



Agenda item 6.3
For information

Council

CNL(17)24

***Annual Progress Report
on Actions Taken Under the Implementation Plan for the Calendar Year 2016***

***Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)
Faroe Islands***

CNL(17)24

Annual Progress Report on Actions taken under the Implementation Plan for the Calendar Year 2016

The primary purposes of the Annual Progress Reports are to provide details of:

- any changes to the management regime for salmon and consequent changes to the Implementation Plan;
- actions that have been taken under the Implementation Plan in the previous year;
- significant changes to the status of stocks, and a report on catches; and
- actions taken in accordance with the provisions of the Convention

These reports will be reviewed by the Council. Please complete this form and return it to the Secretariat **no later than 24 March 2017**.

Party:	Denmark
Jurisdiction/Region:	Faroe Islands

1: Changes to the Implementation Plan
1.1 Describe any proposed revisions to the Implementation Plan <i>(Where changes are proposed, the revised Implementation Plans should be submitted to the Secretariat by 1 December).</i>
No revisions to the Implementation Plan are planned.
1.2 Describe any major new initiatives or achievements for salmon conservation and management that you wish to highlight.
No major new initiatives or achievements for salmon conservation and management but consistent with the scientific advice no salmon fishery was conducted in the waters around the Faroe Islands in 2016 (see action F1).

2: Stock status and catches.
2.1 Provide a description of any new factors which may significantly affect the abundance of salmon stocks and, if there has been any significant change in stock status since the development of the Implementation Plan, provide a brief (200 word max) summary of these changes.
The 2016 ICES Advisory Committee Report, CNL(16)9, indicates that PFAs of both maturing 1SW and non-maturing 1SW salmon for Northern NEAC show a general decline over the time period (since 1983), with the decline being more marked in the maturing 1SW stock. Both stock complexes have, however, been at full reproductive capacity prior to the commencement of distant-water fisheries (i.e. meeting the SER with at least 95% probability) throughout the

time-series. PFA of maturing 1SW and of non-maturing 1SW salmon for Southern NEAC demonstrate broadly similar declining trends over the time period (since 1971). Both stock complexes were at full reproductive capacity prior to the commencement of distant-water fisheries throughout the early part of the time-series. However, in around half of the years since the mid-1990s, the non-maturing 1SW stock has been at risk of suffering reduced reproductive capacity before any fisheries took place. The maturing 1SW stock, on the other hand, was first assessed as being at risk of suffering reduced reproductive capacity in 2009, and has been at risk of suffering reduced reproductive capacity or suffering reduced reproductive capacity in around half of the years since then.

There are no new factors in Faroese waters which may significantly affect the abundance of salmon stocks.

2.2 Provide the following information on catches:(nominal catch equals reported quantity of salmon caught and retained in tonnes ‘round fresh weight’ (i.e. weight of whole, ungutted, unfrozen fish) or ‘round fresh weight equivalent’).

	In-river	Estuarine	Coastal	Total
(a) provisional nominal catch (which may be subject to revision) for 2016 (tonnes)	0	0	0	0
(b) confirmed nominal catch of salmon for 2015 (tonnes)	0	0	0	0
(c) estimated unreported catch for 2016 (tonnes)	0	0	0	0
(d) number and percentage of salmon caught and released in recreational fisheries in 2016.	0			

3: Implementation Plan Actions.

3.1 Provide an update on progress against actions relating to the Management of Salmon Fisheries (Section 2.8 of the Implementation Plan).

Note: The reports under ‘Progress on Action to Date’ should provide a brief overview with a quantitative measure of progress made. While referring to additional material (e.g. via links to websites) may assist those seeking more detailed information, this will not be evaluated by the Review Group.

Action F1:	Description of Action (as submitted in the IP)	The Faroe Islands will continue to manage any salmon fishery through international cooperation and on the basis of the advice from ICES regarding the stocks contributing to the Faroese salmon fishery in a precautionary manner and with a view to sustainability.
	Expected Outcome (as submitted in the IP)	
	Progress on Action to Date (Provide a brief overview with a quantitative measure of progress. Other material (e.g.	A new multi-annual decision for the salmon fishery in Faroese waters in 2015/16, 2016/17 and 2017/18 was adopted at the Thirty-Second (2015) Annual Meeting of NASCO’s North-East Atlantic Commission,

	<i>website links) will not be evaluated.)</i>	NEA(15)10. Under this decision Faroese management decisions will be made with due consideration to the advice of ICES concerning the biological situation and the status of the stocks contributing to the salmon fishery. The 2016 ICES advice (CNL(16)9) states that in the absence of any fisheries in the fishing seasons 2016/2017 to 2018/2019, there is a less than 95% probability of meeting the conservation limits (CLs) for the two age groups (potential 1-sea-winter (1SW) and multi-sea-winter (MSW) spawners) of the Southern NEAC stock complex. Therefore, in the absence of specific management objectives, ICES advises that there are no mixed-stock fisheries options on the NEAC complexes at the Faroes in the fishing seasons 2016/2017 to 2018/2019. Consistent with the 2016 advice from ICES, no salmon fishery was conducted by the Faroe Islands in 2016 in order to contribute to the conservation and rebuilding of the Atlantic salmon stocks.
	Current Status of Action	Completed for Current Year
	If 'Completed', has the Action achieved its objective?	Achieved for 2016

3.2 Provide an update on progress against actions relating to Habitat Protection and Restoration (Section 3.4 of the Implementation Plan).

Note: The reports under 'Progress on Action to Date' should provide a brief overview with a quantitative measure of progress made. While referring to additional material (e.g. via links to websites) may assist those seeking more detailed information, this will not be evaluated by the Review Group.

Action H1:	Description of Action <i>(as submitted in the IP)</i>	
	Expected Outcome <i>(as submitted in the IP)</i>	
	Progress on Action to Date <i>(Provide a brief overview with a quantitative measure of progress. Other material (e.g. website links) will not be evaluated.)</i>	
	Current Status of Action	
	If Completed, has the Action achieved its objective?	

3.3 Provide an update on progress against actions relating to Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers and Transgenics (Section 4.8 of the Implementation Plan).

Note: The reports under 'Progress on Action to Date' should provide a brief overview with a quantitative measure of progress made. While referring to additional material (e.g. via links to websites) may assist those seeking more detailed information, this will not be evaluated by the Review Group.

Action A1:	Description of Action <i>(as submitted in the IP)</i>	Continue to apply NASCO's 'Williamsburg Resolution' and 'Guidance on Best Management Practices to Address
-------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		Impacts of Sea Lice and Escaped Farmed Salmon on Wild Salmon Stocks' in order to minimise the risk of impacts from salmon farming on wild Atlantic salmon.																					
	Expected Outcome <i>(as submitted in the IP)</i>	Continuing progress in reducing sea lice and escapees.																					
	Progress on Action to Date <i>(Provide a brief overview with a quantitative measure of progress. Other material (e.g. website links) will not be evaluated.)</i>	<p>Please find below a table concerning of counts of sea lice and number of breaches annually from 2011 to present</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="703 562 1495 824"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Breaches*</th> <th>Counting **</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2011</td> <td>16</td> <td>183</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2012</td> <td>32</td> <td>357</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2013</td> <td>23</td> <td>555</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2014</td> <td>45</td> <td>469</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015</td> <td>63</td> <td>470</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2016</td> <td>4</td> <td>15</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*Refers to instances above threshold limit</p> <p>** Refers total number of inspections/counts conducted in on site</p> <p>Due to the increasing number of breaches and taking account the fact that research, former and new treatment regimes, empiric results and regulatory instruments have proven to be beneficial, a new regulation no. 75/2016 on sea lice was adopted in 2016. It includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lowering of the treatment threshold to 1.5 sexually mature female lice per salmon; - allowing treatment on a cage by cage basis at this threshold (or voluntarily at lower thresholds); and - sea lice must be counted every fortnight throughout the year. - the counting is to distinguish between different life stages and sizes of lice. <p>Among the most efficient tools to secure adherence to regulatory requirements on sea lice is to align farmers own interest with the objective of reducing sea lice.</p> <p>Thus, some of the most substantial changes relate to incentive and penalties for breach of threshold: The number of breaches above the 1,5 threshold in a production cycle, as well as the number of in-feed and bath treatments used, will influence the allowed production in the coming production cycle. Farms with few lice problems and treatments may, ceteris paribus, increase the number of smolts put to sea. Farms</p>	Year	Breaches*	Counting **	2011	16	183	2012	32	357	2013	23	555	2014	45	469	2015	63	470	2016	4	15
Year	Breaches*	Counting **																					
2011	16	183																					
2012	32	357																					
2013	23	555																					
2014	45	469																					
2015	63	470																					
2016	4	15																					

		<p>with significant lice problems and many treatments are obliged to decrease the number put to sea.</p> <p>If the threshold of 1,5 is exceeded more than three times in a row, all the fish at the farm must be slaughtered within 2 months.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All farms must have a veterinary consultant and an effective management plan for impediment of lice infestation - At each farm and in each unit, counting by an external independent party of sexually mature females is mandatory at fortnightly intervals. The requirement that counts be made by an independent party provides reliable information which can be used as a basis for veterinary decision-making within the companies by the Chief Veterinary Officer (CVO) <p>The data are to be available to the CVO no later than the day after the counts are made. Further requirements are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - mandatory evaluation and new counting immediately after each treatment; - mandatory scrutiny of the cause of ineffective treatment (each farm must have an internal or external veterinary consultant); and - mandatory reporting to the CVO of ineffective treatment, suspicion of immunity/resistance or other inconsistency with anticipated results. <p>The CVO may demand additional or more frequent counting and counting of other species of lice and coordinated following of nearby fjords if considered necessary to impede lice infestations. Exceptions or postponement of such treatment may be allowed by the CVO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - if the breach is diminutive and other effective action is likely to lower the infestation; - if co-ordinated treatment with other farms is imminent; or - in case of imminent slaughter. <p>In the case of ineffective treatment, other agents/treatments are to be used. In the event that these also prove ineffective, the CVO can order other action to be taken including imminent slaughter or destruction. In the case of elevated infestations, disproportionately frequent or incomplete/defective treatments, the CVO may freeze or decrease the number of smolts put to sea in the following production cycle.</p> <p>In addition to mandatory requirements, the following actions were taken by the CVO in 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - demanding imminent slaughter in 5 cases;
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reducing the permitted number of smolts put to sea in early 2016 by 30% in one case; reducing the permitted number of smolts put to sea by 10% in 2 cases (1 in 2015, 1 in early 2016); - denial of 2 applications to increase the number of smolts put to sea (1 in 2015, 1 in 2016); and - exemption from treatment due to slaughter in one case. <p>Voluntary co-ordinated treatments were jointly undertaken by the aquaculture industry in 2013/14 leading to a preliminary decline in the number of sea lice. However, this also resulted in immunity/resistance to the drugs used, likely contributing to the recent increase in resistance. Thus, new approaches are needed both in the legislation and available treatments.</p> <p>Accordingly, research and development is on-going, much of it by the Aquaculture Research Station of the Faroes, Fiskaaling, which has <i>inter alia</i> developed methods for mapping the spatial distribution of sea lice in its pelagic state (Nauplii and Copepodites) and for <i>in situ</i> estimation of naupli production at farm sites. This field effort is combined with mapping of lice distribution using hydrodynamic models. Aquaculture companies also develop and test new approaches.</p> <p>Recently, lumpfish, <i>Cyclopterus lumpus</i> L., have been stocked in caged combat lice and this approach is increasing in use. Although control is not 100% effective, the use of lumpfish may help limit infestations. Breeding of better adapted lumpfish for use in aquaculture and with a higher appetite for salmon lice is under consideration.</p> <p>Containment</p> <p>Related to NASCO's sphere of concern are occasional events of escapes of farmed salmon. Given the financial implications of escapes, the prevention of such incidents is undeniably in the best interest of aquaculture farms. Reporting of escapes to the CVO is mandatory, and farmers are obliged to have a contingency plan in case of escape incidents and to attempt to recapture escapees. Escape incidents mostly occur as a consequence of stormy weather or during handling of nets in relation to delousing and transport to slaughter etc. In such cases, prevention of further escapes, mending of nets and other actions logically become a priority. With regard to the accuracy of reporting of escapes, it should be noted that in order to obtain insurance settlements for escape incidents, the Food and Veterinary Authority must be notified.</p>
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>Escape incidents are often quantified through reduced feed intake following incidents. Since mortalities are also reported on a daily basis, both to alert the Veterinary Authorities of possible disease problems and for the companies to manage feeding optimally, escapes can also be indirectly verified through calculation of loss of fish at slaughter. Relatively reliable estimates of escapees are, therefore, available with some delay or can be calculated. From 2011 to 2014, the following incidents were reported:</p> <p>2011: 2 incidents, no information on number/quantity given. Average weight of fish 1.9kg. The incidents are reported to have occurred during delousing treatments and when moving fish into a new net pen.</p> <p>2012: 4 incidents, with 2,741 fish escaping in two incidents but no numbers were reported for the 2 other incidents. The average weight of escapees was 4.8kg. The incidents are reported to have occurred when moving fish to slaughter, sorting of fish into two net pens and as a result of storms.</p> <p>2013: 4 incidents, estimated at 25,000 fish averaging 2.8kg. The incidents are reported to have occurred due to storms during the winter and when moving fish into a new net pen.</p> <p>2014: 2 incidents estimated at 40,000 fish averaging 4.8kg. The incidents are reported to have occurred during storms and when moving fish into a net pen prior to slaughter. These numbers must be interpreted with some caution since in most cases they are based on decreased food intake in net pens. More accurate numbers may be obtained when the net pens are slaughtered. The Faroes are small, there are few fjords and these are mostly relatively short, hence production units are increasingly placed in exposed sites, necessitating the strengthening and adaptation of the equipment to endure higher currents and waves. Furthermore, harsh weather conditions, including at less exposed sites, lead to fairly frequent renewal of the equipment. As a result, the latest technological innovations and improvements are implemented, often with improved protection against events which may result in escapes.</p>
	Current Status of Action	Ongoing
	If Completed, has the Action achieved its objective?	Ongoing

<p>4: Additional information required under the Convention</p>
<p>4.1 Details of any laws, regulations and programmes that have been adopted or repealed since the last notification.</p>
<p>A new regulation no. 75/2016 on sea lice has been adopted with the following main changes:</p>

<p>Sea lice must be counted every fortnight throughout the year. The counting is to distinguish between different life stages and sizes of lice. The number of mature female lice per fish (threshold) must not exceed 1,5. If exceeded more than three times in a row, all the fish at the farm must be slaughtered within 2 months. Farms with few lice problems may increase the number of smolts put to sea. Farms with significant lice problems are obliged to decrease the number put to sea. Cf. 3.3 above.</p>
<p>4.2 Details of any new commitments concerning the adoption or maintenance in force for specified periods of time of conservation, restoration and other management measures.</p>
<p>There have been no new commitments concerning the adoption or maintenance in force for specified periods of time of conservation, restoration and other management measures.</p>
<p>4.3 Details of any new actions to prohibit fishing for salmon beyond 12 nautical miles.</p>
<p>There has been no salmon fishery at the Faroe Islands for many years.</p>
<p>4.4 Details of any new actions to invite the attention of States not Party to the Convention to matters relating to the activities of its vessels which could adversely affect salmon stocks subject to the Convention.</p>
<p>No new actions taken.</p>
<p>4.5 Details of any actions taken to implement regulatory measures under Article 13 of the Convention including imposition of adequate penalties for violations.</p>