**Enquiry on Baltic salmon fisheries management**

Answeres marked in yellow where set answeres are given

**1. Your country?**
Estonia
Latvia
Lithuania
Russia
Poland
Germany
Denmark
Sweden
Finland

**2. What kind of an organization do you represent?**
An environmental NGO
A consumer organization
Other

**What is the name of your organization?**
Coalition Clean Baltic (CCB)
International Member organisation with 25 members in the whole Batic Sea catchment area

**3. Describe your position/profession**
The Fisheries policy officer and the Executive secretary of CCB have answered the questionnaire together. Have been involved in salmon issues for many years in the IBSFC, BSRAC and at EU level.

**4. Below (table and abstracts) we have described four alternative management options for Baltic salmon: the continuation of the IBSFC SAP (A), current management framework (B), and two new management plans (C and D).**

Abstracts of management plans

Management option A: The continuation of the IBSFC SAP
This option means the continuation of the IBSFC Salmon Action Plan. The objective for smolt production would be to reach 50% of its potential in each wild salmon river, and the management measures would be targeted primarily at open sea and coastal fisheries. Limits to the sea fisheries would be set through the TAC (total allowable catch) and other regulatory measures. In rivers, river specific fishing rules would be implemented as today.

Management option B: No management plan
This option means that salmon management and fishing would continue as it is today, without a long-term management plan or a special objective for smolt production. Primarily salmon management would be targeted to the open sea and coastal fisheries, through the TAC (total allowable catch) and other regulatory measures. River specific fishing rules would remain as today.

Management option C: New management plan I

This option means the implementation of a new management plan. The objective for smolt production would be 75% of the potential. To reach this the regulation would be targeted to all salmon fisheries. Management would be internationally steered towards coherent fishing regulations both in the sea and in the rivers. The TAC would include both sea and river fisheries. In rivers, management would be based on target for river specific stock size.

Management option D: New management plan II
This option means the implementation of a new management plan. The objective for smolt production would be divided in two categories depending on the status of the river concerned. In the first category the objective of 75% production would be set for the rivers with successful salmon production; i.e. expected to reach at least 50% of their estimated potential by 2010, within safe genetic limits. In the second category, the objective of 50% production would be set for rivers with a positive trend in salmon production but still not expected to reach at least 50% of their estimated potential by 2010. To reach the objectives the regulation would be targeted to all salmon fisheries. Management would be internationally steered towards coherent fishing regulations both in the sea and in the rivers. The TAC would include both sea and river fisheries. In rivers, management would be based on target for river specific stock size.

**4.1. What is the position of the stakeholder group that you represent on management option A (Continuation of the IBSFC SAP)?**
This would be a good option
This would be a somewhat good option
This would not be a good option
This would be a totally unacceptable option

**Why?**
SAP management will not safeguard a sufficient number of returning spawners to many wild salmon rivers. There will be a risk for extinction of weak salmon populations under SAP management. The current national regulations are apparently not enough to secure all the individual salmon populations.

**What might be the impacts of this management option on different interest groups in the near future?**
Since this kind of management is not targeting the some of the main problems it will be very difficult to reach a target of 75% of spawning potential since the majority of obstacles are in coastal, river mouth and river areas. There will be negative impacts on all stakeholder groups since there will be fewer salmon than with other management alternatives.

**What might be the regional impacts of this management option?**

**4.2. What is the position of the stakeholder group that you represent on management option B (Management as today without a plan)?**
This would be a good option
This would be a somewhat good option
This would not be a good option
This would be a totally unacceptable option

**Why?**

As with management option A, B does only address issues in the open sea and coastal areas not in the river mouths and rivers. In order to manage salmon in a wise way management of river mouths and rivers must be included.

**What might be the impacts of this management option on different interest groups that you represent?**
Since this kind of management is not targeting the problem it will be very difficult to reach a target of 75% of spawning potential since the majority of obstacles to reach such a goal is in the river mouth and river areas. There will be negative impacts on all stakeholder groups since there will be fewer salmon than with other management alternatives.

**What might be the regional impacts of this management option?**

**4.3. What is the position of the stakeholder group that you represent on management option C (New management plan I)?**
This would be a good option
This would be a somewhat good option
This would not be a good option
This would be a totally unacceptable option

**Why?**
This would be the best option of those presented. The long-term ambition should however be full production (100 % of potential production)

In order to safeguard the different salmon populations and especially the weak ones there must be individual targets set for each river population and not for salmon as a species. It is important to have quantifiable goals, like the 75% of potential production, whoever it is important to realise that this potential must be revised as habitat restoration measures are taken and the potential increases. Salmon river potential production must be updated every 3-5 years.

**What might be the impacts of this management option on different interest groups in the near future?**
This plan has the potential to restore salmon populations which will benefit all stakeholder groups.

**What might be the regional impacts of this management option?**

**4.4. What is the position of the stakeholder group that you represent on management option D (New management plan II)?**
This would be a good option
This would be a somewhat good option
This would not be a good option
This would be a totally unacceptable option

**Why?**
Long-term ambition should be full production (100 % of potential production)

A 50 % goal (instead of a 75 % goal) for a small-sized population (a couple of hundred returning spawners) will substantially raise the risk and not guarantee the long-term survival

for such populations. For small-sized populations it is even more important to reach a 75 % production goal, as we need a sufficient number of fish (salmon) to safeguard the long-term survival of small-sized populations.
(Small-sized populations is not always the same as “weak” populations. Many of the Baltic salmon populations will always be small-sized because, because many river are small and can only hold small-sized populations).

We are also surprised that the “Second category” in Management option D does not include the objective “within safe genetic limits”, when the “First category” include such objective. Such objective is even more important for the “Second category”, as many of the weak and threatened wild salmon populations are found in this category.

**What might be the impacts of this management option on different interest groups in the near future ?**
Local interests for strong salmon river populations will not be given opportunities to develop the local economy if the 50 % ambition goal will be applied.

**What might be the regional impacts of this management option?**

**4.5. If certain river/rivers are not likely to reach their objective (50% or 75% of the potential smolt production), it may be necessary to reduce fishing. How reductions should be realized?**
River specific reductions should be targeted primarily to the river
Reductions should be implemented both in the sea fisheries and river fisheries
Reductions should be implemented primarily in the sea fisheries

**Why?**
There needs to be measures taken both in the river and sea/coastal fisheries. To reduce the illegal fishing is very important in many eastern and southern Baltic countries.

**4.6. In management options C and D, the salmon rivers would be included in the TAC – management (total allowable catch). What is the position of your stakeholder group on this option?**
A good idea
Not a good idea
Would not work

**Why?**
To have good management and control, all kind of  fisheries must be included in a TAC-system.

In a coming TAC-system the following components should be included, to guarantee sustained individual salmon river populations:
-Fisheries on mixed populations in the sea and coastal areas should be stopped
-River specific TACs (for river and river-mouth fisheries harvesting one salmon population) should be developed
-A separate TAC limited to only reared and released salmon (in areas where only such salmon can be harvested) should be developed.

**4.7. Which year should be set as the target year for reaching the smolt production objective?**
2015
2020
another year, what?

**4.8. Which of the above mentioned management options (A, B, C or D) would be the most preferable from the viewpoint of the stakeholder group that you represent?**
Option A: Continuation of the IBSFC SAP
Option B: Management as today, no plan
Option C: New management plan I
Option D: New management plan II

**Why?**
The goal for salmon fisheries management should be
- Develop individual salmon management plans for each salmon river, by 2011, including measures for habitat improvement, effective fish-ways for returning spawners and downstream migration of smolts, minimum number of returning female spawners to safeguard the genetic variability and regulation of fishery activities.

- Fisheries management for open-sea, coastal and river shall be controled to safeguard as many returning female spawners to each salmon river, so the total potential spawning areas will be fully utilized. Salmon eggs from a minimum of 500 returning female spawners (for very small salmon rivers a number of 2-300 returning female spawners can be more relevant) will be hatched at spawning bottoms of each salmon river, with focus on the weak wild populations, until 2011.

Open-sea, coastal and river fisheries must be limited to guarantee minimum 500 returning female spawners

Long-term ambition for all Baltic wild salmon should be full production (100 % of potential production).

In a coming TAC-system the following components should be included, to guarantee sustained individual salmon river populations:
-Fisheries on mixed populations in the sea and coastal areas should be stopped
-River specific TACs (for river and river-mouth fisheries harvesting one salmon population) should be developed
-A separate TAC limited to only reared and released salmon (in areas where only such salmon can be harvested) should be developed.

We are also surprised that the questionnaire on management options, “Second category” in Management option D does not include the objective “within safe genetic limits”, when the “First category” include such objective.
Such objective is even more important for the “Second category”, as many of the weak and threatened wild salmon populations are found in this category.

**5. What is the main indicator for the state of a salmon stock?**
number of smolts starting their migration to sea
parr densities in rivers

number of spawning salmon ascending into rivers
average catch per day
total catch per season
other, what?

**6. What is the importance of the following objectives when planning salmon management in the long term? Mark your opinion on the scale between 5 (very important) and 1 (not important at all).**
Profitability of commercial fishing 1
Sustainability of wild salmon stocks 5
Development of tourism and other business based on recreational fishing 2
Focusing on the existence (non-monetary) value of wild salmon 5
Socio-economic wellbeing in the coastal areas 3
Socio-economic wellbeing in the river valleys 3

**7. What is your position on the following statements? Mark your opinion on the scale between 5 (completely agree) and 1 (completely disagree).**
Salmon fisheries management must support recreational salmon fishing and the development of fishing tourism in the future 3

Salmon fisheries management must support the maintaining and developing of commercial fishing in the future. 1

Individual Transferable Quota (ITQ) system might be an appropriate way of managing salmon fishing in the Baltic Sea. 3

The fishing of wild salmon must be separated from the fishing of reared salmon. 5

Fishers' knowledge must be taken into account in salmon fisheries management to a larger extent than before. 4

Fishers and other interest groups must be involved more than before in the planning of salmon fisheries management. 5

Wild salmon is an important source of food for humans. 2

'Catch and release' is not an acceptable way of fishing. 3

The environmental degradation of the Baltic Sea and some of the salmon rivers must be taken more into account in analyzing the state of the salmon stocks. 5

Resources must be directed at the restoration of all the weakest salmon stocks. 5

Restoration/rebuilding of salmon stocks should be realized in as many former salmon rivers as possible, also in the dammed rivers. 5

**8. Is there something else related to salmon fisheries management, salmon stocks or salmon fishing that you would like to tell?**

I want to submit my answers