

A CHECKLIST FOR FISHERIES RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES
SEEN FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE FAO CODE OF CONDUCT
FOR RESPONSIBLE FISHERIES

the original FAO checklist may be viewed and downloaded from ---
<http://www.fao.org/docrep/W3140E/W3140E01.htm>

PREAMBLE -- The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations is the internationally recognized authority on sustainable food production. FAO's Fisheries and Aquaculture Department has developed and promulgated comprehensive principles, criteria, and methods for sustainable management of wild-capture fisheries. Their checklist is one of those documents. The checklist poses a lengthy and detailed series of questions on sustainable fisheries management -- it is the original, internationally recognized standard. This checklist presents Alaska's answers to FAO's questions, aggregated for Alaska's three major fisheries: salmon, groundfish, and crab. These answers were developed by the Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute (ASMI), and reviewed by Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADFG) and staff from the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council (NPFMC).

The FAO checklist is an impartial standard by which any fishery in the world may be evaluated. As such, the checklist (and the underlying Code of Conduct) is, in essence, a "third-party", which can clearly demonstrate whether a fishery is sustainable. In fact, the introduction to the checklist states -- "The question addressed here then is whether a given fishery or fishery management system is in accord with the requirements laid out under the Code. In attempting to address this question, the document [checklist] provides a series of questions developed with minimal editorial changes from the original text which can be used for an evaluation by the managers themselves or those involved in certification of a fishery as 'responsible', as defined under the Code."

Key To Terms And Acronyms --

ADEC: Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation: www.dec.state.ak.us/eh/

ADFG or Department: Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Commercial Fisheries: www.cf.adfg.state.ak.us

AWT: Alaska Wildlife Troopers: www.dps.state.ak.us/awt/

BoF or Board: Alaska Board of Fisheries: www.boards.adfg.state.ak.us/fishinfo/index.php

BSAI: Bering Sea & Aleutian Islands

EEZ: Exclusive Economic Zone

escapement: the quantity of salmon that must be allowed to spawn, to ensure the sustainability of the stock

FAO: Food & Agriculture Organization of the United Nations: www.fao.org

FDA: (US) Food and Drug Administration

GOA: Gulf of Alaska

IFQ: Individual Fishing Quota

IPQ: Individual Processing Quota

IPHC: International Halibut Commission: www.iphc.washington.edu

MAP: University of Alaska's Marine Advisory Program: seagrant.uaf.edu/map

MPA: Marine Protected Area: www.mpa.gov

MSFCMA: Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, also termed MSA or FCMA

NIH: (US) National Institutes of Health

NSF: (US) National Science Foundation

NPRB: North Pacific Research Board: www.nprb.org

NPFMC or Council: North Pacific Fishery Management Council:

www.fakr.noaa.gov/npfmc

NMFS or NOAA Fisheries: National Marine Fisheries Service, Alaska Region:
www.fakr.noaa.gov

NPAFC: North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission: www.npafc.org

PSC: Pacific Salmon Commission: www.psc.org

TAC: Total Allowable Catch, a firm harvest limit used in crab and groundfish fisheries

USCG: United States Coast Guard

USDA: United States Department of Agriculture

SCORECARDS OF ALASKA'S COMPLIANCE WITH FAO CODE

Article 7: Fisheries Management

Code Provision	Best Possible Score	Alaska's Score	Alaska's %
7.1 General	22	22	100
7.2 Management Objectives	14	14	100
7.3 Management Framework & Purposes	13	13	100
7.4 Data Gathering & Management Advice	10	10	100
7.5 Precautionary Approach	12	11½	96
7.6 Management Measures	21	20	95
7.7 Implementation	15	15	100
Article 7 Overall	107	105½	99

Article 8: Fishing Operations

Code Provision	Best Possible Score	Alaska's Score	Alaska's %
8.1 Duties of All States	8	8	100
8.2 Flag State Duties	8	8	100
8.4 Fishing Gear Operations	13	13	100
8.5 Fishing Gear Selectivity	6	6	100
8.11 Artificial Reefs & Fish Aggregation	4	4	100
Article 8 Overall	39	39	100

Article 10: Integration Of Fisheries Into Coastal Area Management

Code Provision	Best Possible Score	Alaska's Score	Alaska's %
10.1 Institutional Framework	7	7	100
10.2 Policy Measures	8	8	100
10.3 Regional Cooperation	2	2	100
Article 10 Overall	17	17	100

Article 11: Post-Harvest Practices and Trade

Code Provision	Best Possible Score	Alaska's Score	Alaska's %
11.1 Responsible Fish Utilization	1	1	100
11.2 Responsible International Trade	1	1	100
Article 11 Overall	2	2	100

Article 12: Fisheries Research

Code Provision	Best Possible Score	Alaska's Score	Alaska's %
12.1	3	3	100
12.2	1	1	100
12.3	3	3	100
12.4	2	2	100
12.5	2	2	100
12.6	1	1	100
12.7	2	2	100
12.8	2	2	100
12.10	3	3	100
12.11	2	2	100
12.12	1	1	100
12.13	2	2	100
12.14	1	1	100
12.17	1	1	100
12.18	1	1	100
Article 12 Overall	27	27	100

ARTICLE 7 - FISHERIES MANAGEMENT

7.1 General

FAO Code of Conduct 7.1.1 -- States and all those engaged in fisheries management should, through an appropriate policy, legal and institutional framework, adopt measures for the long-term conservation and sustainable use of fisheries resources. Conservation and management measures, whether at local, national, subregional or regional levels, should be based on the best scientific evidence available and be designed to ensure the long-term sustainability of fishery resources at levels which promote the objective of their optimum utilization and maintain their availability for present and future generations; short term considerations should not compromise these objectives.

FAO Checklist Question 7.1.1 (a) Are conservation and management measures based on the best scientific evidence available? Yes...[1] Some...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- ADFG, NMFS, and IPHC conduct statistically scientific programs to assess productivity, stock status, and fishery impacts. The results of these research programs form the sole foundation for stock assessment and quota setting.

FAO Checklist Question 7.1.1 (b) Are conservation and management measures designed to ensure the long-term sustainability of fishery resources at levels which promote the objective of optimum utilization and maintain their availability for present and future generations? Yes...[1] Some...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- In setting salmon escapement levels ("escapements"), ADFG relies solely on its scientific research. Escapements are set conservatively, in accordance with the precautionary principle. The salmon escapements take precedence over any and all human uses of the resource. Similarly, in setting Total Allowable Catch levels ("TACs"), NMFS relies solely on its scientific research. TACs are set conservatively, in accordance with the precautionary principle. The groundfish TACs are small fractions of the available biomasses, and safety buffers (such as the Bering Sea "2 million ton cap") are added.

FAO Checklist Question 7.1.1 (c) Are management measures currently in effect in the fishery designed for the long-term conservation and sustainable use of fishery resources, as opposed to reasons of short-term expediency? Yes...[1] Some...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Groundfish management measures are in agreement with the MSFCMA, which sets national standards for fisheries management. Salmon management measures are based on the mandate of the Alaska state constitution that Alaska's fisheries be managed on the sustained yield principle.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.1.2 -- Within areas under national jurisdiction, States should seek to identify relevant domestic parties having a legitimate interest in the use and management of fisheries resources and establish arrangements for consulting them to gain their collaboration in achieving responsible fisheries.

FAO Checklist Question 7.1.2 (a) Have attempts been made to identify domestic parties having a (legitimate) interest in the use and management of fisheries resources? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Both the federal and state regulatory processes are open to the public, and participation by all parties is actively solicited and encouraged. In fact, all interested parties participate actively and aggressively -- they do not tolerate being left out of the process, and, by law, they must be included.

FAO Checklist Question 7.1.2 (b) Have arrangements been made to consult these parties and gain their collaboration? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- This consultation is legally mandated at both the federal and state levels, in both statute and regulation.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.1.3 -- For transboundary fish stocks, straddling fish stocks, highly migratory fish stocks and high seas fish stocks, where these are exploited by two or more States, the States concerned, including the relevant coastal States in the case of straddling and highly migratory stocks, should cooperate to ensure effective conservation and management of the resources. This should be achieved, where appropriate, through the establishment of a bilateral, subregional or regional fisheries organization or arrangement.

FAO Checklist Question 7.1.3 (a) Where transboundary, straddling or highly migratory fish stocks and high seas fish stocks are exploited by two or more States, do the States concerned cooperate to ensure effective conservation and management of the resources? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Internationally, the USA ("State") cooperates with Canada in the IPHC and transboundary salmon stocks, with Russia regarding the Bering Sea "Donut Hole", and with several nations in prevention of high seas illegal fishing in the North Pacific. Both Alaskan state and American federal representatives participate in the NPAFC (with Canada, Russia, Japan, and Korea. Other state and federal representatives serve on the PSC, which implements salmon-related cooperation between the USA and Canada. Intranationally, Alaska ("state") cooperates with other American states in several ways; for example, representatives of Washington and Oregon serve on the NPFMC, and all four states on the American west coast comprise the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission.

FAO Checklist Question 7.1.3 (b) Is there a formal fishery commission or arrangement to which all parties fishing belong? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- As a matter of both federal and state policy, it is recognized that effective conservation measures must be applied to an entire stock, across all boundaries -- see answer above.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.1.4 -- A subregional or regional fisheries management organization or arrangement should include representatives of States in whose jurisdictions the resources occur, as well as representatives from States which have a real interest in the fisheries on the resources outside national jurisdictions. Where a subregional or regional fisheries management organization or arrangement exists and has the competence to establish conservation and management measures, those States should cooperate by becoming a member of such organization or a participant in such arrangement, and actively participate in its work.

FAO Checklist Question 7.1.4 Do States which have a real interest in the fisheries or the resource outside their national jurisdiction cooperate in the work of the relevant regional fisheries management organization or arrangement by becoming a member of such organization and arrangement and by actively participating in its work? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- See response above.

FAO Checklist Question 7.1.4 (a) Do all parties attend meetings and collect data in the specified format? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- The meetings of organizations such as IPHC, NPFMC, NPAFC, PSC, and PSMFC are well-attended by their members, who routinely share data. Alaska state and American federal representatives routinely collaborate with Canadian, Japanese, Russian, and Korean representatives.

FAO Checklist Question 7.1.4 (b) Is the population analysis updated regularly and in cooperation by a scientific group? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- ADFG has a formal, rigorous, and comprehensive process for assessing salmon stocks and setting escapement goals. The NPFMC's process of groundfish Plan Teams and the Advisory Panel are similarly rigorous and comprehensive. The bilateral and multilateral international organizations (IPHC, PSC, NPAFC) rely on their respective technical committees.

FAO Checklist Question 7.1.4 (d) Are scientific recommendations of groups reflected in the regulations? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- At both the state and federal levels.

FAO Checklist Question 7.1.4 (e) Are the regulations respected by the parties concerned? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Virtually without question.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.1.6 -- Representatives from relevant organizations, both governmental and non-governmental, concerned with fisheries should be afforded the opportunity to take part in meetings of subregional and regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements as observers or otherwise, as appropriate, in accordance with the procedures of the organization or arrangement concerned. Such representatives should be given timely access to the records and reports of such meetings, subject to the procedural rules on access to them.

FAO Checklist Question 7.1.6 (a) Should representatives from relevant organizations, both governmental and non-governmental, concerned with fisheries be afforded the opportunity to take part in meetings of subregional and regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements as observers or otherwise, in accordance with the procedures of the organization or arrangement concerned? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- All participants, both governmental and private sector, in both the state and federal processes, are afforded definite opportunities to take part in meetings. In fact, all participants take strong, aggressive parts in the process -- they cannot be kept out.

FAO Checklist Question 7.1.6 (b) Subject to the procedural rules on access, are such representatives given timely access to the records and reports of such meetings? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- ADFG + BOF and NMFS + NPFMC post all of their records, reports, and other documents on their websites, and these materials are also readily available in print form.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.1.7 -- States should establish, within their respective competences and capacities, effective mechanisms for fisheries monitoring, surveillance, control and enforcement to ensure compliance with their conservation and management measures, as well as those adopted by subregional or regional organizations or arrangements.

FAO Checklist Question 7.1.7 (a) Have mechanisms been established for fisheries monitoring, surveillance, control and enforcement to ensure compliance with their conservation and management measures for the fishery in question? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- The regulations of the State of Alaska are enforced by the Bureau of Wildlife Enforcement, part of the Alaska State Troopers. Federal regulations are enforced by the US Coast Guard and NMFS.

FAO Checklist Question 7.1.7 (b) Have these measures proved effective? Yes...[1] In part...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- The health and sustainability of Alaska's fisheries does not, in itself, prove that Alaska's regulatory enforcement is effective, but our sustainability would be impossible without effective enforcement. In general, USCG's enforcement efforts focus on two types of "significant violations" -- those which would do harm to the resource, and those which would create an economic advantage to the violator. The incidence of, and trends in, these significant violations are monitored closely. Another measure is the "triple correlation" of regulatory compliance with observed violations with enforcement presence. The objective of regulatory enforcement is to ensure compliance. An essential element of this effort is the public perception of a high level of patrol and enforcement, which creates the view that "It doesn't pay to cheat". Finally, the cooperation of citizens and industry is cultivated through programs such as AWT's Fish & Wildlife Safeguard program, which encourages the reporting of violations, and "leverages" the range of enforcers.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.1.8 -- States should take measures to prevent or eliminate excess fishing capacity and should ensure that levels of fishing effort are commensurate with the sustainable use of fishery resources as a means of ensuring the effectiveness of conservation and management measures.

FAO Checklist Question 7.1.8 (a) Have mechanisms been established to (identify, quantify) prevent or eliminate excess fishing capacity? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Since the 1970s, Alaska salmon harvesters have been subject to the state's "limited entry" (license limitation) system. License limitation has been imposed on other state-managed fisheries, such as certain herring and crab

fisheries. The halibut and sablefish fisheries were economically rationalized (with IFQs) in the early 1990s. The federally managed Bering Sea pollock fishery was rationalized in the mid 1990s. Through cooperation of state and federal fishery managers, the Bering Sea king and snow crab fisheries were rationalized (with IFQs and IPQs) in 2005. Further rationalization programs (eg- Gulf of Alaska groundfish) are being considered. ("Rationalization" refers to the economic rationalization of a fishery, by allocating harvest rights among users.)

FAO Checklist Question 7.1.8 (b) Have these measures proved effective? Yes...[1] In part...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- While no system of license limitation or economic rationalization is perfect, the Alaska systems have generally achieved their goals. Excess fishing capacity has been eliminated in many of the larger fisheries, through the use of limited access privilege programs; these include: halibut and sablefish IFQs, BSAI pollock cooperatives, BSAI crab share program, Central GOA rockfish cooperative, and scallop cooperative. In other fisheries where excess capacity still exists, capacity is limited through the number of licenses, and through restrictions (vessel size, gear type) on those licenses. In fisheries subject to IFQs, significant beneficial side-effects have been realized (eg- improved at-sea safety, better product quality, more orderly fishery operations).

FAO Code of Conduct 7.1.9 -- States and subregional or regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements should ensure transparency in the mechanisms for fisheries management and in the related decision-making process.

FAO Checklist Question 7.1.9 Are the arrangements followed for assessment, management of the fishery and the decision-making process in general transparent?

FAO Checklist Question - Assessment Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- All scientific studies and decisions are publicly available (state and federal).

FAO Checklist Question - Management Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- All regulations are clear and widely promulgated.

FAO Checklist Question - Decision-making Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Public participation is actively encouraged (state and federal).

FAO Code of Conduct 7.1.10 -- States and subregional or regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements should give due publicity to conservation and management measures and ensure that laws, regulations and other legal rules governing their implementation are effectively disseminated. The bases and purposes of such measures should be explained to users of the resource in order to facilitate their application and thus gain increased support in the implementation of such measures.

FAO Checklist Question 7.1.10 Are the conservation and management measures adopted for management of the fishery and the related decision-making process given due publicity in order to ensure that laws, regulations and other legal rules governing their implementation are effectively disseminated? Yes...[1] In part...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Both the BoF and the NPFMC are aggressive in publicizing their decisions, laws, regulations, and other legal rules, on their websites and in print.

* * * * *

7.2 Management objectives

FAO Code of Conduct 7.2.1 -- Recognizing that long-term sustainable use of fisheries resources is the overriding objective of conservation and management, States and subregional or regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements should, inter alia, adopt appropriate measures, based on the best scientific evidence available, which are designed to maintain or restore stocks at levels capable of producing maximum sustainable yield, as qualified by relevant environmental and economic factors, including the special requirements of developing countries.

FAO Checklist Question 7.2.1 (a) Are fisheries measures based on the best scientific evidence?
Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- The salmon, crab, and groundfish stocks are closely studied, on an annual cycle of study design, data collection, data analysis, and quota setting. For salmon, ADFG produces annual management plans and reports, as well as several other fishery research reports. For groundfish and crab, NPFMC and NMFS produce annual Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation (SAFE) reports, which are based on annual data collection and analysis.

FAO Checklist Question 7.2.1 (b) Are they qualified by relevant environmental and economic factors? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Environmental and economic factors are explicit parts of each SAFE document, and they are taken into account in ADFG's salmon management plans.

FAO Checklist Question 7.2.1 (c) Have formal reference point(s) based on stock size been established? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- For salmon, the pre-determined "escapement goal" must be met before fishing is allowed. For groundfish and crab, the "Total Allowable Catch" (TAC) defines the maximum permissible harvest. The TAC is always much lower than the Allowable Biological Catch (ABC), and the ABC is always lower than the Overfishing Level (OFL). Because OFL is based on MSY, all catch limits are precautionary.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.2.2 -- Such measures should provide inter alia that:

(a) excess fishing capacity is avoided and exploitation of the stocks remains economically viable;

(b) the economic conditions under which fishing industries operate promote responsible fisheries;

(c) the interests of fishers, including those engaged in subsistence, small-scale and artisanal fisheries, are taken into account;

(d) biodiversity of aquatic habitats and ecosystems is conserved and endangered species are protected;

(e) depleted stocks are allowed to recover or, where appropriate, are actively restored;

(f) adverse environmental impacts on the resources from human activities are assessed and, where appropriate, corrected; and

(g) pollution, waste, discards, catch by lost or abandoned gear, catch of non-target species, both fish and non- fish species, and impacts on associated or dependent species are minimized, through measures including, to the extent practicable, the development and use of selective, environmentally safe and cost-effective fishing gear and techniques.

FAO Checklist Question Introduction -- Have management measures taken into account the need to avoid excess capacity and promote conditions under which the interests of fishermen, especially the small-scale, artisanal and subsistence fishery sectors, are protected, the biochemistry conserved, depleted stocks restored and adverse environmental impacts assessed and corrected?

FAO Checklist Question -- Is the level of excess capacity defined? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- In the state-managed salmon fisheries, and in the federally managed crab, pollock, and certain other groundfish fisheries, the maximum number of harvesters in each area was determined.

FAO Checklist Question -- Is excess capacity avoided? Yes...[1] In part...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- In the salmon fisheries, the state of Alaska imposed a system of license limitation, called "limited entry", in which any new entrant must buy a permit from an existing harvester. In the pollock and crab fisheries, NMFS conducted a program of buying back licenses, and then allowing the formation of harvesting cooperatives.

FAO Checklist Question -- Do the economic conditions under which the fishery operates promote responsible fisheries? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- IFQs have led to less loss of fishing gear (less "ghost gear"), better seafood quality, improved safety-at-sea, and higher prices paid to harvesters.

FAO Checklist Question -- Are interests of small-scale, etc., fishermen accounted for? Yes...[1] In part...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- All salmon fishing permits must be owned by "natural persons", rather than by businesses or corporations. Although the groundfish fisheries are managed by NMFS, the State of Alaska has instituted several "state waters" groundfish fisheries (eg- cod) for the benefit of local, small-scale harvesters. The TACs for these state waters fisheries are deducted from the overall TACs. Also, subsistence fishing is given the highest priority in allocation.

FAO Checklist Question -- Has the biodiversity of aquatic ecosystems been conserved (as a result of operation of the fishery in question)? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Thousands of square miles of ocean space have been placed into Marine Protected Areas, in which fishing operations are restricted, and in some cases, prohibited. The reasons for those closures range from conservation of juvenile fishes, to protection of sensitive habitat, to avoidance of marine mammals.

FAO Checklist Question -- Have depleted stocks been allowed to recover or, where appropriate, restored? Yes...[1] In part...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Some examples -- Bering Sea snow crab and Aleutian Islands Pacific Ocean perch were closed to fishing during periods of low stock abundance. After the stocks recovered, fishing was cautiously permitted. Those rebuilt

stocks are closely monitored so that sustainability is ensured.

FAO Checklist Question -- Have adverse environmental impacts on the stocks from human activities been assessed and, where appropriate, rectified? Yes...[1] In part...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Spills of fuels and other materials are promptly cleaned up. All salmon stocks that were impacted by the Exxon Valdez spill have recovered, some to record-high levels. Many man-made barriers to fish passage (eg-culverts) have been removed so that migrating salmon can use the entire length of a stream.

FAO Checklist Question -- Have pollution and waste been minimized? Yes...[1] In part...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Impacts from human activities (oil drilling, municipal wastewater, etc.) are strictly monitored and controlled. Fishing vessels and seafood processors are subject to strict regulations. Penalties for violations have ranged close to US\$1 million.

FAO Checklist Question -- Has catch by lost and abandoned gear of commercial species and other organisms been minimized? Yes...[1] In part...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- In at least 2 ways. Crab pots (traps) must be equipped with a biodegradable escape panel. When the IFQ management regime was imposed on the halibut fishery, the loss of fishing gear dropped dramatically.

FAO Checklist Question -- Have selective and environmentally-safe and cost-effective fishing methods been developed? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Gillnet gear must be operated only in certain areas and in certain ways. "Circle hooks" have replaced the old-style "J-hooks", with the result that unwanted catch is returned alive to the sea. Trawls are very restricted in their area and style of operation.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.2.3 -- States should assess the impacts of environmental factors on target stocks and species belonging to the same ecosystem or associated with or dependent upon the target stocks, and assess the relationship among the populations in the ecosystem.

FAO Checklist Question 7.2.3 -- Have the impacts of environmental factors on target species and those species associated with, dependent on, or belonging dependent on the target stocks, been assessed? Yes...[1] In part...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- The stocks of both target and non-target species of fishes, crustaceans, mammals, and birds are closely monitored.

* * * * *

7.3 Management framework and procedures

FAO Code of Conduct 7.3.1 -- To be effective, fisheries management should be concerned with the whole stock unit over its entire area of distribution and take into account previously agreed management measures established and applied in the same region, all removals and the biological unity and other biological characteristics of the stock. The best scientific evidence available should be used to determine, inter alia, the area of distribution of the resource and the area through which it migrates during its life cycle.

FAO Checklist Question 7.3.1 (a) Have the management measures developed taken into account the whole stock unit over its entire area of stock distribution? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Stock surveys and test-fishing are performed both within and outside of the fishing grounds. The resulting data are included in scientific decision-making.

FAO Checklist Question 7.3.1 (b) Have previously-agreed management measures established and applied in the same region been considered? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Measures are taken to avoid conflict among fisheries, by various methods, such as time-and-area closures, and bycatch caps. Consultation among various fisheries managers, within the state system, within the federal system, and between the state and federal system is quite routine.

FAO Checklist Question 7.3.1 (c) Have all removals and the biological unity and other biological characteristics of the stock been considered? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Discards and other mortality factors are explicitly considered in the management of all Alaska fisheries. For example, all female and undersize male king and snow crab are returned alive to the sea, but ADFG builds a handling mortality factor into their calculations of biomass and TAC.

FAO Checklist Question 7.3.1 (d) Has the best scientific evidence available been used to determine, inter alia, the area of distribution of the resource? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Rigorous scientific studies and analyses are performed annually, for all commercially fished species. NMFS conducts scientific trawl surveys, and collects data from the at-sea observer program, in the groundfish and crab fisheries.

FAO Checklist Question 7.3.1 (e) Have all removals and the biological unity and other biological characteristics of the stock been considered? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- See above response.

FAO Checklist Question 7.3.1 (f) Has the area through which the species migrates during its life cycle been considered? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Halibut exploitation rates are adjusted based on the abundance of catchable halibut in a given area, during their multi-year migration. Mixed-stock salmon fisheries are generally avoided in favor of single-stock fisheries, which occur close to the natal streams. Bering Sea pollock is studied throughout its range.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.3.2 -- In order to conserve and manage transboundary fish stocks, straddling fish stocks, highly migratory fish stocks and high seas fish stocks throughout their range, conservation and management measures established for such stocks in accordance with the respective competences of relevant States or, where appropriate, through subregional and regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements, should be compatible. Compatibility should be achieved in a manner consistent with the rights, competences and interests of the States concerned.

FAO Checklist Question 7.3.2 In the case of a transboundary, straddling and highly migratory fish stock or high seas fish stock throughout its range, are the conservation and management measures established for such stock within the jurisdiction of the relevant States, or the appropriate subregional, regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements, compatible? Yes...[1] In part...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- The USA and Canada collaborate closely in the IPHC, and in the management of transboundary migrating salmon in southeast Alaska, through the PSC. The USA and Russia collaborate in the prohibition of pollock fishing in the Bering Sea “Donut Hole”.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.3.3 -- Long-term management objectives should be translated into management actions, formulated as a fishery management plan or other management framework.

FAO Checklist Question 7.3.3 Have long-term management objectives been translated into a plan or other management document (subscribed to by all interested parties)?

FAO Checklist Question - Is there a plan? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- In fact, there are many plans, which cover all commercially exploited species.

FAO Checklist Question - Is it subscribed to? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- By all parties: state, federal, and international.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.3.4 -- States and, where appropriate, subregional or regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements should foster and promote international cooperation and coordination in all matters related to fisheries, including information gathering and exchange, fisheries research, management and development.

FAO Checklist Question 7.3.4 Have attempts been made to foster cooperation in all matters related to:

FAO Checklist Question - information gathering and exchange? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Both the state and federal agencies gather a great deal of fisheries data, such as landings, harvest areas, and prices.

FAO Checklist Question - fisheries research? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Scientific data are freely available to any government agency, harvester, company, or interested person. Virtually all data and studies are published on the websites of the various agencies. Third-party at-sea observers are carried aboard hundreds of crab and groundfish vessels, at the vessels' expense.

FAO Checklist Question - fisheries management? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Regulations are developed in a collaborative fashion, at both the Board and the Council levels.

FAO Checklist Question - fisheries development? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Almost all Alaska fisheries are considered to be fully developed. In cases where certain fisheries are still developing (eg- dive fisheries for geoduck clams in southeast Alaska), the regulators and the industry cooperate closely.

* * * * *

7.4 Data gathering and management advice

FAO Code of Conduct 7.4.2 -- Research in support of fishery conservation and management should be promoted, including research on the resources and on the effects of climatic, environmental and socio-economic factors. The results of such research should be disseminated to interested parties.

FAO Checklist Question 7.4.2 Has relevant research been carried out on:

FAO Checklist Question - the resource? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Comprehensive scientific fisheries research is performed on an annual basis for all fisheries.

FAO Checklist Question - climatic and environmental factors? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- The results of those studies are readily available on the websites.

FAO Checklist Question - the socio-economic context? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- NPFMC's annual Stock Assessment & Fishery Evaluation (SAFE) reports include comprehensive analyses of the economics of the groundfish fisheries. The socio-economics of the salmon fisheries are studied by organizations such as the University of Alaska's Institute for Social & Economic Research.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.4.3 -- Studies should be promoted which provide an understanding of the costs, benefits and effects of alternative management options designed to rationalize fishing, in particular, options relating to excess fishing capacity and excessive levels of fishing effort.

FAO Checklist Question 7.4.3 Has research been carried out on:

FAO Checklist Question - cost-benefits of fishing? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Before imposing a new management regime, such as IFQs or license buy-backs, the costs, benefits, and impacts of various alternative measures were considered at length. After the imposition of such new management measures, the fisheries are closely monitored.

FAO Checklist Question - alternative management strategies? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Whenever considering a new management strategy, the NPFMC is required by law to develop and analyze several alternatives, and the “no action” alternative is always explicitly included.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.4.4 -- States should ensure that timely, complete and reliable statistics on catch and fishing effort are collected and maintained in accordance with applicable international standards and practices and in sufficient detail to allow sound statistical analysis. Such data should be updated regularly and verified through an appropriate system. States should compile and disseminate such data in a manner consistent with any applicable confidentiality requirements.

FAO Checklist Question 7.4.4 Are timely and reliable statistics available on catch and fishing effort maintained in accordance with applicable international standards and practices and in sufficient detail to allow sound statistical analysis? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Comprehensive, reliable statistics on many parameters are gathered and made available in-season, on a preliminary basis. After the fishing season, the statistics are reviewed, corrected, and made available to any interested person.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.4.5 -- In order to ensure sustainable management of fisheries and to enable social and economic objectives to be achieved, sufficient knowledge of social, economic and institutional factors should be developed through data gathering, analysis and research.

FAO Checklist Question 7.4.5 Has sufficient knowledge of social, economic and institutional factors relevant to the fishery in question been developed through data gathering, analysis and research? Yes...[1] In part...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- A great deal of data is gathered and analyzed, in areas ranging from ex-vessel prices, to industry labor employment, to subsistence.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.4.6 -- States should compile fishery-related and other supporting scientific data relating to fish stocks covered by subregional or regional fisheries management organizations or arrangements in an internationally agreed format and provide them in a timely manner to the organization or arrangement. In cases of stocks which occur in the jurisdiction of more than one State and for which there is no such organization or arrangement, the States concerned should agree on a mechanism for cooperation to compile and exchange such data.

FAO Checklist Question 7.4.6 Are fishery-related and other supporting scientific data relating to fish stocks covered by subregional or regional fisheries management organizations or arrangements compiled in an internationally agreed format and provided in a timely manner to the organization or arrangement?

FAO Checklist Question - in an internationally agreed format? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- All data and information are presented in English, in clear language and formats that are easily understandable.

FAO Checklist Question - in a timely manner? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Scientific information and analyses are published according to firm annual cycles of management decision-making.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.4.7 -- Subregional or regional fisheries management organizations or arrangements should compile data and make them available, in a manner consistent with any applicable confidentiality requirements, in a timely manner and in an agreed format to all members of these organizations and other interested parties in accordance with agreed procedures.

FAO Checklist Question 7.4.7 With respect to the data collected for management purposes, are applicable confidentiality requirements complied with? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Information on individual persons, vessels, or companies is never revealed to the public, and is shared within government agencies on a "need-to-know" basis only. Any data available to the public is aggregated so that an individual's data cannot be discerned.

* * * * *

7.5 Precautionary approach

FAO Code of Conduct 7.5.1 -- States should apply the precautionary approach widely to conservation, management and exploitation of living aquatic resources in order to protect them and preserve the aquatic environment. The absence of adequate scientific information should not be used as a reason for postponing or failing to take conservation and management measures.

FAO Checklist Question 7.5.1 (a) Has the precautionary approach been applied widely to conservation, management and exploitation of living aquatic resources in order to protect them and preserve the aquatic environment? Yes...[1] In part...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Protection of the resources and the environment has first priority in all Alaska fisheries management.

FAO Checklist Question 7.5.1 (b) Has the absence of adequate scientific information been used as a reason for postponing or failing to take conservation and management measures? No...[1] Occasionally... [½] Often...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- VERY OCCASIONALLY -- Management measures are almost never postponed because of the absence of adequate scientific information. On the rare occasions when this happens, it is because the risk of a blind management action is considered to be greater than the risk of temporarily continuing the status quo.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.5.2 -- In implementing the precautionary approach, States should take into account, inter alia, uncertainties relating to the size and productivity of the stocks, reference points, stock condition in relation to such reference points, levels and distribution of fishing mortality and the impact of fishing activities, including discards, on non-target and associated or dependent species, as well as environmental and socio-economic conditions.

FAO Checklist Question 7.5.2 Has there been an attempt to determine for the stock both safe targets for management (Target Reference Points) and limits for exploitation (Limit Reference Points), and, at the same time, the action to be taken if they are exceeded?

FAO Checklist Question - Have target reference point(s) been established? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- In the salmon fisheries, annual forecasts of run strength, escapement levels, and expected harvest are made. In the groundfish and crab fisheries, annual TACs are set.

FAO Checklist Question - Have limit reference points been established? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- In the salmon fisheries, annual escapement goals are

set. Depending on the stock, these escapement goals are divided into weekly or daily increments. During the season, fishing is not permitted unless that week's or day's escapement goal has been achieved. In the groundfish and crab fisheries, the TACs are never exceeded -- no fishing above the TAC is ever permitted -- these are called "hard TACs".

FAO Checklist Question - Have data and assessment procedures been installed measuring the position of the fishery in relation to the reference points established? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- All fisheries are closely and quantitatively monitored while they are in progress, in order to avoid exceeding their catch limits.

FAO Checklist Question - Have management actions been agreed to in the eventuality that data sources and analyses indicate that these reference points have been exceeded? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- ADFG does not allow salmon fishing until the week's or day's escapement goal is met. NMFS does not allow any fishing beyond the TAC. The TAC is both a trigger and a limit reference point. Actual harvest is much less than the TAC.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.5.4 -- In the case of new or exploratory fisheries, States should adopt as soon as possible cautious conservation and management measures, including, inter alia, catch limits and effort limits. Such measures should remain in force until there are sufficient data to allow assessment of the impact of the fisheries on the long-term sustainability of the stocks, whereupon conservation and management measures based on that assessment should be implemented. The latter measures should, if appropriate, allow for the gradual development of the fisheries.

FAO Checklist Question 7.5.4 (a) For new and exploratory fisheries, are procedures in place for promptly applying precautionary management measures, including catch or effort limits? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- For any new fishery, the precautionary principle is applied even more strongly than in established fisheries. Exploratory fisheries are severely restricted in time, area, and harvest.

FAO Checklist Question 7.5.4 (b) Have provisions been made for the gradual development of new or exploratory fisheries while information is being collected on the impact of these fisheries, allowing an assessment of the impact of such fisheries on the long-term sustainability of the stocks?

FAO Checklist Question - Have precautionary management provisions been established early on? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- See response above.

FAO Checklist Question - Has information collection been initiated early to allow impact assessment? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- In the absence of any data, a fishery might be allowed on a very limited basis, or fishing simply will not be allowed at all. In some cases, ADFG's pre-fishery data collection is funded (but not performed) by industry.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.5.5 -- If a natural phenomenon has a significant adverse impact on the status of living aquatic resources, States should adopt conservation and management measures on an emergency basis to ensure that fishing activity does not exacerbate such adverse impact. States should also adopt such measures on an emergency basis where fishing activity presents a serious threat to the sustainability of such resources. Measures taken on an emergency basis should be temporary and should be based on the best scientific evidence available.

FAO Checklist Question 7.5.5 (a) Have contingency plans been agreed to in advance on the appropriate temporary management response to serious threats to the resource as a result of overfishing or adverse environmental changes or other phenomena adversely affecting the resource? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- The fisheries and their underlying biomass are closely monitored, and fishing is often restricted.

FAO Checklist Question 7.5.5 (b) Have these emergency (temporary) responses been agreed to due to:

FAO Checklist Question - natural phenomena adversely impacting the stock? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- In the event of a decline in the stock, for any reason, fishing is promptly curtailed.

FAO Checklist Question - fishing adversely impacting the stock? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Because of precautionary management and strict controls on escapements and TACs, overfishing virtually never occurs.

* * * * *

7.6 Management measures

FAO Code of Conduct 7.6.1 -- States should ensure that the level of fishing permitted is commensurate with the state of fisheries resources.

FAO Checklist Question 7.6.1 Is the level of fishing permitted commensurate with the current state of the fishery resources? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- In crab and groundfish fisheries, the TACs are small fractions of the biomass. In salmon fisheries, fishing is permitted only after the weekly or daily escapement goals are attained.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.6.2 -- States should adopt measures to ensure that no vessel be allowed to fish unless so authorized, in a manner consistent with international law for the high seas or in conformity with national legislation within areas of national jurisdiction.

FAO Checklist Question 7.6.2 Are fishing vessels allowed to operate on the resource in question without specific authorization? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- NO -- But this is a POSITIVE response! No vessel may fish for the resource without specific authorization. To land groundfish, a federal fishing permit is required. To land salmon, a state fishing permit is required. Also, all fish must be delivered to a licensed seafood processor, who must report all landings (via "fish tickets"), and who is prohibited from accepting fish from an unlicensed harvester.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.6.3 -- Where excess fishing capacity exists, mechanisms should be established to reduce capacity to levels commensurate with the sustainable use of fisheries resources so as to ensure that fishers operate under economic conditions that promote responsible fisheries. Such mechanisms should include monitoring the capacity of fishing fleets.

FAO Checklist Question 7.6.3 (a) Have attempts been made to measure fleet capacity operating in the fishery? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- This has been done in the salmon, halibut, sablefish, crab, and certain groundfish fisheries.

FAO Checklist Question 7.6.3 (b) Have mechanisms been established where excess capacity exists to reduce capacity to levels commensurate with sustainable use of the resource? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Salmon fisheries operate under a limited entry permit system. Halibut, sablefish, crab, and certain groundfish fisheries have been rationalized, and other fisheries are being considered for rationalization.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.6.5 -- States and fisheries management organizations and arrangements should regulate fishing in such a way as to avoid the risk of conflict among fishers using different vessels, gear and fishing methods.

FAO Checklist Question 7.6.5 Has the fishery been regulated in such a manner that conflict among fishers using different vessels, gear and fishing methods are minimized? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- There is almost no interaction among the vessels, gear, and fishing methods of the various fisheries.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.6.6 -- When deciding on the use, conservation and management of fisheries resources, due recognition should be given, as appropriate, in accordance with national laws and regulations, to the traditional practices, needs and interests of indigenous people and local fishing communities which are highly dependent on fishery resources for their livelihood.

FAO Checklist Question 7.6.6 In the course of deciding on use, conservation and management of the resource, were relevant national laws and regulations relating to the traditional practices needs and interests of indigenous people and local fishing communities highly dependent on these resources for their livelihood taken into account? Yes...[1] In part...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- In allocation of fisheries resources, indigenous subsistence users have the highest priority.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.6.7 -- In the evaluation of alternative conservation and management measures, their cost-effectiveness and social impact should be considered.

FAO Checklist Question 7.6.7 Have the cost-effectiveness and social impact been considered in the evaluation of alternative conservation and management measures? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Under the federal National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, these considerations are explicitly taken into account.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.6.8 -- The efficacy of conservation and management measures and their possible interactions should be kept under continuous review. Such measures should, as appropriate, be revised or abolished in the light of new information.

FAO Checklist Question 7.6.8 Are procedures in place to keep the efficacy of current conservation and management measures and their possible interactions under continuous review to revise or abolish them in the light of new information?

FAO Checklist Question - Have review procedures been established? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Both the NPFMC and the BoF revise their conservation and management measures on a routine basis. Most often, if new information becomes available, NMFS will propose a change to NPFMC, and ADFG will propose a change to BoF.

FAO Checklist Question - Does a flexible mechanism for revision of management measures exist? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- See response above.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.6.9 -- States should take appropriate measures to minimize waste, discards, catch by lost or abandoned gear, catch of non-target species, both fish and non-fish species, and negative impacts on associated or dependent species, in particular endangered species. Where appropriate, such measures may include technical measures related to fish size, mesh size or gear, discards, closed seasons and areas and zones reserved for selected fisheries, particularly artisanal fisheries. Such measures should be applied, where appropriate, to protect juveniles and spawners. States and subregional or regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements should promote, to the extent practicable, the development and use of selective, environmentally safe and cost effective gear and techniques.

FAO Checklist Question 7.6.9 (a) Are appropriate measures being applied to minimize:

FAO Checklist Question - waste and discards? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Alaska law prohibits "wanton waste" of natural resources. Both ADFG and NMFS prohibit waste, and have imposed measures to minimize discards. For example, all cod and pollock fisheries are required to retain 100% of their catch, with no discards.

FAO Checklist Question - catch of non-target species (both fish and non-fish species)? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Bycatch of non-target species is severely limited and carefully monitored, through MPAs and other methods. Bottom trawling is prohibited in 521,000 n.mi.² of ocean space off Alaska. Also, no fishing at all is permitted in 7,362 n.mi.² of Marine Reserves; these include Gulf of Alaska seamounts, sea lion rookeries, coral gardens, and several other areas.

FAO Checklist Question - impacts on associated, dependent or endangered species? Yes...[1]
No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Bycatch of non-target species is severely limited and carefully monitored, through MPAs and other methods. Bottom trawling is prohibited in 521,000 n.mi.² of ocean space off Alaska. Also, no fishing at all is permitted in 7,362 n.mi.² of Marine Reserves; these include Gulf of Alaska seamounts, sea lion rookeries, coral gardens, and several other areas.

FAO Checklist Question 7.6.9 (b) Are technical measures being taken in relation to:

FAO Checklist Question - fish size? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- There are minimum size limits for king crab, snow crab, and halibut, and there are many restrictions on the size of mesh in salmon gill nets

FAO Checklist Question - mesh size or gear? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Gill nets may only fish certain mesh sizes.

FAO Checklist Question - discards? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Alaska law prohibits "wanton waste" of natural resources. Both ADFG and NMFS prohibit waste, and have imposed measures to minimize discards. For example, all cod and pollock fisheries are required to retain 100% of their catch, with no discards.

FAO Checklist Question - closed seasons? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Time and area closures are classic tools of Alaska fisheries management, and are used extensively and commonly.

FAO Checklist Question - closed areas? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- See response above.

FAO Checklist Question - areas reserved for particular (e.g. artisanal) fisheries? Yes...[1]
No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- In the ocean, MPAs have been set aside for subsistence needs. Subsistence fishing is of great cultural importance, and is given highest priority. Subsistence fishing in streams is protected from interference from other harvesters.

FAO Checklist Question - protection of juveniles or spawners? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- In the ocean, large MPAs have been set aside for this purpose. In streams, salmon spawning and rearing habitat is protected.

FAO Checklist Question 7.6.9 (c) Are suitable arrangements in place to promote, to the extent practicable, the development and use of selective, environmentally safe and cost-effective gear and techniques? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- The use of selective gear, such as pelagic trawls, circle hooks, and crab pot escape panels is encouraged, and often mandated.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.6.10 -- States and subregional and regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements, in the framework of their respective competences, should introduce measures for depleted resources and those resources threatened with depletion that facilitate the sustained recovery of such stocks. They should make every effort to ensure that resources and habitats critical to the well-being of such resources which have been adversely affected by fishing or other human activities are restored.

FAO Checklist Question 7.6.10 Have measures been introduced to identify and protect depleted resources and those resources threatened with depletion, and to facilitate the sustained recovery of such stocks? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Every year, NMFS publishes its Status Of Stocks report, which identifies depleted resources. In response to such a finding, NMFS and NPFMC institute protective measures. ADFG monitors the salmon fisheries and takes protective action (closes fishing) whenever necessary. For the groundfish fisheries, if the stock size falls below a minimum stock size threshold, stock rebuilding plans are developed and implemented. To date, there have been 5 rebuilding plans adopted (1 for Pacific Ocean perch, 4 for crab species), and the results have been positive for four of the five stocks.

* * * * *

7.7 Implementation

FAO Code of Conduct 7.7.1 -- States should ensure that an effective legal and administrative framework at the local and national level, as appropriate, is established for fisheries resource conservation and fisheries management.

FAO Checklist Question 7.7.1 Has an effective legal and administrative framework been established at the local and national level, as appropriate, for fishery resource conservation and management? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Fisheries under federal jurisdiction are managed by NPFMC and NMFS. Fisheries under state jurisdiction are managed by BoF and ADFG.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.7.2 -- States should ensure that laws and regulations provide for sanctions applicable in respect of violations which are adequate in severity to be effective, including sanctions which allow for the refusal, withdrawal or suspension of authorizations to fish in the event of non-compliance with conservation and management measures in force.

FAO Checklist Question 7.7.2 (a) Are national laws in place that provide for sanctions? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Both the USA and Alaska have laws that provide for sanctions.

FAO Checklist Question 7.7.2 (b) Are these adequate in severity to be effective? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- There are very few repeat offenders.

FAO Checklist Question 7.7.2 (c) Do sanctions affect (refusal/withdrawal/suspension) authorization to fish in the event of non-compliance with conservation and management measures in force? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Sanctions include the possibility of temporary or permanent revocation of fishing privileges.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.7.3 -- States, in conformity with their national laws, should implement effective fisheries monitoring, control, surveillance and law enforcement measures including, where appropriate, observer programmes, inspection schemes and vessel monitoring systems. Such measures should be promoted and, where appropriate, implemented by subregional or

regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements in accordance with procedures agreed by such organizations or arrangements.

FAO Checklist Question 7.7.3 Are there in place:

FAO Checklist Question - monitoring control and surveillance schemes? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Both federal and state fisheries management include comprehensive monitoring and control schemes.

FAO Checklist Question - observer programs? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Scientific observers are carried on board many crab and groundfish vessels, at the vessels' expense. The groundfish observer program comprises 36,000 observer days/year, and uses 500 observers. Groundfish observers are required onboard vessels 30% of the time for vessels 60-125 feet, 100% of the time for vessels over 125 feet, and 100% of the time on motherships and at shoreplants. The costs of the program are at least \$12 million for industry, and \$4.8 million for NMFS in 2007. The observers report their data only to NMFS or ADFG.

FAO Checklist Question - inspection schemes? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Regulatory agencies inspect the catch and landing records ("fish tickets") of both harvesters and processors; the data include quantity landed, and area of catch. Licenses of captains and crew are inspected. Landings of IFQ-based halibut and sablefish are recorded. No government agency inspects seafood for safety or quality, except NMFS when paid by a processor (this is not common). However, seafood plants are inspected for food safety reasons. Some fishing vessels are inspected for fisherman safety. The holding tanks of crab vessels are inspected by ADFG before fishing starts, to make sure that no early fishing takes place. NMFS Office of Law Enforcement will inspect some landings, for species verification.

FAO Checklist Question - vessel monitoring schemes? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Fishing vessels are surveilled by USCG and Alaska Wildlife Troopers (AWT) during fishing. Electronic (satellite) vessel monitoring programs are conducted to protect sea birds and mammals.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.7.4 -- States and subregional or regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements, as appropriate, should agree on the means by which the

activities of such organizations and arrangements will be financed, bearing in mind, inter alia, the relative benefits derived from the fishery and the differing capacities of countries to provide financial and other contributions. Where appropriate, and when possible, such organizations and arrangements should aim to recover the costs of fisheries conservation, management and research.

FAO Checklist Question 7.7.4 (a) Have States and subregional or regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements, as appropriate, agreed on the means by which the activities of such organizations and arrangements will be financed, bearing in mind, inter alia, the relative benefits derived from the fishery and the differing capacities of countries to provide financial and other contributions?

FAO Checklist Question - Is the capacity of member countries to finance taken into account? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- ADFG & BoF are financed by the State of Alaska. NMFS & NPFMC are financed by the federal government. Multi-lateral institutions such as IPHC are financed by the parties.

FAO Checklist Question - Is there an agreement on financing? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- See response above.

FAO Checklist Question - Is there an agreement on relative benefits? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- See response above.

FAO Checklist Question 7.7.4 (b) Is it possible for such organizations and arrangements to agree on an attempt to recover the costs of fisheries conservation, management and research measures (and their enforcement) that are in place? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- The federal government finances NMFS, NPFMC, and its share of international organizations. This money is not "recovered" from the fisheries, except through general federal taxes, such as income tax. However, there is a 1.2% cost-recovery "tax" for the halibut and sablefish IFQ fisheries, which is used to cover the costs of management. Also, the revised MSFCMA allows cost-recovery in all limited-access privilege program fisheries.

FAO Checklist Question - Does an Agreement on cost recovery exist? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- The State of Alaska imposes a Fisheries Business Tax, also called the "Raw Fish Tax". This tax is levied on the ex-vessel value of the landings, and is paid by the seafood processors. The state splits the tax proceeds with

local coastal communities, in proportion to their landings. The communities use their share to fund their operations, including services (eg- port operation) to the fishing industry. The state puts its share into its general budget fund, from which it pays for ADFG and BoF. Historically, the state's income from this tax has been more than adequate to pay its fisheries-related expenses.

FAO Code of Conduct 7.7.5 -- States which are members of or participants in subregional or regional fisheries management organizations or arrangements should implement internationally agreed measures adopted in the framework of such organizations or arrangements and consistent with international law to deter the activities of vessels flying the flag of non-members or non-participants which engage in activities which undermine the effectiveness of conservation and management measures established by such organizations or arrangements.

FAO Checklist Question 7.7.5 (a) Have States which are members of or participants in subregional or regional fisheries management organizations or arrangements taken steps to implement (into national legislation and practice) internationally agreed measures adopted in the framework of such organizations or arrangements which are consistent with international law? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- The governing federal law is the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSFCMA or MSA), which is not only consistent with international law, it is often used as a model by other countries. Also, the USA and the State of Alaska are active participants in international fisheries bodies such as IPHC.

FAO Checklist Question 7.7.5 (b) In particular, have national measures been adopted to deter the activities of vessels flying the flag of non-members or non-participants which engage in activities which undermine the effectiveness of conservation and management measures established by such organizations or arrangements? Yes...[1] Some...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- The USCG is an aggressive enforcer of these measures.

* * * * *

* * * * *

ARTICLE 8 - FISHING OPERATIONS

8.1 Duties of all States

FAO Code of Conduct 8.1.1 -- States should ensure that only fishing operations allowed by them are conducted within waters under their jurisdiction and that these operations are carried out in a responsible manner.

FAO Checklist Question 8.1.1 Are States involved in the fishery ensuring that only fishing operations allowed by them are conducted within waters under their jurisdiction and that these operations are carried out in a responsible manner? Yes...[1] Some...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- The USCG is an aggressive enforcer of these measures.

FAO Code of Conduct 8.1.2 -- States should maintain a record, updated at regular intervals, on all authorizations to fish issued by them.

FAO Checklist Question 8.1.2 Are States involved in the fishery maintaining a record, updated at regular intervals, on all authorizations to fish issued by them? Yes...[1] Some...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Both NMFS and ADFG maintain current records of permit holders. A further check is that seafood processors are not allowed to buy round fish from anyone other than a current permit holder.

FAO Code of Conduct 8.1.3 -- States should maintain, in accordance with recognized international standards and practices, statistical data, updated at regular intervals, on all fishing operations allowed by them.

FAO Checklist Question 8.1.3 Are States involved in the fishery maintaining, in accordance with recognized international standards and practices, statistical data, updated at regular intervals, on all fishing operations allowed by them? Yes...[1] Some...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Both NMFS and ADFG maintain and update these statistical records and databases.

FAO Code of Conduct 8.1.4 -- States should, in accordance with international law, within the framework of subregional or regional fisheries management organizations or arrangements,

cooperate to establish systems for monitoring, control, surveillance and enforcement of applicable measures with respect to fishing operations and related activities in waters outside their national jurisdiction.

FAO Checklist Question 8.1.4 Are States involved in the fishery, in accordance with international law, within the framework of subregional or regional fisheries management organizations or arrangements, cooperating to establish systems for monitoring, control, surveillance and enforcement of applicable measures with respect to fishing operations and related activities in waters outside their national jurisdiction? Yes...[1] Some...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- The USA is an active participant in international monitoring and enforcement of fishing operations in the Bering Sea and North Pacific Ocean.

FAO Code of Conduct 8.1.7 -- States should enhance through education and training programs the education and skills of fishers and, where appropriate, their professional qualifications. Such programs should take into account agreed international standards and guidelines.

FAO Checklist Question 8.1.7 Are education and training programs enhancing the education and skills of fishers and, where appropriate, their professional qualifications, taking into account agreed international standards and guidelines? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- The Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute (ASMI) has a long history of providing education and training to fishers and processors. Also, the University of Alaska conducts many training and education classes through its Marine Advisory Program (eg- HACCP) and Alaska Vocational Technical Education Center (eg- marine safety, radar observation).

FAO Code of Conduct 8.1.8 -- States should, as appropriate, maintain records of fishers which should, whenever possible, contain information on their service and qualifications, including certificates of competency, in accordance with their national laws.

FAO Checklist Question 8.1.8 Are records of fishers being maintained which should, whenever possible, contain information on their service and qualifications, including certificates of competency, in accordance with their national laws? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Certain certifications (eg- Master Mariner) are maintained, and crew members are also licensed. By law, fishing vessel operators maintain these records on board during fishing.

FAO Code of Conduct 8.1.9 -- States should ensure that measures applicable in respect of

masters and other officers charged with an offence relating to the operation of fishing vessels should include provisions which may permit, inter alia, refusal, withdrawal or suspension of authorizations to serve as masters or officers of a fishing vessel.

FAO Checklist Question 8.1.9 Do measures applicable in respect of masters and other officers charged with an offence relating to the operation of fishing vessels include provisions which may permit, inter alia, refusal, withdrawal or suspension of authorizations to serve as masters or officers of a fishing vessel? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- These penalties are among the enforcement options.

FAO Code of Conduct 8.1.10 -- States, with the assistance of relevant international organizations, should endeavour to ensure through education and training that all those engaged in fishing operations be given information on the most important provisions of this Code, as well as provisions of relevant international conventions and applicable environmental and other standards that are essential to ensure responsible fishing operations.

FAO Checklist Question 8.1.10 Is an attempt being made to ensure that, through education and training, all those engaged in fishing operations are given information on the most important provisions of this Code, as well as provisions of relevant international conventions and applicable environmental and other standards that are essential to ensure responsible fishing operations? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Regulations imposed by NPFMC & NMFS and BoF & ADFG are widely publicized. As explained earlier, these regulations are indeed consistent with this Code and other international conventions.

* * * * *

8.2 Flag State Duties

FAO Code of Conduct 8.2.1 -- Flag States should maintain records of fishing vessels entitled to fly their flag and authorized to be used for fishing and should indicate in such records details of the vessels, their ownership and authorization to fish.

FAO Checklist Question 8.2.1 (a) Are flag States maintaining records of fishing vessels entitled

to fly their flag and authorized to fish, which indicate details of the vessels, their ownership and authorization to fish? Yes...[1] Some...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- NMFS and USCG maintain these records.

FAO Checklist Question 8.2.1 (b) Have such vessels have been issued with, and carry on board, a Certificate of Registry and authorization to fish? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- NMFS and ADFG grant such authorizations, which must be carried on board.

FAO Code of Conduct 8.2.2 -- Flag States should ensure that no fishing vessels entitled to fly their flag fish on the high seas or in waters under the jurisdiction of other States unless such vessels have been issued with a Certificate of Registry and have been authorized to fish by the competent authorities. Such vessels should carry on board the Certificate of Registry and their authorization to fish.

FAO Checklist Question 8.2.2 Are Flag States taking steps to ensure that no fishing vessels entitled to fly their flag fish on the high seas or in waters under the jurisdiction of other States unless such vessels have been issued with a Certificate of Registry and have been authorized to fish by the competent authorities? Yes...[1] Some...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- USCG aggressively enforces these provisions.

FAO Code of Conduct 8.2.3 -- Fishing vessels authorized to fish on the high seas or in waters under the jurisdiction of a State other than the flag State, should be marked in accordance with uniform and internationally recognizable vessel marking systems such as the FAO Standard Specifications and Guidelines for Marking and Identification of Fishing Vessels.

FAO Checklist Question 8.2.3 Are national fishing vessels authorized to fish on the high seas or in waters under the jurisdiction of a State other than the Flag State marked in accordance with uniform and internationally recognizable vessel marking systems such as the FAO Standard Specifications and Guidelines for Marking and Identification of Fishing Vessels? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- USCG aggressively enforces these provisions.

FAO Code of Conduct 8.2.4 -- Fishing gear should be marked in accordance with national

legislation in order that the owner of the gear can be identified. Gear marking requirements should take into account uniform and internationally recognizable gear marking systems.

FAO Checklist Question 8.2.4 Is there national legislation requiring fishing gear to be marked, taking into account uniform and internationally recognizable gear marking systems, in order that the owner of the gear can be identified? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- This is required by both federal and state laws.

FAO Code of Conduct 8.2.6 -- States not party to the Agreement to Promote Compliance with International Conservation and Management Measures by Vessels Fishing in the High Seas should be encouraged to accept the Agreement and to adopt laws and regulations consistent with the provisions of the Agreement.

FAO Checklist Question 8.2.6 Are States involved in a fishery on the high seas party to the Agreement to Promote Compliance with International Conservation and Management Measures by Vessels Fishing in the High Seas? Yes...[1] Some...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- The USA accepted this agreement in 1995. But there are very few, if any, Alaska-based fishing vessels that participate in high-seas (outside EEZ) fisheries.

FAO Code of Conduct 8.2.7 -- Flag States should take enforcement measures in respect of fishing vessels entitled to fly their flag which have been found by them to have contravened applicable conservation and management measures, including, where appropriate, making the contravention of such measures an offence under national legislation. Sanctions applicable in respect of violations should be adequate in severity to be effective in securing compliance and to discourage violations wherever they occur and should deprive offenders of the benefits accruing from their illegal activities. Such sanctions may, for serious violations, include provisions for the refusal, withdrawal or suspension of the authorization to fish.

FAO Checklist Question 8.2.7 (a) Are Flag States taking enforcement measures in respect of fishing vessels entitled to fly their flag which have been found by them to have contravened applicable conservation and management measures, including, where appropriate, making the contravention of such measures an offence under national legislation? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- For vessels fishing in the US EEZ, USCG establishes boarding goals per fishery, as well as observed compliance rate targets, and takes enforcement action against vessels found in violation. For international fishery treaties that have been ratified by the US, enabling legislation has been passed; in Alaska, these include: International Pacific Halibut Convention, Convention for the Conservation

of Anadromous Stocks in the North Pacific Ocean, Central Bering Sea Pollock Convention, and UN Moratorium on High Seas Driftnets. The US has also agreed to several non-binding international instruments such as the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, and International Plans of Action (IPOA) on sharks, seabirds, and Illegal, Unregulated, and Unreported (IUU) Fishing.

FAO Checklist Question 8.2.7 (b) Are sanctions applicable in respect of violations and illegal activities adequate in severity to be effective in securing compliance and discouraging violations wherever they occur? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Within the USA EEZ, penalties can range up through forfeiture of the catch to forfeiture of the vessel, including financial penalties and prison sentences. The USCG has interdicted US vessels fishing illegally in Russian waters. Also, USCG takes enforcement action on behalf of other States party to an international agreement -- they have turned over Russian and Chinese vessels found in contravention of international agreements to the respective flag state for punitive actions. As far as can be determined, those flag states have assessed similar penalties to those mentioned above, and in some cases revoked the master's license.

* * * * *

8.4 Fishing operations

FAO Code of Conduct 8.4.2 -- States should prohibit dynamiting, poisoning and other comparable destructive fishing practices.

FAO Checklist Question 8.4.2 Have States prohibited within national legislation dynamiting, poisoning and other comparable destructive fishing practices? Yes...[1] Some...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Many fishing practices, including these, are prohibited.

FAO Code of Conduct 8.4.3 -- States should make every effort to ensure that documentation with regard to fishing operations, retained catch of fish and non-fish species and, as regards discards, the information required for stock assessment as decided by relevant management bodies, is collected and forwarded systematically to those bodies. States should, as far as possible, establish programs, such as observer and inspection schemes, in order to promote compliance with applicable measures.

FAO Checklist Question 8.4.3 (a) Is documentation required with regard to fishing operations, retained catch of fish and non-fish species and, as regards discards, the information required for stock assessment as decided by relevant management bodies, collected and forwarded systematically to those bodies?

FAO Checklist Question - documentation on fishing operations Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Both NMFS and ADFG require and collect this information, and make it available to NPFMC and BoF, respectively.

FAO Checklist Question - documentation on non-fish catches Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- See response above.

FAO Checklist Question - documentation on fish catches Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- See response above.

FAO Checklist Question 8.7.3 (b) Is such as (*sic*) observer and inspection scheme being established in order to promote compliance with applicable (fishery management) measures? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- At-sea scientific observers are carried aboard most groundfish and crab vessels, at the vessels' expense. These observers, as well as NMFS and ADFG personnel, inspect the catch for verification of species and quantities.

FAO Code of Conduct 8.4.4 -- States should promote the adoption of appropriate technology, taking into account economic conditions, for the best use and care of the retained catch.

FAO Checklist Question 8.4.4 Is the adoption of appropriate technology being promoted taking into account economic conditions for the best use and care of the retained catch? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- However, this is conducted mostly by the private-sector companies, rather than imposed by government agencies.

FAO Code of Conduct 8.4.5 -- States, with relevant groups from industry, should encourage the development and implementation of technologies and operational methods that reduce discards. The use of fishing gear and practices that lead to the discarding of catch should be discouraged and the use of fishing gear and practices that increase survival rates of escaping fish should be promoted.

FAO Checklist Question 8.4.5 Are States and relevant groups from the fishing industry encouraging the development and implementation of technologies and operational methods that reduce discards? Yes...[1] Some...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Reduction of discards is a high-priority goal for both industry and government, and refinements in technology and operations are continually being made.

FAO Code of Conduct 8.4.6 -- States should cooperate to develop and apply technologies, materials and operational methods that minimize the loss of fishing gear and the ghost fishing effects of lost or abandoned fishing gear.

FAO Checklist Question 8.4.6 Are technologies, materials and operational methods being applied that minimize the loss of fishing gear and the ghost fishing effects of lost or abandoned fishing gear? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- In at least 2 ways. Crab pots (traps) must be equipped with a biodegradable escape panel. When the IFQ management regime was imposed on the halibut fishery, the loss of fishing gear dropped dramatically.

FAO Code of Conduct 8.4.7 -- States should ensure that assessments of the implications of habitat disturbance are carried out prior to the introduction on a commercial scale of new fishing gear, methods and operations to an area.

FAO Checklist Question 8.4.7 Are assessments being carried out of the implications of habitat disturbance prior to the introduction on a commercial scale of new fishing gear, methods and operations? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- In fact, these impact assessments are conducted for both new and established fisheries.

FAO Code of Conduct 8.4.8 -- Research on the environmental and social impacts of fishing gear and, in particular, on the impact of such gear on biodiversity and coastal fishing communities should be promoted.

FAO Checklist Question 8.4.8 Is research being promoted on the environmental and social impacts of fishing gear and, in particular, on the impact of such gear on biodiversity and coastal fishing communities, being promoted (*sic*)?

FAO Checklist Question - on the environmental impacts? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- These analyses have been performed, and they are frequently updated as new information becomes available.

FAO Checklist Question - on the social impacts? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- See response above.

FAO Checklist Question - on the impact on biodiversity? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- See response above.

FAO Checklist Question - on the impact on coastal fisheries? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- See response above.

* * * * *

8.5 Fishing gear selectivity

FAO Code of Conduct 8.5.1 -- States should require that fishing gear, methods and practices, to the extent practicable, are sufficiently selective so as to minimize waste, discards, catch of non-target species, both fish and non-fish species, and impacts on associated or dependent species and that the intent of related regulations is not circumvented by technical devices. In this regard, fishers should cooperate in the development of selective fishing gear and methods. States should ensure that information on new developments and requirements is made available to all fishers.

FAO Checklist Question 8.5.1 (a) Where practicable, is there a requirement that fishing gear, methods and practices are sufficiently selective as to minimize waste, discards, catch of non-target species - both fish and non-fish species - and impacts on associated or dependent species and that the intent of related regulations is not circumvented by technical devices and that information on new developments and requirements is made available to all fishers? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- All types of fishing gear are restricted in their operation, and usually in their construction. Several fishing methods (eg- pelagic longline, benthic gillnets) are completely illegal.

FAO Checklist Question - Are regulatory measures being circumvented by technical devices? Yes...[0] Sometimes...[½] No...[1]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- NO -- ADFG and NMFS are vigilant in detecting any circumventions.

FAO Checklist Question 8.5.1 (b) Are fishers cooperating in the development of selective fishing gear and methods? Yes...[1] Sometimes...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- It is often the case that government and industry work together. One example is the Steller sea lion protective measures (termed a "Reasonable and Prudent Alternative") that were crafted cooperatively by the trawl industry, NPFMC, and NMFS. Another example is the seabird protection measures ("streamer lines) that were voluntarily implemented by the longline industry, and then later adopted formally by NPFMC and NMFS.

FAO Code of Conduct 8.5.2 -- In order to improve selectivity, States should, when drawing up their laws and regulations, take into account the range of selective fishing gear, methods and strategies available to the industry.

FAO Checklist Question 8.5.2 Do regulations governing the selectivity of fishing gear take into

account the range of fishing gear, methods and strategies available to the industry? Yes...[1]
No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Several types of fishing gear are legal in Alaska, but only certain types of gear, used in only specified ways, and only in specified areas, are legal in any particular fishery.

FAO Code of Conduct 8.5.3 -- States and relevant institutions should collaborate in developing standard methodologies for research into fishing gear selectivity, fishing methods and strategies.

FAO Checklist Question 8.5.3 Are States and relevant institutions involved in the fishery collaborating in developing standard methodologies for research into fishing gear selectivity, fishing methods and strategies? Yes...[1] Some...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Also, private companies which design and manufacture fishing gear do so with clear regard to selectivity and regulations.

FAO Code of Conduct 8.5.4 -- International cooperation should be encouraged with respect to research programs for fishing gear selectivity, and fishing methods and strategies, dissemination of the results of such research programs and the transfer of technology.

FAO Checklist Question 8.5.4 Is international cooperation being encouraged with respect to research programs for fishing gear selectivity and fishing methods and strategies, dissemination of the results of such research programs and the transfer of technology? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- ADFG participates actively in international cooperative organizations such as the NPAFC and the IPHC.

* * * * *

8.11 Artificial reefs and fish aggregation devices

FAO Code of Conduct 8.11.1 -- States, where appropriate, should develop policies for increasing stock populations and enhancing fishing opportunities through the use of artificial structures, placed with due regard to the safety of navigation, on or above the seabed or at the surface. Research into the use of such structures, including the impacts on living marine resources and the environment, should be promoted.

FAO Checklist Question 8.11.1 Have policies been developed for increasing stock populations and enhancing fishing opportunities through the use of artificial structures, placed with due regard to the safety of navigation? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Sort of. This section does not apply very well to Alaska, because Alaska has no need to use artificial reefs or fish aggregating devices. With the exception of three small artificial reefs, there are no enhancement devices used in salt water.

FAO Code of Conduct 8.11.2 -- States should ensure that, when selecting the materials to be used in the creation of artificial reefs as well as when selecting the geographical location of such artificial reefs, the provisions of relevant international conventions concerning the environment and safety of navigation are observed.

FAO Checklist Question 8.11.2 When selecting the materials to be used in the creation of artificial reefs, as well as when selecting the geographical location of such artificial reefs, have the provisions of relevant international conventions concerning the environment and safety of navigation been observed? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- See response above.

FAO Code of Conduct 8.11.3 -- States should, within the framework of coastal area management plans, establish management systems for artificial reefs and fish aggregation devices. Such management systems should require approval for the construction and deployment of such reefs and devices and should take into account the interests of fishers, including artisanal and subsistence fishers.

FAO Checklist Question 8.11.3 (a) Are management systems for artificial reefs and fish aggregation devices established within the framework of coastal area management plans? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- See response above.

FAO Checklist Question 8.11.3 (b) Does the construction and deployment of such reefs and devices take into account the interests of fishers, including artisanal and subsistence fishers?
Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- See response above.

* * * * *

* * * * *

ARTICLE 10 - INTEGRATION OF FISHERIES INTO COASTAL AREA MANAGEMENT

10.1 Institutional framework

FAO Code of Conduct 10.1.1 -- States should ensure that an appropriate policy, legal and institutional framework is adopted to achieve the sustainable and integrated use of the resources, taking into account the fragility of coastal ecosystems and the finite nature of their natural resources and the needs of coastal communities.

FAO Checklist Question 10.1.1 Has an appropriate policy, legal and institutional framework been adopted in order to achieve sustainable and integrated use of living marine resources, taking into account the fragility of coastal ecosystems and the finite nature of their natural resources and the needs of coastal communities? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Issues related to coastal ecology are explicitly considered in the evaluation of possible impacts from human activity, at both the state and federal levels.

FAO Code of Conduct 10.1.2 -- In view of the multiple uses of the coastal area, States should ensure that representatives of the fisheries sector and fishing communities are consulted in the decision-making processes and involved in other activities related to coastal area management planning and development.

FAO Checklist Question 10.1.2 In view of the multiple uses of the coastal area, are representatives of the fisheries sector and fishing communities consulted in the decision-making processes involved in other activities related to coastal area management planning and development? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Any such decision-making is a transparent, public process, and involvement by the fishing sector and fishing communities is actively invited.

FAO Code of Conduct 10.1.3 -- States should develop, as appropriate, institutional and legal frameworks in order to determine the possible uses of coastal resources and to govern access to them taking into account the rights of coastal fishing communities and their customary practices to the extent compatible with sustainable development.

FAO Checklist Question 10.1.3 Do institutional and legal frameworks regulating the possible uses of coastal resources and their access take into account the rights of coastal fishing communities and their customary practices to the extent compatible with sustainable development? Yes...[1] Partly...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- See two responses above.

FAO Code of Conduct 10.1.4 -- States should facilitate the adoption of fisheries practices that avoid conflict among fisheries resources users and between them and other users of the coastal area.

FAO Checklist Question 10.1.4 (a) Has the adoption of fisheries practices been promoted that avoids conflict among bottom resource users? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- All activities in the coastal zone (e.g.- construction of breakwaters, ports, & infrastructure) are subject to a formal Coastal Zone Management (CZM) review process, and usually to NEPA process.

FAO Checklist Question - bottom resource users and other users of the coastal area? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- The CZM and NEPA processes deliberately take into account all resources and users of resources.

FAO Checklist Question 10.1.4 (b) Have procedures and mechanisms been adopted which help settle these conflicts? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Conflict settlement mechanisms include both administrative (through government agencies) and legal (through courts of law) procedures.

FAO Checklist Question 10.1.4 (c) Have procedures and mechanisms been established at the appropriate administrative level to settle conflicts which arise within the fisheries sector and between fisheries resource users and other users of the coastal area? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Conflict settlement mechanisms include both administrative (through government agencies) and legal (through courts of law) procedures.

* * * * *

10.2 Policy measures

FAO Code of Conduct 10.2.1 -- States should promote the creation of public awareness of the need for the protection and management of coastal resources and the participation in the management process by those affected.

FAO Checklist Question 10.2.1 Is public awareness being created on the need for the protection and management of coastal resources, and the participation in the management process by those affected? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- The process of public information and involvement is robust and inclusive, at both the state and federal levels.

FAO Code of Conduct 10.2.2 -- In order to assist decision-making on the allocation and use of coastal resources, States should promote the assessment of their respective value taking into account economic, social and cultural factors.

FAO Checklist Question 10.2.2 Has an attempt been made to assess the economic, social and cultural value of coastal resources in order to assist decision-making on their allocation and use?

FAO Checklist Question - economic Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- This is an explicit part of decision-making.

FAO Checklist Question - social and cultural Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- This is an explicit part of decision-making.

FAO Code of Conduct 10.2.3 -- In setting policies for the management of coastal areas, States should take due account of the risks and uncertainties involved.

FAO Checklist Question 10.2.3 Have risks and uncertainties involved in the management of coastal areas been taken into account in setting policies for the management of coastal areas? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- This is an explicit part of decision-making.

FAO Code of Conduct 10.2.4 -- States, in accordance with their capacities, should establish or

promote the establishment of systems to monitor the coastal environment as part of the coastal management process using physical, chemical, biological, economic and social parameters.

FAO Checklist Question 10.2.4 In accordance with capacities, have measures been taken to establish or promote the establishment of systems to monitor the coastal environment as part of the coastal management process using physical, chemical, biological, economic and social parameters? Yes...[1] In part...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- This is done by the Alaska Department of Natural Resources and the (US) Environmental Protection Agency, in close consultation with ADFG and NMFS.

FAO Code of Conduct 10.2.5 -- States should promote multi-disciplinary research in support of coastal area management, in particular on its environmental, biological, economic, social, legal and institutional aspects.

FAO Checklist Question 10.2.5 Has multi-disciplinary research in support of coastal area management been promoted on

FAO Checklist Question - environmental and biological aspects? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- This is a standard component of the NEPA impact assessment process.

FAO Checklist Question - economic and social aspects? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- This is a standard component of the NEPA impact assessment process.

FAO Checklist Question - legal and institutional aspects? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- This is a standard component of the NEPA impact assessment process.

* * * * *

10.3 Regional cooperation

FAO Code of Conduct 10.3.1 -- States with neighboring coastal areas should cooperate with one another to facilitate the sustainable use of coastal resources and the conservation of the environment.

FAO Checklist Question 10.3.1 Do States with neighboring coastal areas cooperate with one another in:

FAO Checklist Question - the sustainable use of resources? Yes...[1] Some...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- As outlined earlier, interstate and international cooperation is both frequent and routine.

FAO Checklist Question - the conservation of the environment? Yes...[1] Some...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- As outlined earlier, interstate and international cooperation is both frequent and routine.

* * * * *
* * * * *

ARTICLE 11 - POST-HARVEST PRACTICES AND TRADE

11.1 Responsible fish utilization

FAO Code of Conduct 11.1.1 -- States should adopt appropriate measures to ensure the right of consumers to safe, wholesome and unadulterated fish and fishery products.

FAO Checklist Question 11.1.1 Is international domestic (*sic*) trade in fish and fishery products in accord with sound conservation and management practices through the identification of the origin of fish and fish products traded? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- The US FDA enforces strict labeling laws, and USDA enforces Country Of Origin labeling. Also, NMFS enforces the rule that all seafood exported from Alaska is identified as originating from FAO Area 67.

* * * * *

11.2 Responsible international trade

FAO Code of Conduct 11.2.3 -- States should ensure that measures affecting international trade in fish and fishery products are transparent, based, when applicable, on scientific evidence, and are in accordance with internationally agreed rules.

FAO Checklist Question 11.2.3 Are measures affecting international trade in fish and fishery products transparent, based, when applicable, on scientific evidence, and in accordance with internationally agreed rules? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- By FDA and USDA.

* * * * *
* * * * *

ARTICLE 12 - FISHERIES RESEARCH

FAO Code of Conduct 12.1 -- States should recognize that responsible fisheries requires the availability of a sound scientific basis to assist fisheries managers and other interested parties in making decisions. Therefore, States should ensure that appropriate research is conducted into all aspects of fisheries including biology, ecology, technology, environmental science, economics, social science, aquaculture and nutritional science. States should ensure the availability of research facilities and provide appropriate training, staffing and institution building to conduct the research, taking into account the special needs of developing countries.

FAO Checklist Question 12.1 Responsible fishing requires the availability of a sound scientific basis to assist fisheries managers and other interested parties in making decisions, taking into account the special needs of developing countries.

FAO Checklist Question 12.1 (a) Is appropriate research conducted into all aspects of fisheries, including biology, ecology, technology, environmental science, economics, social science, aquaculture and nutritional science? Yes...[1] In part...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Research is conducted by government agencies, and by scores of universities, with scores of millions of dollars in annual federal funding from agencies such as NMFS, NSF, and NPRB.

FAO Checklist Question 12.1 (b) Are research vessel surveys of the resource and the marine environment carried out? Annually...[1] Occasionally...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- NMFS and ADFG conduct annual surveys, and publish the results promptly.

FAO Checklist Question 12.1 (c) Are appropriate research and training facilities available and provisions made for staffing and institution building to conduct the necessary research, taking into account the special needs of developing countries? Yes...[1] In part...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Research is conducted by government agencies, and by scores of universities, with scores of millions of dollars in annual federal funding. Representatives of MAP participate in organizations such as Pacific Fisheries Technologists, and they assist in fisheries management capacity building in the Russian Far East. Many representatives of ADFG and NMFS participate in organizations such as the American Fisheries Society.

FAO Code of Conduct 12.2 -- States should establish an appropriate institutional framework to determine the applied research which is required and its proper use.

FAO Checklist Question 12.2 Has an appropriate institutional framework been established to determine the applied research which is required and its proper use? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- This framework includes government agencies (state and federal), plus a strong, aggressive, and well-funded network of scores of university researchers.

FAO Code of Conduct 12.3 -- States should ensure that data generated by research are analyzed, that the results of such analyses are published, respecting confidentiality where appropriate, and distributed in a timely and readily understood fashion, in order that the best scientific evidence is made available as a contribution to fisheries conservation, management and development. In the absence of adequate scientific information, appropriate research should be initiated as soon as possible.

FAO Checklist Question 12.3 (a) Are data generated by research being analyzed and the results of such analyses published in a way that confidentiality is respected where appropriate? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Confidentiality is always safeguarded, at all levels.

FAO Checklist Question 12.3 (b) Are results of analyses being distributed in a timely and readily understandable fashion in order that the best scientific evidence be made available as a contribution to fisheries conservation, management and development? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Government agencies promptly publish their research on their websites. University researchers promptly publish their research in peer-reviewed journals.

FAO Checklist Question 12.3 (c) In the absence of adequate scientific information, is appropriate research being initiated in a timely fashion? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Research is initiated by both government and university scientists

FAO Code of Conduct 12.4 -- States should collect reliable and accurate data which are required to assess the status of fisheries and ecosystems, including data on bycatch, discards and waste. Where appropriate, this data should be provided, at an appropriate time and level of aggregation, to relevant States and subregional, regional and global fisheries organizations.

FAO Checklist Question 12.4 (a) Are reliable and accurate data required to assess the status of fisheries and ecosystems - including data on bycatch, discards and waste - being collected? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- These data are required, and they are collected.

FAO Checklist Question 12.4 (b) Are these data being provided, at an appropriate time and level of aggregation, to relevant States and subregional, regional and global fisheries organizations? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Prompt provision of data and analyses by researchers to decision-makers is a well-established routine.

FAO Code of Conduct 12.5 -- States should be able to monitor and assess the state of the stocks under their jurisdiction, including the impacts of ecosystem changes resulting from fishing pressure, pollution or habitat alteration. They should also establish the research capacity necessary to assess the effects of climate or environment change on fish stocks and aquatic ecosystems.

FAO Checklist Question 12.5 (a) Are States monitoring and assessing the state of the stocks under their jurisdiction, including the impacts of ecosystem changes resulting from fishing pressure, pollution or habitat alteration? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- These parameters form the core of research and assessments by NMFS and ADFG.

FAO Checklist Question 12.5 (b) Have they established the research capacity necessary to assess the effects of climate or environment change on fish stocks and aquatic ecosystems? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- The research capacity regarding Alaska-region fisheries is large, well-established, and well-funded. Also, the North Pacific Research Board is a new, well-funded research institution.

FAO Code of Conduct 12.6 -- States should support and strengthen national research capabilities to meet acknowledged scientific standards.

FAO Checklist Question 12.6 Are States taking steps to support and strengthen national research capabilities to meet acknowledged scientific standards? Yes...[1] Some...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Improvements are constantly and aggressively pursued.

FAO Code of Conduct 12.7 -- States, as appropriate in cooperation with relevant international organizations, should encourage research to ensure optimum utilization of fishery resources and stimulate the research required to support national policies related to fish as food.

FAO Checklist Question 12.7 (a) Are States cooperating with relevant international organizations to encourage research in order to ensure optimum utilization of fishery resources? Yes...[1] Some...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Both NMFS and ADFG participate actively in multi-jurisdictional fisheries-related bodies.

FAO Checklist Question 12.7 (b) Are they stimulating the research required to support national policies related to fish as food? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- State and national policies regarding seafood are guided and driven by the Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute, FDA, USDA, NIH, and many others.

FAO Code of Conduct 12.8 -- States should conduct research into, and monitor, human food supplies from aquatic sources and the environment from which they are taken and ensure that there is no adverse health impact on consumers. The results of such research should be made publicly available.

FAO Checklist Question 12.8 (a) Is research being conducted into the study and monitoring of human food supplies from aquatic sources and the environments from which they are taken to ensure that there is no adverse health impact on consumers? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Food safety is regulated by FDA, USDA, and ADEC. Research in this area is performed by these agencies and by scores of university researchers.

FAO Checklist Question 12.8 (b) Are results of such research being made publicly available? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Government agencies promptly publish their research on their websites. University researchers promptly publish their research in peer-reviewed journals.

FAO Code of Conduct 12.10 -- States should carry out studies on the selectivity of fishing gear, the environmental impact of fishing gear on target species and on the behaviour of target and non-target species in relation to such fishing gear as an aid for management decisions and with a view to minimizing non-utilized catches as well as safeguarding the biodiversity of ecosystems and the aquatic habitat.

FAO Checklist Question 12.10 (a) Are studies on the selectivity of fishing gear, the environmental impact of fishing gear on target species and on the behavior of target and non-target species in relation to such fishing gear being conducted as an aid for management decisions? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Most research on the selectivity and impacts of fishing gear used in the Alaska region was performed in the 1970s-1980s, and gear designs and operation have been well-refined since then. Further refinements continue to occur.

FAO Checklist Question 12.10 (b) Is an attempt being made through research to minimize non-utilized catches? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Avoidance of bycatch and minimization of discards is ongoing, under the title Improved Retention / Improved Utilization (IR/IU).

FAO Checklist Question 12.10 (c) Is the biodiversity of ecosystems and the aquatic habitat being safeguarded? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- This is done through a variety of means, including MPAs, gear restrictions, and environmental impact assessment and mitigation.

FAO Code of Conduct 12.11 -- States should ensure that before the commercial introduction of new types of gear, a scientific evaluation of their impact on the fisheries and ecosystems where they will be used should be undertaken. The effects of such gear introductions should be monitored.

FAO Checklist Question 12.11 (a) Before the commercial introduction of a new type of gear, is a scientific evaluation of its impact on the fisheries and ecosystems where it will be used being undertaken? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- However, very little new fishing gear has been introduced in the past several years. Where necessary, its impacts are evaluated scientifically.

FAO Checklist Question 12.11 (b) Is the effect of such gear introduction monitored? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- See response above.

FAO Code of Conduct 12.12 -- States should investigate and document traditional fisheries knowledge and technologies, in particular those applied to small-scale fisheries, in order to assess their application to sustainable fisheries conservation, management and development.

FAO Checklist Question 12.12 Are traditional fisheries knowledge and technologies being investigated and documented, in particular those applied to small-scale fisheries, in order to assess their application to sustainable fisheries conservation, management and development? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- "Local and Traditional Knowledge" is an important component of Alaskan fisheries management. Subsistence fisheries users get first priority in allocation of resources.

FAO Code of Conduct 12.13 -- States should promote the use of research results as a basis for the setting of management objectives, reference points and performance criteria, as well as for ensuring adequate linkages between applied research and fisheries management.

FAO Checklist Question 12.13 (a) Is the use of research results as a basis for the setting of management objectives, reference points and performance criteria being promoted? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- In fact, scientific research is the only basis for setting reference points and management objectives.

FAO Checklist Question 12.13 (b) Is research being used to help ensure adequate linkages between applied research and fisheries management? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Scientific research forms the foundation of Alaska fisheries management.

FAO Code of Conduct 12.14 -- States conducting scientific research activities in waters under the jurisdiction of another State should ensure that their vessels comply with the laws and regulations of that State and international law.

FAO Checklist Question 12.14 Are States conducting scientific research activities in waters under the jurisdiction of another State, ensuring that their vessels comply with the laws and regulations of that State and international law? Yes...[1] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- All research vessels comply with the regulations of the host nation's coast guard.

FAO Code of Conduct 12.17 -- States, either directly or with the support of relevant international organizations, should develop collaborative technical and research programmes to improve understanding of the biology, environment and status of transboundary aquatic stocks.

FAO Checklist Question 12.17 Are States, either directly or with the support of relevant international organizations, developing collaborative technical and research programs to improve understanding of the biology, environment and status of transboundary aquatic stocks? Yes...[1] Some...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- NMFS and ADFG conduct their own research on transboundary pollock and salmon, and they also collaborate in international research by bodies such as IPHC.

FAO Code of Conduct 12.18 -- States and relevant international organizations should promote and enhance the research capacities of developing countries, inter alia, in the areas of data collection and analysis, information, science and technology, human resource development and provision of research facilities, in order for them to participate effectively in the conservation, management and sustainable use of living aquatic resources.

FAO Checklist Question 12.18 Are States and relevant international organizations promoting and enhancing the research capacities of developing countries, inter alia, in the areas of data collection and analysis, information, science and technology, human resource development and provision of research facilities, in order for them to participate effectively in the conservation, management and sustainable use of living aquatic resources? Yes...[1] Some...[½] No...[0]

ALASKA RESPONSE -- YES -- Alaska is very far away from any developing country, and therefore should not be penalized for its remoteness. NMFS and USAID do indeed participate in enhancing research capability in developing countries. Also, the USA is an active participant in, and major funder of, UN/FAO, ADB, and similar institutions.