial fishery. <p>Bycatch</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In commercial and recreational fisheries, any bycatch of American Eel caught incidentally while fishing for other species must be returned to the water. In First Nations FSC fisheries, any bycatch of American Eel caught incidentally while fishing for other species may be retained if specified in the Aboriginal Fisheries Strategy Agreements; otherwise, it must be returned to the water.
<p>Croatia</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 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.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. • Eel fishing in Croatia is regulated by way of Ordinance on commercial fishing with gillnets, pots, hook and line gears spears and particular fishing techniques (OG 84/15, 94/15, 107/15, 62/17 and 64/17) as well as Ordinance on fishing in protected areas, special habitats and areas with particular management regimes (OG 125/20) and Ordinance on eel closure season (adopted on annual basis). • Upgrade of the national management framework is currently under way. • European eels are included in Annex B of Council Regulation (EC) No 338/97, which implements the CITES provisions in the EU. • For Annex B species, one of the conditions for issuance of an export permit by the relevant EU Member State is that the applicant for the export permit provides “documentary evidence that the specimens have been obtained in accordance with the legislation in force on the protection of the species in question” (cf. Article 5(4) and 5(2)(b)). • Exports from the EU of European eels have been suspended since December 2010, as the scientific authorities of the EU Member States have concluded that a “non-detriment finding” for the species could not be performed. This assessment has been confirmed again for 2021 by the competent EU expert Group, the Scientific Review Group, in December 2020.
Cuba	Partially or under development

<p>Czech Republic</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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
------------------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM) Recommendation GFCM/42/2018/1 establishing management measures for European eel in the Mediterranean Sea. • Czech National Action Plan for the Management of European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>), for details in the Czech language please see: http://eagri.cz/public/web/file/233931/Management_plan.pdf • An update of this strategic document is planned to be conducted in close future. • In addition, European eels are included in Annex B of Council Regulation (EC) No 338/97, which implements the CITES provisions in the EU. As for any 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.
Denmark	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. • European eels are included in Annex B of Council Regulation (EC) No 338/97, which implements the CITES provisions in the EU. • For Annex B species, one of the conditions for issuance of an export permit by the relevant EU Member State is that the applicant for the export permit provides “documentary evidence that the specimens have been obtained in accordance with the legislation in force on the protection of the species in question” (cf. Article 5(4) and 5(2)(b)). • Exports from the EU of European eels have been suspended since December 2010, as the scientific authorities of the EU Member States have concluded that a “non-detriment finding” for the species could not be performed. This assessment has been confirmed again for 2021 by the competent EU expert Group, the Scientific Review Group, in December 2020.
Dominican Republic	No.
Estonia	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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.
<p>Finland</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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

	<p>supported (e.g. via Article 37(2) on direct restocking and Article 54 on aquaculture providing environmental services).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the “Our Baltic” Declaration of 2020, and - General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM) Recommendation GFCM/42/2018/1 establishing management measures for European eel in the Mediterranean Sea. • A multiannual management Plan for eel is adopted on the level of the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (Recommendation GFCM/42/2018/1) and is obligatory to all CPCs. • European eels are included in Annex B of Council Regulation (EC) No 338/97, which implements the CITES provisions in the EU. • For Annex B species, one of the conditions for issuance of an export permit by the relevant EU Member State is that the applicant for the export permit provides “documentary evidence that the specimens have been obtained in accordance with the legislation in force on the protection of the species in question” (cf. Article 5(4) and 5(2)(b)). • Exports from the EU of European eels have been suspended since December 2010, as the scientific authorities of the EU Member States have concluded that a “non-detriment finding” for the species could not be performed. This assessment has been confirmed again for 2021 by the competent EU expert Group, the Scientific Review Group, in December 2020.
<p>Greece</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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.
- **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.**
- European eels are included in Annex B of Council Regulation (EC) No 338/97, which implements the CITES provisions in the EU.
- For Annex B species, one of the conditions for issuance of an export permit by the relevant EU Member State is that the applicant for the export permit provides “documentary evidence

	<p>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)).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exports from the EU of European eels have been suspended since December 2010, as the scientific authorities of the EU Member States have concluded that a “non-detriment finding” for the species could not be performed. This assessment has been confirmed again for 2021 by the competent EU expert Group, the Scientific Review Group, in December 2020.
<p>Ireland</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Escapement target is to be achieved in the long term. Various measures were set up under those Eel Management Plans EMPs such as limiting (professional and recreational) fisheries, making it easier for fish to migrate through the rivers, or restocking suitable inland waters with young eel. 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. 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 month’s 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.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • European eels are included in Annex B of Council Regulation (EC) No 338/97, which implements the CITES provisions in the EU. • For Annex B species, one of the conditions for issuance of an export permit by the relevant EU Member State is that the applicant for the export permit provides “documentary evidence that the specimens have been obtained in accordance with the legislation in force on the protection of the species in question” (cf. Article 5(4) and 5(2)(b)). • Exports from the EU of European eels have been suspended since December 2010, as the scientific authorities of the EU Member States have concluded that a “non-detriment finding” for the species could not be performed. This assessment has been confirmed again for 2021 by the competent EU expert Group, the Scientific Review Group, in December 2020. • 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.
Japan	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive measures including population management and habitat restoration. • Called upon the People's Republic of China and Chinese Taipei to engage in an international discussion, “the Informal Consultation on International Cooperation for Conservation and Management of Japanese Eel Stock and Other Relevant Eel Species” held in September 2012. The Republic of Korea joined from the fourth meeting in September 2013 • In 2014, China, Japan, Korea, and Chinese Taipei released Joint Statement at the seventh meeting, restricting input of eel seeds into aquaculture ponds: the amount of input of eel seeds for the 2014-2015 input season would be no more than 80% of the 2013-2014 input season. • Upper limit of pond input in Japan was set at 21.7 tons. Thereafter, the upper limit of input in the next fishing season has been discussed every year through informal consultations. • Limit has remained the same since 2014-2015 season because no scientific evidence has been provided to change it. • To implement the upper limit, Japan introduced a licensing system to eel aquaculture under the Inland Water Fishery Promotion Act established in June 2015.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to instruct fishers appropriately report the weight of glass eels catch; - to supervise and inspect the catch of glass eels thoroughly; - to fully understand the catch, distribution, export of glass eels without any non-transparency; and - to instruct Fisheries Cooperative which are obliged to promote eel resources to properly implement stocking and conserve and regenerate eels' habitat efficiently.
Malaysia	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permits are issued for imports/exports (not up to species level for anguillid)
Morocco	Partially or under development

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Morocco has a fairly solid legal arsenal that allows it to properly frame the implementation of its eel management plan. • In accordance with the provisions of Law n°130-12 on continental fishing and aquaculture as amended and completed in 2015 and Law 29-05 on the protection of species of wild fauna and flora and the control of their trade, a certain number of regulatory mechanisms make it possible to guarantee an adaptive and coordinated management of this species, notably through <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Eel exploitation based on specific specifications that define the rights and obligations of operators, including the principle of fishing quotas, the prohibition of trade in glass eels, the obligation to aquaculture the glass eels caught and the contribution to restocking operations. - 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.
<p>The Netherlands</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Escapement target is to be achieved in the long term. • Various measures were set up under those EMPs such as limiting (professional and recreational) fisheries, making it easier for fish to migrate through the rivers, or restocking suitable inland waters with young eel. • 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. • 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). • In the Netherlands this temporary eel fishing closure is set from 1 September till 1st December. This is also the period that silver eel migrates toward the sea.

- 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.
- **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).**
- European eels are included in Annex B of Council Regulation (EC) No 338/97, which implements the CITES provisions in the EU.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
New Zealand	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shortfin and longfin eel fisheries are managed under an Individual Transferable Quota (ITQ) system. • The New Zealand Fisheries Act 1996 requires that Total Allowable Commercial Catches (TACCs) and Total Allowable Catches (TACs, which include the TACC along with allowances for recreational and customary catches and other sources of mortality) are set to provide for utilisation while ensuring sustainability. • Eels smaller than 220 grams may not be kept, nor eels larger than 4 kg. • Except for one catchment in the South Island, fishers voluntarily avoid adult migrant (silver) eels. • Recreational use is also regulated with a bag limit of 6 eels per day. • Māori customary use is regulated by Māori guardians and is only for local consumption. • Farming does not occur due to these restrictions.
Norway	<p>Partially or under development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As part of ICES call for information the catch ban was lifted in 2017 with quotas for research catch. • Only professional fishermen can apply. • Catch per vessel is set at a maximum of 700kgs, and there is a need to apply for taking part in the research fishery. • The Institute of marine research decides with fishermen may participate and the fishermen must report the information required by the Institute of marine research. • It is not allowed to fish for eels in freshwater
Republic of Korea	<p>Yes.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A harvest closure period (from 1 October until 31 March of the following year) and minimum size requirements (15-45cm) are enforced according to the enforcement ordinance of the Inland Water Fisheries Act.
Slovakia	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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 • European eels are included in Annex B of Council Regulation (EC) No. 338/97, which implements the CITES provisions in the EU. • For Annex B species, one of the conditions for issuance of an export permit by Slovakia as one of the EU Member States 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.
Spain	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on Council Regulation (EC) 1100/2007, establishing measures for the recovery of the European eel stock, the management plans for the European eel in Spain were drawn up (one national plan, plus 12 plans of the Autonomous Communities) approved by Commission Decision dated 1 October 2010. • For the international stretch of the Miño river, a joint management plan between Spain and Portugal was prepared, approved by Commission Decision dated May 21, 2012. • Some measures have been updated by the Autonomous Communities • 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.

<p>Sweden</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Escapement target is to be achieved in the long term. • Various measures were set up under those EMPs such as limiting (professional and recreational) fisheries, making it easier for fish to migrate through the rivers, or restocking suitable inland waters with young eel. • 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. • 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.
----------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Swedish Eel Management Plan, approved by the EU-Commission in 2009 includes protective actions in four main areas: stocking, up- and downstream migration, fishery regulation. • The plan is evaluated every third year, according to article 9, EU regulation (1100/2007). • During the last years, Sweden have arranged three workshops within the framework of Helcom and Baltfish focusing primarily on to share information and discuss improved methods of data collection and Baltic stock status assessment, control of trade and fishery. • In order to increase data and knowledge, Sweden participate in an initiated monitoring program on eel migration from the Baltic Sea using a fishing-independent technology, acoustic telemetry. An infrastructure of receivers is placed at strategic locations such as outlets from lakes and in narrow straits. • System is under construction, but eels have been marked and in 2021 the first ones are expected results. • In addition, European eels are included in Annex B of Council Regulation (EC) No 338/97, which implements the CITES provisions in the EU. • For Annex B species, one of the conditions for issuance of an export permit by the relevant EU Member State is that the applicant for the export permit provides “documentary evidence that the specimens have been obtained in accordance with the legislation in force on the protection of the species in question” (cf. Article 5(4) and 5(2)(b)). • Exports from the EU of European eels have been suspended since December 2010, as the scientific authorities of the EU Member States have concluded that a “non-detriment finding” for the species could not be performed. This assessment has been confirmed again for 2021 by the competent EU expert Group, the Scientific Review Group, in December 2020.
Tunisia	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DGPA. 2010. Eel Management Plan of Tunisia. Technical report of the General Directorate of Fisheries and Aquaculture. Ministry of Agriculture, Tunisia. 108p.
Ukraine	<p>No.</p>
United Kingdom	<p>Yes.</p>
United States of America	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (Commission) has coordinated interstate management of American eel (<i>Anguilla rostrata</i>) from 0-3 miles offshore since 2000.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> American eel is currently managed under the Interstate Fishery Management Plan (FMP) and Addenda I-V to the FMP. Management authority in the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) from 3-200 miles from shore lies with NOAA Fisheries. The management unit is defined as the portion of the American eel population occurring in the territorial seas and inland waters along the Atlantic coast from Maine to Florida.
<p>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.</p>	
Algeria	<p>Partially or under development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of the GFCM research program on the European eel <i>Anguilla Anguilla</i>.
Australia	<p>Partially or under development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All fisheries provide annual catch and effort reports. Monitoring programs/arrangements can be found in assessment reports published on the department's website: See links in A.2
Canada	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> American Eels reared in Atlantic drainages of Canada and the United States are part of a common genetic stock, although the American Eel has not been confirmed to be panmictic because genetic samples are unavailable for the remainder of the species' range. Recent evaluation of 38 American Eel abundance series in Canada identified 35 as either valid or could be considered valid after standardization. The 12 most robust fisheries were used in an examination of abundance trends. The longest data series began in 1952, with most series using data collected through 2018. 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.
Croatia	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council Regulation (EC) No 1100/2017 contains general requirements for EU Member States for the monitoring of the European eel.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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.
Cuba	No.
Czech Republic	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council Regulation (EC) No 1100/2017 contains general requirements for EU Member States for the monitoring of the European eel. • This includes a monitoring under EMPs with the purpose of achieving the escapement target, a system related to glass eel restocking, monitoring and reporting of various biological data, as well as control and catch monitoring systems. • EU Member States have an obligation to collect data related to the European eel under the EU Data Collection Framework. • Regulation (EU) 2017/1004 of the European Parliament and of the Council establishes an EU framework for the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries sector and support for scientific advice regarding the CFP. • EU data collection framework (DCF) is applicable to eels and covers inland waters, specifically establishing a programme for the collection of biological data on all stocks caught or by-caught in EU commercial and, where appropriate, recreational fisheries in and outside EU waters, including eels.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EU Member States coordinate their data collection activities in regional coordination groups. • Issues related to diadromous species are subject to pan-European coordination in a dedicated subgroup. • 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.
Denmark	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council Regulation (EC) No 1100/2017 contains general requirements for EU Member States for the monitoring of the European eel. • This includes a monitoring under EMPs with the purpose of achieving the escapement target, a system related to glass eel restocking, monitoring and reporting of various biological data, as well as control and catch monitoring systems. • EU Member States have an obligation to collect data related to the European eel under the EU Data Collection Framework. • Regulation (EU) 2017/1004 of the European Parliament and of the Council establishes an EU framework for the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries sector and support for scientific advice regarding the CFP. • EU data collection framework (DCF) is applicable to eels and covers inland waters, specifically establishing a programme for the collection of biological data on all stocks caught or by-caught in EU commercial 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.
Dominican Republic	No.
Estonia	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council Regulation (EC) No 1100/2017 contains general requirements for EU Member States for the monitoring of the European eel. • This includes a monitoring under EMPs with the purpose of achieving the escapement target, a system related to glass eel restocking, monitoring and reporting of various biological data, as well as control and catch monitoring systems.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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.
<p>Finland</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council Regulation (EC) No 1100/2017 contains general requirements for EU Member States for the monitoring of the European eel, including 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 are obligated to collect data related to the European eel under the EU Data Collection Framework. • As noted in the Commission report on the evaluation of the Eel Regulation, “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. This 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”. • 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.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An index for the abundance of yellow eels and silver eels along the Finnish coast is obtained from fisheries statistics. • Both yellow and silver eels are caught as bycatch in professional and recreational fisheries. • Eel has been included in the EU Data Collection Programme in Finland since 2017. Since then samples are collected along the Finnish coast to estimate the share of yellow/silver eels and restocked/wild eels (on the basis of strontium chloride label, only for individuals from year-class 2009 and later). • Samples are collected in two locations in inland waters as well: lake Kulovesi (Kokemäenjoki watershed) and lake Vesijärvi (Kymijoki watershed), where all eels are supposed to be of restocked origin due to migration barriers. • An index for the silver eels migrating from Finland is obtained from two sites. There is an eel trap in the river Vääksynjoki and an echosounder (DIDSON) in Kokemäenjoki under the lowest hydro-power dam. Eels caught in Vääksynjoki are tagged and released into the sea at Kymijoki estuary (below hydropower dams). All eels are originally restocked in the lake Vesijärvi. • During 2014-2020, 1942 eels have been caught and transported to the sea. In total more than 3,0 tn of eels have been transported over the hydroelectric power plants.
Greece	No.
Ireland	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council Regulation (EC) No 1100/2017 contains general requirements for EU Member States for the monitoring of the European eel. • This includes a monitoring under EMPs with the purpose of achieving the escapement target, a system related to glass eel restocking, monitoring and reporting of various biological data, as well as control and catch monitoring systems. • EU Member States have an obligation to collect data related to the European eel under the EU Data Collection Framework. • Regulation (EU) 2017/1004 of the European Parliament and of the Council establishes an EU framework for the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries sector and support for scientific advice regarding the CFP. • EU data collection framework (DCF) is applicable to eels and covers inland waters, specifically establishing a programme for the collection of biological data on all stocks caught or by-caught in EU commercial 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.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues related to diadromous species are subject to pan-European coordination in a dedicated subgroup. • 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.
Japan	<p>Yes.</p> <p>See A4.</p>
Malaysia	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landing data is collected throughout the year (not up to species level)
Morocco	<p>Partially or under development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On 24/02/2020, the Department of Water and Forests launched a study on the evaluation of eel stocks. • The objective of this study is to develop a standardized methodology for monitoring the population dynamics of eel adapted to Moroccan continental waters and to apply it to the main eel fisheries. • The completion of the study is scheduled for February 2022.
The Netherlands	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council Regulation (EC) No 1100/2017 contains general requirements for EU Member States for the monitoring of the European eel. • This includes a monitoring under EMPs with the purpose of achieving the escapement target, a system related to glass eel restocking, monitoring and reporting of various biological data, as well as control and catch monitoring systems. • EU Member States have an obligation to collect data related to the European eel under the EU Data Collection Framework. • Regulation (EU) 2017/1004 of the European Parliament and of the Council establishes an EU framework for the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries sector and support for scientific advice regarding the CFP. • EU data collection framework (DCF) is applicable to eels and covers inland waters, specifically establishing a programme for the collection of biological data on all stocks

	<p>caught or by-caught in EU commercial and, where appropriate, recreational fisheries in and outside EU waters, including eels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EU Member States coordinate their data collection activities in regional coordination groups. • Issues related to diadromous species are subject to pan-European coordination in a dedicated subgroup. • In the Netherlands Wageningen Marine Research is involved in a monitoring programme regarding the Council Regulation (EC) No 1100/2017 and for the EU Data Collection Framework. • The monitoring programme for European eel involves: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Market sampling: representative samples (usually 150-200 eels) are taken from retained catches from commercial fishers each year. - Monitoring of glass eel at major entry points (also in cooperation with RAVON); - Monitoring and sampling of European eel in designated water bodies (main rivers; lakes and even ditches). • The outcomes of the monitoring is also input for the stock assessment as described in A.4 • Part of this data is also input for the ICES advise on the European Eel as, for example the data for the glass eel monitoring of the locations Den Oever Spuisluis, IJmuiden, Katwijk, Stellendam and Lauwersoog are used for the ICES glass eel recruitment indices.
New Zealand	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The same monitoring programmes are used for all QMS fish stocks. • These involve compulsory commercial logbook programmes, electronic reporting, and requirements for processing firms (all of which must be licensed fish receivers) to provide data on vessel and area-specific fishing effort and landings by species, as well as destinations of all processed fish. • New Zealand does not need to collaborate with other countries to achieve this. • We also monitor elver recruitment at hydro dams to provide indices of recruitment strength. • Other forms of monitoring that assist with assessments of stock status are detailed in the Freshwater eels section of the following link: https://www.mpi.govt.nz/dmsdocument/40781
Norway	<p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institute of Marine Research has established at sea listening buoys recording migration • Various monitoring schemes from last 100 years have been established, with most related to sea areas.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upstream in watercourses only one monitoring program is of any length: Norwegian Institute for Nature Research and their research station at lms IMR monitors eels through the research fishery data. Fishers are required to record the number of small (under 300 g) and large eels, total weight of small and large eels, the number of fyke nets per fishing trip. IMR also carries out an annual mark-recapture survey on the western coast of Norway. This survey provides biomass and density estimates for this part of Norway, which are reported to ICES. Samples are also regularly taken to obtain data on age structure and presence of the swimbladder parasite (<i>Anguillicola crassus</i>).
Republic of Korea	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exchange of statistical data on eel capture, harvest and stocking and discussions on resource conservation between Members of the Informal Consultation on International Cooperation for the Conservation and Management of Japanese Eel Stock and Other Relevant Eel Species held annually
Slovakia	<p>No.</p>
Spain	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> European eel fisheries in Spain take place in waters under the jurisdiction of the Autonomous Communities (CC.AA.), in estuaries, lagoons, river mouths...so it is the CC.AA. that apply the control and surveillance measures based on their planning. 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.
Sweden	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council Regulation (EC) No 1100/2017 contains general requirements for EU Member States for the monitoring of the European eel. This includes a monitoring under EMPs with the purpose of achieving the escapement target, a system related to glass eel restocking, monitoring and reporting of various biological data, as well as control and catch monitoring systems. EU Member States have an obligation to collect data related to the European eel under the EU Data Collection Framework.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Every third year the Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management (SwAM) commission a scientific report and assessment of the eel stock in Sweden. • Latest assessment is from 2018. • A new report will be published in July 2021. • Sweden collect on the basis of a national program within the EU Data Collection Framework, manage and make available a wide range of fisheries data needed for scientific advice. • Annual reports on the implementation of the national data collection programmes to the EU Commission. • Sweden provides yearly requested information on stock assessment and data on harvest, trap-and-transport, glass eel releases, etc. to ICES (Ices datacall). • Sweden also participate in ICES/EIFAAC WGeel.
Tunisia	<p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GFCM Research programme on European eel: towards coordination of European eel stock management and recovery in the Mediterranean. • Research program over 2 years (2021-2022) which includes 4 components or working packages, 1 of which is entitled "Establishment of a common framework for the long-term biological monitoring of eel in the Mediterranean".
Ukraine	<p>No.</p>
United Kingdom	<p>Partially or under development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the eel reg (as retained in GB) and the related Eel Management Plans in place, monitoring is carried out to assess progress towards the 40% silver eel escapement target.

<p>United States of America</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Fishery Independent Data Collection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any state or jurisdiction with a commercial glass eel fishery must implement a fishery-independent life cycle survey covering glass/elver, yellow, and silver eels within at least one river system. • If possible and appropriate, the survey should be implemented in the river system where the glass eel survey (as required under Addendum III) is being conducted to take advantage of the long-term glass eel survey data collection. • At a minimum the survey must collect the following information: fishery-independent index of abundance, age of entry into the fishery/survey, biomass and mortality of glass and yellow eels, sex composition, age structure, prevalence of <i>Anguillicoloides crassus</i> (invasive nematode), and average length and weight of eels in the fishery/survey. • Survey proposals will be subject to Technical Committee (TC) review and Board approval. • States or jurisdictions commercially harvesting less than 750 pounds of glass eels are exempt from this requirement. • Yellow eel and silver eel survey requirements can be found in Addendum III. <p>Fishery Dependent Data Collection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To increase accuracy of reporting, states and jurisdictions with a commercial yellow eel fishery will be required to implement a trip level reporting system for both dealer and harvester reporting. • Dealer and harvester landing catches must submit reports to the state of landing monthly or more frequently, if possible. • This includes reporting on directed commercial harvest, by trip, (pounds landed by life stage, gear type, and catch per unit effort (CPUE)). • Cross referencing between dealer and fishery trip level reporting should be conducted to ensure accuracy. States with more conservative reporting requirements in place will be required to maintain them. • States must continue collect biological data, per Section 3.4.1 of the FMP, from a representative sub-sample of the commercial catch, if available, to evaluate sex and age structure (for yellow/silver eels), length and weight. • States must also continue report on the estimated percent of harvest going to food versus bait.
--	--

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

Croatia	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Commission is monitoring the state of European eel stock on a regular basis. • This is done through recurrent and ad-hoc requests to the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) which provides scientific advice on the state of the stock and other specific matters related to eels. • The Joint EIFAAC/ICES/GFCM Working Group on Eel (WGEEL) provides the stock assessment and other analysis in support of ICES scientific advices. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ICES Advice on fishing opportunities, catch, and effort, European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>) throughout its natural range - Expert Group Report 2020 - EU request on temporal migration patterns of European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>) • Assessment of the status of the eel stock is done under the framework of ICES, STECF and SAC
Cuba	<p>No.</p>
Czech Republic	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Commission is monitoring the state of European eel stock on a regular basis. • This is done through recurrent and ad-hoc requests to the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) which provides scientific advice on the state of the stock and other specific matters related to eels. • The Joint EIFAAC/ICES/GFCM Working Group on Eel (WGEEL) provides the stock assessment and other analysis in support of ICES scientific advices. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ICES Advice on fishing opportunities, catch, and effort, European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>) throughout its natural range - Expert Group Report 2020 - EU request on temporal migration patterns of European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>) • Based on the national legislation the Czech Republic there is annually monitored stock assessment recording restocking and harvest data on Eels.
Denmark	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Commission is monitoring the state of European eel stock on a regular basis. • This is done through recurrent and ad-hoc requests to the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) which provides scientific advice on the state of the stock and other specific matters related to eels.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Joint EIFAAC/ICES/GFCM Working Group on Eel (WGEEL) provides the stock assessment and other analysis in support of ICES scientific advices. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ICES Advice on fishing opportunities, catch, and effort, European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>) throughout its natural range - Expert Group Report 2020 - EU request on temporal migration patterns of European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>)
Dominican Republic	No.
Estonia	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Commission is monitoring the state of European eel stock on a regular basis. • This is done through recurrent and ad-hoc requests to the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) which provides scientific advice on the state of the stock and other specific matters related to eels. • The Joint EIFAAC/ICES/GFCM Working Group on Eel (WGEEL) provides the stock assessment and other analysis in support of ICES scientific advices. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ICES Advice on fishing opportunities, catch, and effort, European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>) throughout its natural range - Expert Group Report 2020 - EU request on temporal migration patterns of European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>) • 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).
Finland	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Commission is monitoring 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 provide scientific advice on the state of the stock and other specific matters related to eels. • The joint EIFAAC/ICES/GFCM Working Group on Eel (WGEEL) provides the stock assessment and other analysis in support of ICES scientific advices. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ICES Advice on fishing opportunities, catch, and effort, European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>) throughout its natural range

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expert Group Report 2020 - EU request on temporal migration patterns of European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>) • See also A3.
Greece	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Commission is monitoring 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 provide scientific advice on the state of the stock and other specific matters related to eels. • The joint EIFAAC/ICES/GFCM Working Group on Eel (WGEEL) provides the stock assessment and other analysis in support of ICES scientific advices. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ICES Advice on fishing opportunities, catch, and effort, European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>) throughout its natural range - Expert Group Report 2020 - EU request on temporal migration patterns of European eel (<i>Anguilla Anguilla</i>)
Ireland	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Commission is monitoring 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 provide scientific advice on the state of the stock and other specific matters related to eels. • The joint EIFAAC/ICES/GFCM Working Group on Eel (WGEEL) provides the stock assessment and other analysis in support of ICES scientific advices. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ICES Advice on fishing opportunities, catch, and effort, European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>) throughout its natural range - Expert Group Report 2020 - EU request on temporal migration patterns of European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>) • 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.
Japan	Partially or under development.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2019, the Fisheries Agency of Japan launched a research project with the goal of developing a comprehensive assessment of Japanese eel populations. In this research project, 34 research institutes are cooperating to understand trends and size of the Japanese eel resources and implement risk assessment for those resources. The project is multidisciplinary, utilising data/information from various sources (eg. fish catch records, population genetics, satellite tag of migration surveys, and monitoring of glass-eel recruitment patterns). This will provide essential information for mathematical and statistical assessment models that aim to evaluate the sustainability of eel harvest and input of glass eels into aquaculture ponds. • An estimation of yearly effective population size from genomic data expects to provide a fishery-independent indicator of population trends. • Since 2012, Japan has regularly exchange various data/information of both adult eels and glass eels with China, Korea, and Chinese Taipei under the framework of "the Informal Consultation on International Cooperation for Conservation and Management of Japanese Eel Stock and Other Relevant Eel Species". • In September 2018, a Regional Workshop on Japanese Eel took place in Tokyo, during which Japan reviewed existing scientific data and information related to Japanese eel, and discussed what kind of scientific research should be conducted in the future from a scientific point of view with participants from Korea and Chinese Taipei. • In March 2020, Japan intended to hold a scientific meeting inviting eel experts from the International Council for the Exploration of the Seas (ICES) and Zoological Society of London (ZSL), with attendance of China, Korea, and Chinese Taipei, but cancelled it due to COVID-19 pandemic.
Malaysia	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No stock assessments been conducted yet on anguillid. The focus is more to other species.
Mexico	Partially or under development
Morocco	<p>Partially or under development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The terms of reference of the study mentioned in point A3 provide for the development of a permanent monitoring program related to the management of the species. This program will be built around a battery of indicators relating, among others, to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The determination of the elver recruitment rates, in particular through - Recruitment rate - Estimation of the elver stock - Index of abundance

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluation of silver eel flows downstream to the sea, by estimating the escapement rate of silver eels.
The Netherlands	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Commission is monitoring 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 provide scientific advice on the state of the stock and other specific matters related to eels. • The joint EIFAAC/ICES/GFCM Working Group on Eel (WGEEL) provides the stock assessment and other analysis in support of ICES scientific advices. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ICES Advice on fishing opportunities, catch, and effort, European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>) throughout its natural range - Expert Group Report 2020 - EU request on temporal migration patterns of European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>) • 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.
New Zealand	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempted to conduct stock assessments for eels in each catchment area for both of the main species (<i>A. australis</i> (shortfin eels) and <i>A. dieffenbachii</i> (longfin eels)). • Given each species is considered biologically to come from the same New Zealand-wide population, it is difficult to come up with reference points by catchment area, but the stock status for <i>A. dieffenbachii</i> has been determined based on the fact that only a small proportion of the area of occupation is open to fishing or accessible to fishing. • Currently undertaking research into recent developments in spatial stock assessments to assess New Zealand longfin eel. • Fisheries New Zealand also analyses standardised Catch-Per-Unit-of-Effort (CPUE) trends for the fished areas of each catchment, indicating that subpopulations in most catchments are either stable or increasing for both species, with a few notable exceptions in highly populated regions. • The status of both species is meeting management performance measures, including being near or above maximum sustainable yield (MSY) related management targets and well above biomass limits.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recruitment indices based on elver counts at hydro dams have fluctuated without trend for about 30 years, suggesting that recruitment has remained at healthy levels. • The Department of Conservation also produces a periodic Threat Classification Report for freshwater species (and other groups of species) that includes both species of eels. • <i>A. australis</i> was evaluated as “Not Threatened / increasing” in 2017 using the New Zealand Threat Classification System. • <i>A. dieffenbachii</i> was evaluated as “At Risk / declining”. • Three points need to be noted to put this evaluation into context: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the Department of Conservation evaluation was based on projected future status, not current or recent status. The criterion used was a projected 10-70% decline over the next 3 generations. A generation time for this species is about 40 years, so this criterion only requires a projected decrease of 10% over about 120 years. - current trends, however, indicate that the status in each catchment is either stable or increasing. The Department of Conservation report states that (p8): “The panel also notes that public discourse on the longfin eel portrays the species as being severely threatened despite 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	Partially or under development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See under A.3
Republic of Korea	No.
Slovakia	No. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> is introduced in Slovakia
Spain	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the framework of the Eel Management Plans and the annual and post-assessment reports required every three years by EU regulations (see baseline reports on European eel assessment, and by country, in ICES).

Sweden	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Commission is monitoring 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 provide scientific advice on the state of the stock and other specific matters related to eels. • The joint EIFAAC/ICES/GFCM Working Group on Eel (WGEEL) provides the stock assessment and other analysis in support of ICES scientific advices. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ICES Advice on fishing opportunities, catch, and effort, European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>) throughout its natural range - Expert Group Report 2020 - EU request on temporal migration patterns of European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>)
Tunisia	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GFCM Research programme on European eel: towards coordination of European eel stock management and recovery in the Mediterranean. • 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	<p>Partially or under development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary set out in NDF document attached below.
United States of America	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • most recent stock assessment update was finalized in October 2017. • Next benchmark stock assessment is scheduled to be peer reviewed in 2022.
<p>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</p>	
Algeria	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerning national trade, a system for collecting statistical information on commercial catches has been put in place. • For international trade, all trade data are recorded at the level of the customs services.

Australia	No.
Canada	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Government and Licence holders have been working together to enhance the traceability of elvers caught in the Maritimes Region. • Under licence conditions, a paper trail must be maintained from the river until the point of sale. • Logbooks are used to document catches at the river, and track transport of elvers from the river to the holding facility. • 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.
Croatia	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under EU legislation (the Control Regulation), all lots of fisheries and aquaculture products (including eel) shall be traceable at all stages of production, processing and distribution, from catching or harvesting to retail stage. • 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. • 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

	<p>for those catches that are transported as well as an obligation to register first sales via sales note.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A system for traceability of eel, although planned, is not yet in place.
Cuba	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a system of fishing licenses for each company, all state-owned, and there is a control system for the entire process that includes reports and reports (daily, monthly, and annual) on fisheries, transportation, shipping, and international trade. • System is monitored at the national level by the Ministerio de la Industria Alimentaria. • Only one company is authorized to export.
Czech Republic	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Commission is monitoring 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 provide scientific advice on the state of the stock and other specific matters related to eels. • The joint EIFAAC/ICES/GFCM Working Group on Eel (WGEEL) provides the stock assessment and other analysis in support of ICES scientific advices. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ICES Advice on fishing opportunities, catch, and effort, European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>) throughout its natural range - Expert Group Report 2020 - EU request on temporal migration patterns of European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>)
Denmark	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under EU legislation (the Control Regulation), all lots of fisheries and aquaculture products (including eel) shall be traceable at all stages of production, processing, and distribution, from catching or harvesting to retail stage. • 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. • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Export statistics of the General Customs Directorate
Estonia	Partially or under development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under EU legislation (the Control Regulation), all lots of fisheries and aquaculture products (including eel) shall be traceable at all stages of production, processing, and distribution, from catching or harvesting to retail stage. • 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. • 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.
Finland	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under EU legislation (the Control Regulation), many 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.
Greece	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under EU legislation (the Control Regulation), many 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.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Regarding Greece the Ministerial Decision No. 643/39462 / 01-04-2013 established the issue of an attestation by the Regional Fisheries Authorities, called “Attestation of Legal Production” for the intra-community movement and trade of eel between member states, stating that the quantity <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> for intra-Community movement between Member States, has been fished or produced from farming in accordance with national and Community legislation and in accordance with the approved National Eel Management Plan (HEMP) in the framework of Regulation 1100/2007. • Only with these attestations the CITES Regional Authorities allow the intra-Community movement of the eel issuing the called “simple permits” in order to succeed the traceability requirements for the traded specimens of <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> between EU Member States.
Ireland	<p>Partially or under development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under EU legislation (the Control Regulation), many 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. • 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.
Japan	<p>Partially or under development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The national government requires each eel farmer to report the input amount of glass eels and production amount of adult eels according to the Inland Water Fishery Promotion Act. • 100% traceability for adult eels is being implemented by industry voluntary measures.
Malaysia	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landing data is collected throughout the year (not up to species level)

Mexico

- 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.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The length at which they reach sexual maturity is not known but is assumed to be between 37 cm and 100 cm TL. • Maximum reported age is 43 years (Jessop 1987). • In Mexico, the American eel is a potential predator of the blind white lady (<i>Ogilbia pearsei</i>) and blind eel (<i>Ophisternon infernale</i>) in the open cenotes of Quintana Roo (Schmitter-Soto 2006). <p>Distribution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An anadromous, demersal, subtropical species, found between 0 m and 464 m, in temperatures between 4 °C and 25 °C. • 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	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the national level, a traceability system for fishery products has been put in place with the companies that own the fishing rights. • At the international level, traceability is ensured through CITES export permits.

The Netherlands	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under EU legislation (the Control Regulation), many 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.
New Zealand	<p>Partially or under development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Such mechanisms have been fully developed domestically (see A3) • In terms of international trade, our Statistics Department only records the first receiving port and does not differentiate between species.
Norway	<p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All landings of marine resources are controlled by Norges Råfisklag. • They also ensure traceability and resource control according to quotas and register of fishermen. • Packaged and sealed products for domestic trade is marked with 'origin Norway' in Norwegian.
Republic of Korea	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Korea collects import and export data on eels and follows CITES regulations as appropriate but does not yet have a mechanism dedicated to eel traceability, e.g. catch documents.
Slovakia	<p>Partially or under development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Export and import currently not authorised • National CITES legislation - in accordance with the Act. No 15/2005 Coll. on the protection of species of wild fauna and flora by regulating trade therein and on the amendment to certain acts. • Holder of live fish (including <i>Anguilla Anguilla</i>) shall the keep “breeding book”, containing specimen holder name, registered office, dates of acquired specimens, species status, quantity, source, and breeding data.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Holder of a live animal specimen (including <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>), are obliged to prove the way of specimen acquisition to the government authority (on request) by a written statement of the way of acquisition. • During each change of the holder of a live animal specimen, the specimen holder shall be obliged to hand over to the new specimen holder along with the specimen the written statement pursuant to letter b) and to keep a copy of it for a period of ten years. <p>National legislation on aquaculture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special national Act on aquaculture is in competence of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development of the Slovak Republic and is under development. • In accordance with Article 19a of the Act No 194/1998 Coll. on the breeding and breeding of livestock Ministry of Agriculture issues fish farming certificates, based on the application. • Fish farming certificates are voluntary.
Spain	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traceability regulations and the existing national traceability control program are the same as for other fishery and aquaculture products.
Sweden	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under EU legislation (the Control Regulation), many 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. • In 2020 the Swedish national fishery control regulation was tightened. • A notification must be made to the Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management (SwAM) at least two hours before arrival at port and eel fishermen must report their positions of in-water holding cages prior their fishing. This gives better possibilities to control trade and IUU-fishing. • Sweden has developed a central IT-system for traceability of fish according to the EU Control regulation (EG 1224/2009) that will be mandatory for the fish receivers and wholesalers. The system is force since January 2019 and will include legally caught eels from the ocean.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
Ukraine	No.
United Kingdom	Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catch certificates(?)
United States of America	No. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ASMFC does not have any coastwide measures outside of requiring dealer and harvester reporting which is explained above. • No specific traceability program via the ASMFC’s FMP but individual states may have programs for traceability such as Maine’s glass eel fishery
B. FOR RANGE STATES OF EUROPEAN EEL (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>)	
<p>B1: Have you made a non-detriment finding (NDF) for trade in European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>)?</p> <p>If “No”, please explain why this is the case.</p> <p>If “Yes”,</p> <p>a) what information source(s) was used? If possible, please provide NDFs and any relevant reports, links and/or analyses related to sources and uses for the NDF (Please indicate if you are happy to share the NDF on the CITES website)</p>	

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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data in progress as part of a stock assessment.
Australia	No. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Australia is not a range state for European eel and do not make our own non-detriment finding for imported species.
Canada	No. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not a range state.
Croatia	No. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EU Scientific Review Group (SRG) has confirmed its negative opinion on imports from all range States, as well as the zero-export quota for <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> for all Member States, in 2021. This opinion reflects the critical status of the stock of European eel as well as the scientific advice by the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) that, "when the precautionary approach is applied for European eel, all anthropogenic impacts (e.g. recreational and commercial fishing on all stages, hydropower, pumping stations, and pollution) decreasing production and escapement of silver eels should be reduced to – or kept as close to – zero as possible". SRG is of the opinion that it is currently not possible to make a non-detriment finding for trade in European eels. 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.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
Czech Republic	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EU Scientific Review Group (SRG) has confirmed its negative opinion on imports from all range States, as well as the zero-export quota for <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> for all Member States, in 2021. • This opinion reflects the critical status of the stock of European eel as well as the scientific advice by the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) that, "when the precautionary approach is applied for European eel, all anthropogenic impacts (e.g. recreational and commercial fishing on all stages, hydropower, pumping stations, and pollution) decreasing production and escapement of silver eels should be reduced to – or kept as close to – zero as possible". • SRG is of the opinion that it is currently not possible to make a non-detriment finding for trade in European eels.
Denmark	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EU Scientific Review Group (SRG) has confirmed its negative opinion on imports from all range States, as well as the zero-export quota for <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> for all Member States, in 2021. • This opinion reflects the critical status of the stock of European eel as well as the scientific advice by the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) that, "when the precautionary approach is applied for European eel, all anthropogenic impacts (e.g. recreational and commercial fishing on all stages, hydropower, pumping stations, and pollution) decreasing production and escapement of silver eels should be reduced to – or kept as close to – zero as possible". • SRG is of the opinion that it is currently not possible to make a non-detriment finding for trade in European eels.
Estonia	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EU Scientific Review Group (SRG) has confirmed its negative opinion on imports from all range States, as well as the zero-export quota for <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> for all Member States, in 2021. • This opinion reflects the critical status of the stock of European eel as well as the scientific advice by the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) that, "when the precautionary approach is applied for European eel, all anthropogenic impacts (e.g.

	<p>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".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRG is of the opinion that it is currently not possible to make a non-detriment finding for trade in European eels.
Finland	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EU Scientific Review Group (SRG) has confirmed its negative opinion on imports from all range States, as well as the zero-export quota for <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> for all Member States, in 2021. • This opinion reflects the critical status of the stock of European eel as well as the scientific advice by the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) that, "when the precautionary approach is applied for European eel, all anthropogenic impacts (e.g. recreational and commercial fishing on all stages, hydropower, pumping stations, and pollution) decreasing production and escapement of silver eels should be reduced to – or kept as close to – zero as possible". • SRG is of the opinion that it is currently not possible to make a non-detriment finding for trade in European eels.
Greece	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EU Scientific Review Group (SRG) has confirmed its negative opinion on imports from all range States, as well as the zero-export quota for <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> for all Member States, in 2021. • This opinion reflects the critical status of the stock of European eel as well as the scientific advice by the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) that, "when the precautionary approach is applied for European eel, all anthropogenic impacts (e.g. recreational and commercial fishing on all stages, hydropower, pumping stations, and pollution) decreasing production and escapement of silver eels should be reduced to – or kept as close to – zero as possible". • SRG is of the opinion that it is currently not possible to make a non-detriment finding for trade in European eels.
Ireland	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EU Scientific Review Group (SRG) has confirmed its negative opinion on imports from all range States, as well as the zero-export quota for <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> for all Member States, in 2021.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • The commercial fishery is closed in Ireland and no stocking takes place requiring the purchase of eels from another range state
Japan	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Japan is not a range state of the European eel.
Malaysia	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Malaysia is not a range state.
Morocco	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Studies to issue a non-detriment finding are underway
The Netherlands	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EU Scientific Review Group (SRG) has confirmed its negative opinion on imports from all range States, as well as the zero-export quota for <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> for all Member States, in 2021. • This opinion reflects the critical status of the stock of European eel as well as the scientific advice by the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) that, "when the precautionary approach is applied for European eel, all anthropogenic impacts (e.g. recreational and commercial fishing on all stages, hydropower, pumping stations, and pollution) decreasing production and escapement of silver eels should be reduced to – or kept as close to – zero as possible". • SRG is of the opinion that it is currently not possible to make a non-detriment finding for trade in European eels.
New Zealand	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No catch, export or import this species. • Records of imports of <i>Anguilla</i> spp. with the species name not being reported – including imports from countries that may be involved in the illegal trafficking of <i>Anguilla Anguilla</i>.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information reported in the 2018 questionnaire has turned out to be inaccurate – for reasons unknown. There it was indicated that trivial amounts of imports of <i>Anguilla</i> spp. of 1,020 kg in total from 2009-2014, with no records of imports from 2015-2017; however, the revised information (same source but a different, more complete extract) provides much higher levels of imports (25-30 tonnes in recent years). By regulation, all eels imported to New Zealand must be pre-cooked.
Norway	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A general NDF has not been made due to the lack of exports from Norway.
Republic of Korea	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When the exporting country is not a party to CITES, the relevant data cannot be checked.
Slovakia	<p>No</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EU Scientific Review Group (SRG), which gathers scientific authorities of the EU Member States, has confirmed its negative opinion on imports from all range States, as well as the zero-export quota for <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> for all Member States (including Slovakia), 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.
Spain	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scientific Authorities of the SRG consider that its preparation for export is not possible.
Sweden	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EU Scientific Review Group (SRG) has confirmed its negative opinion on imports from all range States, as well as the zero-export quota for <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> for all Member States, in 2021. This opinion reflects the critical status of the stock of European eel as well as the scientific advice by the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) that, "when the

	<p>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".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRG is of the opinion that it is currently not possible to make a non-detriment finding for trade in European eels.
Tunisia	<p>No</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The quantity exported has never exceeded the annual quota
Ukraine	<p>No.</p>
United Kingdom	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information source(s) used: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Species-specific stock assessment - Fisheries dependent data - Ecosystem modelling - Fisheries models • Copy of NDF was provided • NDF was carried out at local/sub-national and national levels
United States of America	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • U.S.A is not a range state for European Eel
<p>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.</p>	
Algeria	<p>Strict measures to limit harvest and / or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibition of capture of individuals (glass eels, eels) not having the minimum market size except those intended for breeding, the capture of which is subject to the authorization provided by the administration in accordance with the provisions of the executive decree. n ° 04-188 of July 7, 2004 fixing the methods of capture, transport, marketing and introduction into aquatic environments of broodstock, larvae, fry and spat as well as the methods of capture, transport, storage , importation and marketing of fishery and aquaculture products that have not reached the minimum regulatory size intended for breeding, cultivation or scientific research.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
Croatia	<p>Limited restrictions on harvest and/or trade.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Temporary fishing closures apply at EU level (See A2). They include also the glass eel life stage in marine and transitional waters for commercial and recreational fishing. WKEELMIGRATION report provides some information on the fishing closures. MS have various measures on restricting fishing set. 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.
Czech Republic	<p>Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As provided for in point A.2, temporary fishing closures apply at EU level. They also include the glass eel life stage in marine and transitional waters for commercial and recreational fishing. The WKEELMIGRATION report provides some information on the fishing closures. MS have various measures on restricting fishing. In the Czech Republic the fishing of glass eels is not permitted.
Denmark	<p>No restrictions on harvest and/or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Temporary fishing closures apply at EU level (See A2). They also include the glass eel life stage in marine and transitional waters for commercial and recreational fishing. WKEELMIGRATION report provides some information on the fishing closures. MS have various measures on restricting fishing set. Denmark has no veterinary restrictions; hence eels are not susceptible to any notable fish diseases.
Dominican Republic	<p>Limited restrictions on harvest and / or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Export quota system per company from the season October 2020 to March 2021, and closure of capture from March to October.
Estonia	<p>No restrictions on harvest and/or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Temporary fishing closures apply at EU level (See A2). They also include the glass eel life stage in marine and transitional waters for commercial and recreational fishing.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WKEELMIGRATION report provides some information on the fishing closures. • MS have various measures on restricting fishing set. • 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.
Finland	<p>Limited restrictions on harvest and/or trade.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporary fishing closures apply at EU level, including the glass eel life stage in marine and transitional waters for commercial and recreational fishing. • The WKEELMIGRATION report provides some information on the fishing closures. • MS have various measures on restricting fishing. • 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.
Greece	<p>Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporary fishing closures apply at EU level (See A2). They also include the glass eel life stage in marine and transitional waters for commercial and recreational fishing. • WKEELMIGRATION report provides some information on the fishing closures. • MS have various measures on restricting fishing set. • 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.
Ireland	<p>Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporary fishing closures apply at EU level (See A2). They also include the glass eel life stage in marine and transitional waters for commercial and recreational fishing. • WKEELMIGRATION report provides some information on the fishing closures. • MS have various measures on restricting fishing set. • Ireland has introduced a full ban on eel fishing everywhere and all year round.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
Malaysia	<p>No restrictions on harvest and/or trade.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No study been conducted yet on eels in general, including the identification and distribution of eel species in Sabah water.
Morocco	<p>Strict measures to limit harvest and / or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eel fishing within the framework of a leasing of fishing rights is framed according to the specifications provided for by Law No. 130-12 on inland fishing and aquaculture. • The latter has set several restrictive measures to ensure responsible fishing, including a fishing quota for glass eels set at 2,000 kg and a ban on the trade and export of glass eels and eels not exceeding 12 cm. • All the quantities of glass eels caught must be intended exclusively for fattening in a breeding facility that the company must dispose of.
The Netherlands	<p>Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporary fishing closures apply at EU level (See A2). They also include the glass eel life stage in marine and transitional waters for commercial and recreational fishing. • WKEELMIGRATION report provides some information on the fishing closures. • MS have various measures on restricting fishing set. • 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 <i>Anguilla anguilla</i>
New Zealand	<p>Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not permissible to catch or retain eels less than 220 grams; however, the regulated size of escape holes in eel nets ensures that few individuals less than 300 grams are caught. • No glass eels are harvested or exported.
Norway	<p>Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ban on catching of glass eels. This product has never been of interest for Norwegian fisheries
Republic of Korea	<p>Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Article 68 (Penalty) of the Wildlife Protection and Management Act provides that a person who has exported, imported, transferred or introduced an internationally endangered species or product therefrom or a person who has failed to register or falsely registered a husbandry facility for an internationally endangered species is subject to imprisonment of up to 3 years or criminal fine of up to KRW 30 million. • Article 69 (Penalty) of the Wildlife Protection and Management Act provides that a person who has used an internationally endangered species or product therefrom for the purposes of import or introduction or a person who has captured, harvested, purchased, received, assigned, or mediated for receiving or assigning, owned, occupied or displayed an internationally endangered species is subject to imprisonment of up to 2 years or criminal fine of up to KRW 20 million. • Article 17 (Confiscation) of the Wildlife Protection and Management Act provides that an internationally endangered species or product therefrom that has been imported or introduced without authorization or that is used for purposes other than the original purposes for the import or introduction or an internationally endangered species or product therefrom that has been captured, harvested, purchased, received, assigned or displayed without authorization is subject to confiscation.
Slovakia	<p>No restrictions on harvest and/or trade.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only obligations in relation to trade in glass eel (intra EU trade) (See A.5)
Spain	<p>Some restrictions on catching or trade.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The regulation regarding catches is established in each Autonomous Community by its management plan and regional reference regulations. • In the case of the international section of the river Miño (TIRM), the regulations are included in its management plan and in the annual Fishing Edict approved within the Permanent Commission of the TIRM. • The C.A. Andalusia has prohibited European eel fishing in all its phases since the start of the management plans in 2010. • Regarding trade, the European eel is included in Annex II of CITES, and within the framework of the EU regulations, the import and export of European eel and its products with third countries is prohibited.

Sweden	<p>Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporary fishing closures apply at EU level (See A2). They also include the glass eel life stage in marine and transitional waters for commercial and recreational fishing. • WKEELMIGRATION report provides some information on the fishing closures. • MS have various measures on restricting fishing set. • 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.
Tunisia	<p>Strict measures to limit harvest and / or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The decree of September 28, 1995 regulating the exercise of fishing is the main implementing text of law n ° 94-13 of January 31, 1994. It includes the conservation measures fixing the minimum catch size for the eel. at 30 cm.
Ukraine	<p>Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In accordance with the Order No 29 of 19 January 2021 of the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of Ukraine European Eel is listed in the Red Data Book of Ukraine. • Pursuant to the Law of Ukraine “On the Red 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	<p>Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishing authorisations and fishing season • Catch certificates
United States of America	<p>Strictly enforced measures to restrict harvest and/or trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding the American eel, only two states allow for the harvest of glass eel. Maine and South Carolina. • FMP restricts the amount of harvest for Maine to 9,688 lbs.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.
--	--

Résultats préliminaires de l'étude visée par la Décision 18.198, paragraphe d)
établis par la Société Zoologique de Londres

D'après les données de la FAO, la pêche mondiale d'anguilles a atteint un pic de 26 053 t en 1973, après quoi elle a baissé jusqu'à 8 151 t en 2018. D'un autre côté, la production mondiale d'anguilles a augmenté de manière stable au cours des décennies et atteint plus de 277 000 t en 2018 grâce au développement de l'élevage. L'élevage, qui s'opère principalement en Asie orientale, repose sur de jeunes anguilles sauvages, et représentait 97% de l'approvisionnement mondial total en 2018.

Les données du commerce indiquent qu'au cours de la décennie passée, la majorité du commerce de civelles/anguillons comme intrant pour les fermes venait de l'Amérique et du sud-est asiatique, l'Europe et l'Afrique jouant un rôle considérablement moindre dans cet approvisionnement.

Au moment de la rédaction, 25 Parties ont répondu au questionnaire en Annexe 3 de la Notification 2021/018 : l'Algérie, l'Australie, le Canada, la Croatie, Cuba, la République Tchèque, le Danemark, l'Estonie, la Finlande, la Grèce, l'Irlande, le Japon, le Mexique, le Maroc, les Pays-Bas, la Nouvelle-Zélande, la Norvège, la République de Corée, **Singapour**, la **Slovaquie**, l'Espagne, la Suède, la Tunisie, le Royaume-Uni et les États-Unis d'Amérique.

Vingt-trois des réponses reçues relevaient d'États de l'aire de répartition de dix sur les seize espèces d'anguillidés concernées, et deux réponses relevaient d'États **hors aires de répartition**, bien que l'un d'entre eux compte des anguilles européennes introduites.

- Vingt Parties ont indiqué avoir importé et/ou exporté² des anguillidés **depuis 2018**.

L'Australie, le Canada, Cuba, la République Tchèque, le Danemark, l'Estonie, la Grèce, la Finlande, le Japon, le Maroc, les Pays-Bas, la Nouvelle-Zélande, la République de Corée, Singapour, la Slovaquie, l'Espagne, la Suède, la Tunisie, le Royaume-Uni, les États-Unis d'Amérique.

- Parmi ceux-ci, deux seulement exportent des anguilles européennes inscrites à la CITES en dehors de leur aire de répartition.

Le Maroc et la Tunisie.

- Neuf Parties ont déclaré des pêches de civelles :

L'Australie, le Canada, Cuba, le Japon, le Maroc, la République de Corée, l'Espagne, le Royaume-Uni, les États-Unis d'Amérique.

- Ces pêches sont toutes destinées à l'élevage domestique et/ou international, certaines sont également destinées au repeuplement domestique et/ou international.

Usage domestique – Japon, Maroc, Royaume-Uni

Exportation – Australie, Canada, Cuba, États-Unis d'Amérique³

Précisions demandées – République de Corée, l'Espagne

- Vingt-et-une Parties ont déclaré des pêches d'anguilles jaunes et/ou argentées.

² Y compris le commerce entre États membres de l'UE - République Tchèque, Danemark, Estonie, Finlande, Grèce, Pays-Bas, Espagne, Suède et Royaume-Uni (jusqu'au 31/12/20). Ces pays n'ont pas exporté en dehors de l'UE.

³ Dont une petite part allouée à l'usage domestique pour l'élevage aux États-Unis d'Amérique en 2019 (<100kg).

L'Algérie, l'Australie, le Canada, la Croatie, la République Tchèque, le Danemark, l'Estonie, la Finlande, la Grèce, le Japon, la République de Corée, le Maroc, les Pays-Bas, la Nouvelle-Zélande, la Norvège, la Slovaquie, l'Espagne, la Suède, la Tunisie, le Royaume-Uni et les États-Unis d'Amérique.

- Celles-ci sont destinées à la consommation nationale et/ou à l'exportation pour transformation et/ou consommation.

Consommation nationale – *Algérie, Canada, Croatie, République Tchèque, Danemark, Estonie, Finlande, Japon, Pays-Bas, Nouvelle-Zélande, Slovaquie, Suède, Royaume-Uni*

Exportation – *Australie, Canada, Maroc, Nouvelle-Zélande, Tunisie, États-Unis d'Amérique*

Précisions demandées – *Grèce, République de Corée, Espagne*

- Treize Parties ont déclaré des élevages d'anguilles - on notera que la plupart des données ont été transmises par des Parties en dehors de l'Asie occidentale, et ne représentent donc pas la majorité de la capacité mondiale en matière de fermes.

Australie, Canada, République Tchèque, Danemark, Estonie, Grèce, Japon, République de Corée, Maroc, Pays-Bas, Slovaquie, Suède, États-Unis d'Amérique

- Celles-ci sont destinées à la consommation nationale et/ou l'exportation pour transformation et/ou consommation, certaines sont également destinées au repeuplement domestique et/ou international.

Consommation nationale – *Danemark, Estonie, Grèce, Slovaquie, Japon, Pays-Bas, République de Corée, Suède*

Exportation – *Maroc, République de Corée, États-Unis d'Amérique*⁴

N'ayant pas fourni d'informations pour des raisons de confidentialité – *Australie, Canada*

Informations non disponibles - *Australie*

Précisions demandées – *République Tchèque*

- Sur la base des données disponibles, il semble que l'élevage ait baissé au cours de la dernière décennie, avec une réduction à la fois du nombre de fermes et de la capacité totale.
- Cependant les deux n'étaient pas toujours proportionnels, suggérant que les petites fermes avaient fermé, et les fermes de plus grande capacité étaient toujours en production.
- Dans deux cas la capacité d'élevage national a augmenté.
- La plupart des Parties n'ont pas fourni/n'ont pas été en mesure de fournir d'informations relatives aux changements en question.
- En ce qui concerne les défis relatifs à la gestion des anguilles, les Parties de l'UE (11) ayant répondu au questionnaire ont indiqué qu'une évaluation récente du règlement sur les anguilles (Règlement (CE) N°1100/2007 du Conseil) soulignait que malgré les progrès en matière de réduction de la pêche, le taux d'échappement ciblé n'était toujours pas atteint, la mortalité résultant de facteurs extérieurs à l'activité de pêche n'avait pas baissé de manière significative au cours de la dernière décennie, '*...que la reconstitution du stock d'anguilles européennes prendra plusieurs dizaines d'années, étant donné la grande longévité des espèces*'.

En dehors de l'UE, des défis relatifs à l'application des mesures de pêche et la traçabilité ont été signalés, du fait que les acheteurs regroupent de multiples prises de pêche. Il a été proposé d'alourdir les amendes et les peines de prison comme mesure de prévention des infractions.

⁴ L'exportation d'anguilles d'élevage depuis les États-Unis d'Amérique est extrêmement faible (<25kg).

- Les Parties ont fait état de systèmes de traçabilité nationale à des degrés différents.
 - Dans l'ensemble, il semblerait que cela reste un point faible dans les efforts pour garantir une capture et un commerce légal et durable des anguillidés.