WGEEL Country Reports

Report on the eel stock and fishery in Belgium 2013/2014

Authors

Claude Belpaire, Research Institute for Nature and Forest (INBO), Duboislaan 14, 1560 Groenendaal-Hoeilaart, Belgium. Tel. +32 +32 2 658 04 11. Fax +32 2 657 96 82 Claude.Belpaire@inbo.be

David Buysse, Research Institute for Nature and Forest (INBO), Kliniekstraat 25, 1070 Brussels, Belgium

Jan Breine, Research Institute for Nature and Forest (INBO), Duboislaan 14, 1560 Groenendaal-Hoeilaart, Belgium

Hugo Verreycken, Research Institute for Nature and Forest (INBO), Duboislaan 14, 1560 Groenendaal-Hoeilaart, Belgium

Michael Ovidio, Laboratoire de Démographie des Poissons et Hydroécologie, Unité de Biologie du Comportement, Institut de Zoologie, Département des Sciences et Gestion de l'Environnement, Université de Liège, Quai van Beneden 22, 4020 Liège, Belgium

Billy Nzau Matondo, Laboratoire de Démographie des Poissons et Hydroécologie, Unité de Biologie du Comportement, Institut de Zoologie, Département des Sciences et Gestion de l'Environnement, Université de Liège, Quai van Beneden 22, 4020 Liège, Belgium

Jens De Meyer, Ghent University, Evolutionary Morphology of Vertebrates & Zoology Museum, K.L. Ledeganckstraat 35, 9000 Gent (Belgium)

Dominique Adriaens, Ghent University, Evolutionary Morphology of Vertebrates & Zoology Museum, K.L. Ledeganckstraat 35, 9000 Gent (Belgium)

Kathleen Roland, Unit of Research in Environmental and Evolutive Biology (URBE), University of Namur (FUNDP), Rue de Bruxelles, 61, 5000 Namur (Belgium)

Patrick Kestemont, Unit of Research in Environmental and Evolutive Biology (URBE), University of Namur (FUNDP), Rue de Bruxelles, 61, 5000 Namur (Belgium)

Kristof Vlietinck, Agency for Nature and Forests, Koning Albert II-laan 20/bus 8, 1000 Brussels, Belgium.

Reporting Period: This report was completed in October 2014, and contains data up to 2014.

1. Introduction

This report is written in preparation of the EIFAAC/ICES Working Group on Eel meeting at Copenhagen (4–10 September 2013). Extensive information on the eel stock and fishery in Belgium has been presented in the previous Belgian country reports (i.e. Belpaire *et al*., 2006; 2007; 2008; 2009; 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013), in the Belgian Eel Management Plan (EMP), in the first report submitted in line with Article 9 of the eel Regulation 1100/2007 (Vlietinck *et al*., 2012). This report should thus be read in conjunction with those documents.

Four international RBDs are partly lying on Belgian territory: the Scheldt (Schelde/Escaut), the Meuse (Maas/Meuse), the Rhine (Rijn/Rhin) and the Seine. For description of the river basins in Belgium see the 2006 Country Report (Belpaire *et al*., 2006). All RBDs are part of the North Sea ICES ecoregion.

In response to the Council Regulation CE 1100/2007, Belgium has provided a single Eel Management Plan (EMP), encompassing the two major river basin districts (RBD) present on its territory: the Scheldt and the Meuse RBD.

Given the fact that the Belgian territory is mostly covered by two internationals RBDs, namely the Scheldt and Meuse, the Belgian Eel Management Plan was prepared jointly by the three Regional entities, each respectively providing the overview, data and measures focusing on its larger RBDs. The Belgian EMP thus focuses on the Flemish, Brussels and Walloon portions of the Schelde/Escaut RBD, and the Walloon and Flemish portions of the Meuse/Maas RBD.

The Belgian EMP has been approved by the European Commission on January 5th, 2010.

The three Belgian authorities (Flanders, Wallonia or Brussels Regions) are responsible for the implementation and evaluation of the proposed EMP measures on their respective territory.

In the next years, all eel-related measures proposed in the Belgian EMP will be fine-tuned according to the existing WFD management plans and implemented in such manner by the responsible regional authorities.

The Belgian EMP focuses on:

For the Flemish region

- the ban of fyke fishing on the lower Scheldt in 2009;
- making up an inventory of the bottle necks for upstream eel migration (priority and timing for solving migration barriers).

Specific action in 2010–2014: In Flanders, 38 fish migration bottlenecks of high priority were identified. 90% has to be solved at the end of 2015 and the remaining part by 2021. Until mid-2013, eight of the 38 bottlenecks were remediated and for several of them remediations are planned. In addition, a number of bottlenecks of moderate priority were remediated. In 2013, a study was started at the sea sluices of Leopold Canal and Schipdonk Canal to optimize management of the sluices in order to allow glass eel migration.

For downward migration

Specific action in 2012–2014: In the fall of 2013 a research will start on the Albert Canal to estimate the damage and mortality causes by the combined pump/hydropower installations. Also downstreaming silvers eels will be equipped with transmitters in order to study their behaviour at the pump/hydropower installations and in order to determine to which amount they use the Albert Canal as downstream migration route.

Controlling poaching

Specific action in 2012–2014: actions have been focused and will be continued specifically on the Scheldt estuary, on the Nete catchment and in the polders. Illegal fishing equipment was seized.

Glass eel restocking programme

Specific action in 2012–2014: In Flanders 156 kg, 140 kg and 500 kg were stocked respectively in 2012, 2013 and 2014.

achieving WFD goals for water quality

Specific action in 2010–2015: Flanders continues to work to the development of water treatment infrastructure to achieve the good ecological status and ecological potential for the WFD.

Eel stock monitoring

Specific action in 2012–2014:

Glass eel: the monitoring of the glass eel recruitment at Nieuwpoort (River IJzer) has been continued in 2013 and 2014, and will be continued in upcoming years.

Yellow eel/silver eel: A new report (Stevens *et al*., 2013) discusses the methodology for calculating the escapement of silver eel in Flanders. The suitability of the new Monitoring Network Freshwater Fish for the European Eel Regulation reporting is discussed and recommendations are made to improve the methodology and validate the model results.

Eel quality monitoring

Specific action in 2012–2014: Flanders has contributed to the scientific work about the status and effects of hazardous substances on the eel (see abstracts under subchapter 11.3). Flanders continues to coordinate the Eel Quality Database (Belpaire *et al*., 2011b), for which a new application has been developed. A pilot programme to monitor eel and perch quality with respect to their levels of contaminants for reporting to the WFD has been finalised.

General status

The European eel is categorized as 'Critical Endangered' on the new Red List of Fishes in Flanders.

For the Walloon region

No updated information was made available by the Walloon region. We repeat here the information provided in the 2012 report.

- avoiding mortality at hydropower stations;
- sanitation of migration barriers on main waterways (especially in the Meuse catchment);
- Glass eel restocking programme.

No information was provided by the Walloon Region.

Controlling poaching

Specific action in 2010–2012: actions have been focused specifically on the river Meuse and in the canals during the night. Numerous illegal fishing equipment was seized.

In the coming years, Belgium will pursue with its neighbouring countries the development and implementation of cross boundary eel management plans. These coordination activities will take place within the International Scheldt Commission (ISC) and the International Meuse Commission (IMC).

In June 2012 Belgium submitted the first report in line with Article 9 of the eel Regulation 1100/2007. This report outline focuses on the monitoring, effectiveness and outcome of the Belgian Eel Management Plan.

2. Time-series data

2.1. Recruitment

2.1.1 Glass eel recruitment

2.1.1.1 Commercial

There are no commercial glass eel fisheries.

2.1.1.2 Recreational

There are no recreational glass eel fisheries.

2.1.1.3 Fishery independent

Glass eel recruitment at Nieuwpoort at the mouth of River Yser (Yser basin)

In Belgium, both commercial and recreational glass eel fisheries are forbidden by law. Fisheries on glass eel are carried out by the Flemish government. Former years, when recruitment was high, glass eels were used exclusively for restocking in inland waters in Flanders. Nowadays, the glass eel caught during this monitoring are returned to the river.

Long-term time-series on glass eel recruitment are available for the Nieuwpoort station at the mouth of the river Yser. Recently new initiatives have been started to monitor glass eel recruitment in the Scheldt basin (see below).

For extensive description of the glass eel fisheries on the river Yser see Belpaire (2002, 2006).

Figure 1 and Table 1 give the time-series of the total annual catches of the dipnet fisheries in the Nieuwpoort ship lock and give the maximum day catch per season. Since the last report the figure has been updated with data for 2014.

Fishing effort in 2006 was half of normal, with 130 dipnet hauls during only 13 fishing nights between March 3rd, and June 6th. Catches of the year 2006 were extremely low and close to zero. In fact only 65 g (or 265 individuals) were caught. Maximum day catch was 14 g. These catches are the lowest record since the start of the monitoring (1964).

In 2007 fishing effort was again normal, with 262 dipnet hauls during 18 fishing nights between February 22nd, and May 28th. Catches were relatively good (compared to former years 2001–2006) and amounted 2214 g (or 6466 individuals). Maximum day catch was 485 g. However this 2007 catch represents only 0.4% of the mean catch in the period 1966–1979 (mean = 511 kg per annum, min. 252–max. 946 kg).

In 2008 fishing effort was normal with 240 dipnet hauls over 17 fishing nights. Fishing was carried out between February 16th and May 2nd. Total captured biomass of glass eel amounted 964.5 g (or 3129 individuals), which represents 50% of the catches of 2007. Maximum day catch was 262 g.

In 2009 fishing effort was normal with 260 dipnet hauls over 20 fishing nights. The fishing was carried out between and February 20th and May 6th. Total captured biomass of glass eel amounted 969 g (or 2534 individuals), which is similar to the catches of 2008). Maximum day catch was 274 g.

In 2010 fishing effort was normal with 265 dipnet hauls over 19 fishing nights. The fishing was carried out between and February 26th and May 26th. Total captured biomass of glass eel amounted 318 g (or 840 individuals). Maximum day catch was 100 g. Both total captured biomass, and maximal day catch is about at one third of the quantities recorded in 2008 and 2009. Hence, glass eel recruitment at the Yser in 2010 was at very low level. The 2010 catch represents only 0.06% of the mean catch in the period 1966–1979 (mean = 511 kg per annum, min. 252–max. 946 kg).

In 2011 fishing effort was normal with 300 dipnet hauls over 20 fishing nights. The fishing was carried out between and February 16th and April 30th. Compared to 2010, the number of hauls was ca. 15% higher, but the fishing period stopped earlier, due to extremely low catches during April. Total captured biomass of glass eel amounted 412.7 g (or 1067 individuals). Maximum day catch was 67 g. Total captured biomass is similar as the very low catches in 2010. Maximal day catch is even lower than data for the four previous years (2007–2010). Overall, the quantity reported for the Yser station should be regarded as very low, comparable to the 2010 record. The 2011 catch represents only 0.08% of the mean catch in the period 1966–1979 (mean = 511 kg per annum, min. 252–max. 946 kg).

In 2012 fishing effort was higher than previous years with 425 dipnet hauls over 23 fishing nights. The fishing was carried out between and March 2nd and May 1st. Compared to 2010, the number of hauls was 42% higher. Total captured biomass of glass eel amounted 2407.7 g (or 7189 individuals). Maximum day catch was 350 g. Both, the total captured biomass and the maximum day catch are ca. six times higher than in 2010. Overall, the quantity reported in 2012 for the Yser station increased significantly compared to previous years and is similar to the 2007 catches. Still, the 2012 catch represents only 0.47% of the mean catch in the period 1966–1979 (mean = 511 kg per annum, min. 252–max. 946 kg).

In 2013 fishing effort included 410 dipnet hauls over 23 fishing nights. The fishing was carried out between 20 February and 6 May. Total captured biomass of glass eel amounted 2578.7 g (or 7368 individuals). Maximum day catch was 686 g. So compared to 2012, similar fishing effort (number of hauls), and similar year catches, but higher maximum day catch.

In 2014 fishing effort included 460 dipnet hauls over 23 fishing nights. The fishing was carried out between 24 February and 25 April. Total captured biomass of glass eel amounted 6717 g (or 17 815 individuals). Maximum day catch was 770 g. So compared to 2013, same number of fishing nights, but 12% more hauls (increased fishing effort in number of hauls), and a 2.6 fold increase of the total year catches. Maximum day catch increased with 12% compared to the 2013 value.

See below under 7.1 for cpue data for the period 2002–2014.



Figure 1 and Table 1. Annual variation in glass eel catches at river Yser using the dipnet catches in the ship lock at Nieuwpoort (total year catches and maximum day catch per season). Figure 1A represents the data for the period 1964–2014; Figure 1b shows the data for the period 2000–2014.

In Table 1 the presented data are the total year catches between 1964 and 2014. Data Provincial Fisheries Commission West-Vlaanderen.

Decade						
Year	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010
0		795	252	218.2	17.85	0.318
1		399	90	13	0.7	0.413
2		556.5	129	18.9	1.4	2.408
3		354	25	11.8	0.539	2.579
4	3.7	946	6	17.5	0.381	6.717
5	115	274	15	1.5	0.787	
6	385	496	27.5	4.5	0.065	
7	575	472	36.5	9.8	2.214	
8	553.5	370	48.2	2.255	0.964	
9	445	530	9.1		0.969	

Other glass eel recruitment studies

The glass eel recruitment-series for the Schelde estuary which was reported in the 2011 Country Report (See Belpaire *et al*., 2011) for the period 2004–2011 has been stopped.

2.1.2 Yellow eel recruitment

2.1.2.1 Commercial

There is no commercial fishery for yellow eel in inland waters in Belgium. Commercial fisheries for yellow eel in coastal waters or the sea are negligibly small.

2.1.2.2 Recreational

No data available.

2.1.2.3 Fishery independent

On the Meuse, the University of Liège is monitoring the amount of ascending young eels in a fish-pass. From 1992 to 2014 upstream migrating eels were collected in a trap (0.5 cm mesh size) installed at the top of a small pool-type fish-pass at the Visé-Lixhe dam (built in 1980 for navigation purposes and hydropower generation; height: 8.2 m; not equipped with a ship-lock) on the international River Meuse near the Dutch–Belgium border (290 km from the North Sea; width: 200 m; mean annual discharge: 238 m^3 s^{-1}; summer water temperature 21–26°C). The trap in the fish-pass is checked continuously (three times a week) over the migration period from March to September each year, except in 1994. A total number of 37302 eels was caught (biomass 2445 kg) with a size from 14 cm (1992 and 2001) to 88 cm (2012) and an increasing median value of 28.5 cm (1992) to 40 cm (2012) corresponding to yellow eels. The study based on a constant year-to-year sampling effort revealed a regular decrease of the annual catch from a maximum of 5613 fish in 1992 to minimum values of 423–758 in 2004–2007) (Figure 2, Table 2). In 2008 2625 eels were caught. This sudden increase might be explained by the fact that a new fish pass was opened (20/12/2007) at the weir of Borgharen-Maastricht, which enabled passage of eels situated downward the weir in the uncanalized Grensmaas. Nevertheless the number of eels were very low again in 2009 (n=584) and 2010 (n = 249). The figure for 2011 (n=208) is the lowest ever recorded since the start of the controls (1992, n = 5613). The figure for 2012 (n= 317) is a bit more than the two previous years. In 2013, 265 eels were caught (size range 19.6–76.5 cm, median 39.1 cm),

the data for 2014 (incomplete data, situation September 2014) are similar with 255 individuals. The decreasing trend in the recruitment of young eels in this part of the Meuse was particularly marked from 2004 onwards. The University of Liège (Ovidio *et al.*, 2012) is continuing a research program financed by EFF-EU to follow the upstream migration of yellow eels at Lixhe and to analyse the historical trends. Since 2011, every individual yellow eel is pit-tagged and its upstream migration has been followed along detection stations placed at fish-passes located upstream in the Meuse and in the lower course of the river Ourthe (main tributary of River Meuse). A preliminary report has been published (Nzau Matondo *et al.*, 2014). Note that some small changes have been made to the figure as presented in last years' reports.



Figure 2. Variation in the number of ascending young yellow eels trapped at the fish trap of the Visé-Lixhe dam between 1992 and 2014. Data from University of Liège (J.C. Philippart) in Philippart and Rimbaud (2005), Philippart (2006) and Ovidio (pers. comm. 2014). * Data for 2014 are incomplete (situation 1/9/2014).

Table 2 Variation in the number of ascending young yellow eels trapped at the fish trap of the Visé-Lixhe dam between 1992 and 2013. Data from University of Liège (J.C. Philippart) in Philippart and Rimbaud (2005), Philippart (2006) and Ovidio (pers. comm., 2014). * Data for 2014 are incomplete (situation 1/9/2014).

Decade			
Year	1990	2000	2010
0		3365	249
1		2915	208
2	5613	1790	324
3		1842	265
4		423	255*
5	4240	758	
6		575	
7	2709	731	
8	3061	2625	
9	4664	584	

2.2 Yellow eel landings

2.2.1 Commercial

No time-series available. Currently there is no commercial yellow eel fisheries.

2.2.2 Recreational

No time-series available.

Based on an inquiry by the Agency for Nature and Forest in public waters in Flanders in 2008, recreational anglers harvest on a yearly basis 33,6 tons of eel (Vlietinck, 2010). In 2010 a small restriction of eel fishing was aimed by a new regulation (Besluit van de Vlaamse Regering 5/3/2010). Between April 16th and May 31th, and during the night, eels may not be taken home. This results in a roughly estimate of 10% reduction of eel harvest. Hence estimates for 2010 and later are an annual eel harvest of 30 tons (Vlietinck, pers. comm.). There is no distinction between the catch of yellow eel and silver eel, but due to the specific behaviour of silver eel, it is considered that these catches are mainly composed of yellow eel.

Only eels above the size limit of 30 cm are allowed to be taken home. In 2013 a new legislation on river fisheries went into force (Agentschap voor Natuur en Bos, 2013). The total number of fish (all species, including eel) which an angler is allowed to take with him on a fishing occasion is now limited to five. There is no indication to what extent this will have an impact on the total recreational biomass of eel retrieved by recreational fisheries.

2.3 Silver eel landings

2.3.1 Commercial

There is no commercial fishery for silver eel in inland waters in Belgium. Commercial fisheries for silver eel in coastal waters or the sea are negligibly small.

2.3.2 Recreational

No time-series available. Due to the specific behaviour of silver eel catches of silver eel by recreational anglers are considered low.

2.4 Aquaculture production

There is no aquaculture production of eel in Belgium.

2.4.1 Seed supply

2.4.2 Production

2.5 Stocking

2.5.1 Amount stocked

Stocking in Flanders

Glass eel and young yellow eels were used for restocking inland waters by governmental fish stock managers. The origin of the glass eel used for restocking from 1964 onwards was the glass eel catching station at Nieuwpoort on river Yser. However, due to the low catches after 1980 and the shortage of glass eel from local origin, foreign glass eel was imported mostly from UK or France.

Also young yellow eels were restocked; the origin was mainly the Netherlands. Restocking with yellow eels was stopped after 2000 when it became evident that also yellow eels used for restocking contained high levels of contaminants (Belpaire and Coussement, 2000). So only glass eel is stocked from 2000 on (Figure 3). Glass eel restocking is proposed as a management measure in the EMP for Flanders.

In some years the glass eel restocking could not be done each year due to the high market prices. Only in 2003 and 2006 respectively 108 and 110 kg of glass eel was stocked in Flanders (Figure 3 and Table 3). In 2008 117 kg of glass eel from U.K. origin (rivers Parrett, Taw and Severn) was stocked in Flemish waterbodies. In 2009 152 kg of glass eel originating from France (Gironde) was stocked in Flanders. In 2010 (April 20th, 2010) 143 kg has been stocked in Flanders. The glass eel was originating from France (area 20–50 km south of Saint-Nazaire, small rivers nearby the villages of Pornic, Le Collet and Bouin). A certificate of veterinary control and a CITES certificate were delivered.

In 2011 (21 April 2011) 120 kg has been stocked in Flemish waters. The glass eel was originating from France (Bretagne and Honfleur). A certificate of veterinary control and a CITES certificate were delivered.

In 2012 156 kg has been stocked in Flemish waters. The glass eel was supplied from the Netherlands but was originating from France.

In 2013 140 kg has been stocked in Flemish waters. The glass eel was supplied via a French company (SAS Anguilla, Charron, France).

In 2014 the lower market price allowed a higher quantity of glass eel to be stocked. 500 kg has been stocked in Flemish waters. The glass eel was supplied via a French company (Aguirrebarrena, France).

The cost of the glass eel per kg (including transport but without taxes) is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Prices of restocked glass eel in Belgium (2008–2014).

Year	Cost (€/kg)
2008	510
2009	425
2010	453
2011	470 (Flanders) 520 (Wallonia)
2012	416 (Flanders) 399 (Wallonia)
2013	460 (Flanders) 400 (Wallonia)
2014	128 (Flanders) ??(Wallonia)*

***No information was provided by the Walloon region about the glass eel stocking in Wallonia in 2014.**

Glass eel restocking activities in Flanders are not taking account of the variation in eel quality of the restocking sites.



Figure 3 and Table 3. Restocking of glass eel in Belgium (Flanders and Wallonia) since 1994, in kg of glass eel. Flanders is represented in red and Wallonia in blue in the figure. * left Flanders/right Wallonia.

Decade	1980	1990	2000	2010
Year				
0			0	143
1			54	120/40*
2			0	156/50*
3			108	140/4*
4		175	0	500/?**
5		157,5	0	
6		169	110	
7		144	0	
8		0	117	
9		251,5	152	

****No information was provided by the Walloon region about the glass eel stocking in Wallonia in 2014.**

Stocking in Wallonia

In Wallonia, glass eel restocking was initiated in 2011, in the framework of the Belgian EMP. In March 2011 40 kg of glass eel was restocked in Walloon rivers and lakes, in 2012 the amount stocked was 50 kg.

In 2013, for financial reasons no stocking was carried out in Wallonia, except for some restocking in three small rivers in the context of a research program led by the University of Liège. This research program is financed by EFF (project code 32-1102-002) to test the efficiency of glass eel restocking in waterbodies of diverse typology. In May 2013 in total 4 kg of glass eel was stocked (1,5 kg in La Burdinale, 1,5 kg in d'Oxhe and 1 kg in Mosbeux). (price per kg was 400 Euros). The origin of these glass eels was UK

glass eels Ldt, UK Survival, dispersion, habitat and growth will be followed from September on, to assess to what extent glass eel stocking is a valuable management measure to restore Walloon eel stocks.

See under for more details on this restocking survey.

More information on stocking details for Wallonia is presented in Table 4 (Cost of the glass eel) and Table 5 (origin). No information was provided by the Walloon region about the glasseel stocking in Wallonia in 2014.

2.5.2 Catch of eel <12 cm and proportion retained for restocking

There are no glass eel fisheries in Belgium. As the glass eel caught for monitoring purposes by the Flemish authorities at the sluices at the mouth of River Yzer is so low, these glass eel are released directly above the sluices.

2.5.3 Reconstructed time-series on stocking

Stocking in Flanders

Table 5. Source and size of eel restocked in Flanders between 1994 and 2014.

	Local Source				Foreign Source			
Year	Glass Eel	Quarantined Glass Eel	Wild Bootlace	On-grown cultured	Glass Eel	Quarantined Glass Eel	Wild Bootlace	On-grown cultured
1994					175		5394	
1995					157,5		4880	
1996					169		4168	
1997					144		5517	
1998					0		5953	
1999					251,5		5208	
2000					0		4283	
2001					54			
2002					0			
2003					108			
2004					0			
2005					0			
2006					110			
2007					0			
2008					117			
2009					152			
2010					143			
2011					120			
2012					156			
2013					140			
2014					500			

Stocking in Wallonia

Table 5. Source and size of eel restocked in Wallonia between 1994 and 2014.

Information to update this table has not been provided by the Walloon region.

	Local Source				Foreign Source			
Year	Glass Eel	Quarantined Glass Eel	Wild Bootlace	On-grown cultured	Glass Eel	Quarantined Glass Eel	Wild Bootlace	On-grown cultured
1994								
1995								
1996								
1997								
1998								
1999								
2000								
2001								
2002								
2003								
2004								
2005								
2006								
2007								
2008								
2009								
2010								
2011					40			
2012					50			
2013					4			
2014					?*			

***No information was provided by the Walloon region about the glass eel stocking in Wallonia in 2014.**

All glass eel used for the Flemish and Walloon restocking programmes are purchased from foreign sources (usually UK or France). There are no quarantine procedures. Nowadays, no bootlace eels, nor ongrown cultured eels are restocked.

Table 5. Origin and amounts of glass eel restocked in Belgium (Flanders and Wallonia) between 2008 and 2013.

Year	Region	Origin	Amount (kg)
2008	Flanders	UK	125
2009	Flanders	France	152
2010	Flanders	France	143
2011	Wallonia	UK	40
2011	Flanders	France	120
2012	Flanders	France	156
2012	Wallonia	France	50
2013	Flanders	France	140
2013	Wallonia	UK	4
2013	Flanders	France	500
2013	Wallonia*	?	?

***No information was provided by the Walloon region about the glass eel stocking in Wallonia in 2014.**

2.6 Trade in eel

Information on the trade of the eel in Belgium is currently not available, but will be integrated in next year's report.

3 Fishing capacity

3.1 Glass eel

Commercial nor recreational fishery for glass eels is allowed in Belgium.

3.2 Yellow eel

Professional coastal and sea fisheries

Marine eel catches through professional and coastal fisheries are negligible.

Estuarine fisheries on the Scheldt

The trawl fisheries on the Scheldt was focused on eel, but since 2006 boat fishing has been prohibited, and only fyke fishing was permitted until 2009. Since 2009 no more licences are issued, which is as a measure of the Eel Management Plan of Flanders to reduce catches. In 2010 a Decree (Besluit van de Vlaamse Regering van 5 maart 2010) was issued to regulate the prohibition of fyke fishing in the lower Seascheldt.

For a figure of the time-series of the number of licensed semi-professional fishermen on the Scheldt from 1992 to 2009 (Data Agency for Nature and Forests) we refer to Belpaire *et al*., 2011 (Belgian Eel Country Report 2011).

Recreational fisheries in the Flemish region

The number of licensed anglers was 60 520 in 2004, 58 347 in 2005, 56 789 in 2006, 61 043 in 2007, 58 788 in 2008, 60 956 in 2009, 58 338 in 2010, 61 519 in 2011, 62 574 in 2012 and 64 643 in 2013. The time-series shows a general decreasing trend from 1983 (Figure 6). However in 2007 there was again an increase in the number of Flemish anglers (+7.5% compared to 2006). From an inquiry of the Agency for Nature and Forests in 2008 among 10 000 recreational anglers (36% feedback) it appeared that ca. 7% fishes for eel.



Figure 4. Time-series of the number of licensed anglers in Flanders (above) and Wallonia (below) since 1980 and 1995 respectively (Data Agency for Nature and Forests and Nature and Forestry Division (DNF) of the Walloon Environment and Natural Resources DG (DGRNE). 2012 and later data not updated for Walloon region.

Recreational fisheries in the Walloon Region

Although in constant decline since the nineties, fishermen are still a well-represented community in the Walloon region. The number of licensed anglers was 65 687 in 2004, 63 145 in 2005, 59 490 in 2006, and 60 404 in 2007. Since then, numbers have decreased with 56 864 in 2008, 59 714 in 2009, 54 636 in 2010 and 55 592 in 2011 (Figure 4). The data for 2012 and later were not updated for the Walloon region.

Recreational fisheries in the Brussels capital

The number of licensed anglers is approximately 1400 (Data Brussels Institute for Management of the Environment).

3.3 Silver eel

See Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2.

3.4 Marine fishery

Marine eel catches through professional and coastal fisheries are negligible.

4 Fishing effort

4.1 Glass eel

There is no professional or recreational fisheries on glass eel.

4.2 Yellow eel

See Section 4.2 for the number of recreational fishermen and the proportion of eel fishermen.

4.3 Silver eel

There are no professional or recreational fisheries on silver eel.

4.4 Marine fishery

Marine fisheries on eel are not documented and are assumed to be negligible.

5 Catches and landings

5.1 Glass eel

Commercial nor recreational fishery for glass eels is allowed in Belgium.

5.2 Yellow eel

Catches and landings–estuarine fyke fisheries on river Scheldt

Fyke fishing for eel on the lower Scheldt estuary is prohibited now. Since 2009 no more licences for fyke fisheries on the river Scheldt are issued, which is as a measure of the Eel Management Plan of Flanders to reduce fishing capacity. Before 2009 annual catches of eel by semi-professional fyke fishermen was estimated between 2.8 and 12.4 tons. This is thus reduced to zero in 2009 and later.

Catches and landings–recreational fisheries in Flanders

Based on an inquiry by the Agency for Nature and Forest in public waters in Flanders in 2008, recreational anglers harvest on a yearly basis 33,6 tons of eel (Vlietinck, 2010). This figure holds for 2009 too (Vlietinck, pers. comm.). In 2010 a small restriction of eel fishing was aimed by a new regulation (Besluit van de Vlaamse Regering 5/3/2010). Between April 16th and May 31th, and during the night, eels may not be taken home. This results in a roughly estimate of 10% reduction of eel harvest. Hence estimate for 2010, 2011 and 2012 is an annual eel harvest of 30 tons (Vlietinck, pers. comm.). There is no distinction between the catch of yellow eel and silver eel, but due to the specific behaviour of silver eel, it is considered that these catches are mainly composed of yellow eel.

Other earlier estimates were 121 tonnes per annum and 43 tonnes per annum (Belpaire *et al.*, 2008).

In 2000 a catch and release obligation for the recreational fishing of eel was issued due to high contaminant concentrations, however this law was abolished in 2006. This resulted in an increase in yield of yellow eel by recreational fisheries from nihil to the actual 30 tons.

It is worth mentioning that based on the 2008 inquiry in a population of recreational anglers (Vlietinck, 2010), the majority (77%) of anglers are in favour of a restriction in the fishing or the harvest of eel (in the framework of the protection of the eel). 27% of the respondents are in favour of (among other options) the obligatory release of caught eel as management option (Figure 5).



Figure 5. Results of a 2008 inquiry among 10 000 Flemish recreational anglers for their preference in management options for restoring the eel stock. 36% (N = 3627 anglers) responded (Vlietinck, 2010).

Only eels above the size limit of 30 cm are allowed to be taken home.

In 2013 a new legislation on river fisheries went into force (Agentschap voor Natuur en Bos, 2013). The total number of fish (all species, including eel) which an angler is allowed to take with him on a fishing occasion is now limited to five. There is no indication to what extent this will have an impact on the total recreational biomass of eel retrieved by recreational fisheries.

Currently (2014), in Flanders the eel is classified as "Critically Endangered" in the new Flemish Red List of Freshwater Fishes and Lampreys (Verreycken *et al*., 2014). It is not known if in the future this will have some implications on further restrictions on fishing and taking home eel by recreational fishermen.

Catches and landings–recreational fisheries in Wallonia

No new data available for recreational fisheries in the Walloon Region. See Belpaire *et al*. (2008) for an overview. In the Walloon region, fishing of eels is prohibited since 2006 (Walloon Government, 2006). By modification of the 1954 law on fishing activities, there is an obligation to release captured eels whatever their length. So from 2006 on, recreational catches of eel in Wallonia should be zero.

Recreational fisheries in Brussels capital

No information on eel catches.

5.3 Silver eel

There are no professional or recreational fisheries on silver eel.

5.4 Marine fishery

Marine fisheries on eel are negligible and not documented.

5.5 Recreational fishery

See under 6.2 and 7.2 for the information available on recreational fisheries.

No further data available.

Recreational Fisheries: Retained and Released Catches.

	Retained				Released			
	Inland		Marine		Inland		Marine	
Year	Angling	Passive Gears	Angling	Passive gears	Angling	Passive gears	Angling	Passive gears

Provide the catch and release mortality (%) used in your country for angling in marine and inland waters.

Recreational Fisheries: Catch and Release Mortality.

	Released			
	Inland		Marine	
	Angling	Passive gears	Angling	Passive gears
Year				

5.6 Bycatch, underreporting, illegal activities

Bycatch through exploitation of marine fish stocks is not reported and is considered low.

From time to time illegal activities have been observed. Fishing using illegal gears, and illegal selling of catches might be the illegal activities with most impact on the eel stock. Quantitative information is not available.

Table 6-x. Estimation of underreported catches in Country, per EMU and Stage.

		Glass eel				Yellow eel				Silver Eel				Combined (Y + S)			
Year	EMU_code	Reported catches (kg)	Underrept. %	Underrept. (kg)	Total catches (kg)	Reported catches (kg)	Underrept. %	Underrept. (kg)	Total catches (kg)	Reported catches (kg)	Underrept. %	Underrept. (kg)	Total catches (kg)	Reported catches (kg)	Underrept. %	Underrept. (kg)	Total catches (kg)
2013	EMU_a																
	EMU_b																
	EMU_c																
	EMU_d																
	EMU_e																
	EMU_f																
	Total/mean (%)																

AIM: Determine the % of the underreporting and the total catches of the Country per stage.

NOTE: Please indicate in the text whether the percentage underreported catch is a direct measurement or a guess using the estimate to calculate the underreported kgs and Total catches.

Table 6-y. Existence of illegal activities, its causes and the seizures quantity they have caused.

		Glass eel			Yellow eel			Silver Eel			Combined (Y +S)		
Year	EMU	Y/N/?	Cause	Seizures (kg)	Y/N/?	Seizures (kg)	Cause	Y/N/?	Seizures (kg)	Cause	Y/N/?	Seizures (kg)	Cause
2013	EMU_a												
	EMU_b												
	EMU_c												
	EMU_d												
	EMU_e												
	EMU_f												

AIM: Identify the illegal fishing activities and in case it is possible its causes and the seized kgs in case they were seizures.

NOTES:

-Y/N/?:

- Y: you know for sure they have been illegal activities;
- N: illegal activities are considered negligible / not significant;
- ?: You do not know whether they have been illegal activities or not.

-Cause: One of the followings:

- Fishing out of the season;
- Fishing without licence;
- Fishing using illegal gears;
- Retention of eel below or above any size limit;
- Illegal selling of catches.

6 Catch per unit of effort

6.1 Glass eel

Commercial nor recreational fishery for glass eels is allowed in Belgium.

There is some information available on the cpue trend in the governmental glass eel monitoring at Nieuwpoort (River Yzer) (Table 6).

Table 6. Temporal trend in catch per unit of effort for the governmental glass eel monitoring by dipnet hauls at the sluices in Nieuwpoort (River Yzer, 2002–2014). Cpue values are expressed as Kg glass eel caught per fishing day with catch and as Kg glass eel per haul.

Year	Total year catch	Max daycatch	Total year catch/Number of fishing days with catch (Kg/day)	Total year catch/Number of hauls per season (Kg/haul)
2002	1,4	0,46	0,140	0,0081
2003	0,539	0,179	0,034	0,0040
2004	0,381	0,144	0,042	0,0029
2005	0,787	0,209	0,056	0,0044
2006	0,065	0,014	0,006	0,0005
2007	2,214	0,485	0,130	0,0085
2008	0,964	0,262	0,060	0,0040
2009	0,969	0,274	0,057	0,0037
2010	0,318	0,1	0,017	0,0012
2011	0,412	0,067	0,021	0,0014
2012	2,407	0,35	0,105	0,0057
2013	2.578	0.686	0.112	0.0063
2014	6.717	0.770	0.292	0.0146

6.2 Yellow eel

There are only rough estimates about the catches of eel by recreational fishing. These data are based on an inquiry (N=3627 responses) by the Agency for Nature and Forest in public waters in Flanders in 2008 (Vlietinck, 2010). At that time recreational anglers harvest on a yearly basis 33,6 tons of eel. 6.6% of the recreational fishermen (N=58 788) are eel fishermen. So 3880 eel fishermen are catching 33.6 tons, or an average eel fishermen is fishing 8.7 kg eel per year.

6.3 Silver eel

There are no professional or recreational fisheries on silver eel.

6.4 Marine fishery

Marine fisheries on eel are negligible and not documented.

7 Other anthropogenic and environmental impacts

In Belgium, the eel stock is considerably impacted by an overall poor water quality (especially for Flanders), and by a multitude of migration barriers (draining pumps, sea sluices, dams, weirs, impingement by power stations and hydropower units).

Water quality

Improvement of water quality by installing purification units is an on-going process (within the objectives of the Water Framework Directive). As an example the installation of an important purification unit in 2007 on the River Senne (north of Brussels) purifying the waste waters of the capital, has led to an impressive increase in the eel population in river Senne and Rupel during 2008 and 2009. Due to a temporary closure of the water treatment plant (for technical reasons) at the end of 2009 all eels disappeared, subsequent monitoring showed that the eel population restored approximately six months after restart of the plant.

Restoring migration possibilities

On April 26, 1996, the Benelux Decision about free fish migration was adopted. The Decision sets that the Member States should guarantee free fish migration in all hydrographic basins before January 1, 2010. Recently, the 1996 Benelux decision has been evaluated. The general conclusion is that a lot of barriers have been removed, but also that the timing is not achievable and that the focus should be on the most important watercourses. On June 16, 2009 a new Benelux Decision (Benelux, 2009) was approved. According to this new Decision, Member States commit themselves to draw up a map indicating the most important watercourses for fish migration. Hereto, the Research Institute for Nature and Forest (INBO) drew up a proposal for this prioritization map based on ecological criteria (Figure 6).

The proposal for the new prioritization map accounts for both the distribution of EU Habitat Directive species and the recommendations of the eel management plan. In addition, the Benelux Decision allows accounting for regionally important fishes. Therefore, we also accounted for the distribution of the rheophilic species for which Flanders has developed a restoration program (dace, chub and burbot).

The total length of the prioritization network of Flemish water courses is 3237 km (almost 15% of the total length of the watercourses in Flanders). Besides the barriers on the selected watercourses, also pumping stations and hydro turbines on unselected water courses should be taken into account. Depending on their location and functioning, pumping stations and hydro turbines may have a significant impact on the survival of downstream migrating fish and eel in particular. The results of a survey of pumping stations in Flanders will be used to draw up a list of the most harmful pumping stations. This list will then be added to the prioritization map.

The prioritization map gives an overview of the water courses that should be barrier-free in order to preserve the populations of the target species. Hereto a distinction is made between obstacles of first and second priority. Obstacles of first priority are those

located on the main rivers of the major river basins (Scheldt and Meuse). 90% of these barriers should be eliminated by 2015, the remaining 10% by 2021. In Flanders, the highest priority is given to the obstacles on the River Scheldt and to the obstacles that should be removed first according to the eel management plan. The remaining obstacles on the water courses of the prioritization map are assigned to the second priority. These obstacles will be divided into three groups. 50% of these should be removed before December 31, 2015. 75% should be removed before December 31, 2021 and 100% by December 31, 2027.

Additionally, water courses of special attention were selected. These are water courses that have important fish habitat, but where the removal of migration barriers is not a priority. These water courses are important for the restoration of the eel stock, have an ecologically valuable structure or are located in a sub-basin where Habitat Directive species occur. They are not part of the prioritization map and have no timing for the removal of existing migration barriers. However, downstream migration should be guaranteed in these water courses and if an opportunity arises, the existing fish migration barriers should be removed.



Figure 6. Fish migration prioritization network of Flemish water courses (blue) and water courses of special attention (grey) following the Benelux Decision "Free migration of fish" M(2009)1.

An update of the anthropogenic impacts has recently been made in the framework of the report of the evaluation of the Belgian EMP (Vlietinck *et al.*, 2012). We refer to this document for a more complete description of the anthropogenic impacts on the stock.

In summary following management measures are foreseen:

Table 7. Status of measures of habitat restoration as reported in the evaluation of the Belgian EMP (Vlietinck *et al.*, 2012).

Measures	region	status	timing
Resolving migration barriers for upstream migration	Flanders	In progress	2027
Resolving migration barriers for upstream migration	Wallonia	In progress	2027
Measures to protect eels from impingment (by industries using cooling water) during their downward migration.	Wallonia	In progress	To be defined

Measures to protect eels from hydropower installations during their downward migration.	Wallonia	In progress	To be defined
Measures to protect eels from hydroturbines and pumping stations during their downward migration.	Flanders	In progress	To be defined
Measures to attain good ecological status or good ecological potential of water bodies.	Belgium	In progress	2027
Measures for sanitation of polluted sediments	Flanders	To be started	To be defined
	Wallonia	In progress	To be defined

Although numerous pumping stations have been used by water managers for numerous applications on rivers, canals and other waterbodies, their impact on fish populations is poorly understood. Buysse *et al*. (2014) investigated European eel mortality after natural downstream passage through a propeller pump and two Archimedes screw pumps at two pumping stations on two lowland canals in Belgium. Fykenets were mounted permanently on the outflow of the pumps during the silver eel migration periods. Based on the condition and injuries, maximum eel mortality rates were assessed. Mortality rates ranged from 97 ± 5% for the propeller pump to 17 ± 7% for the large Archimedes screw pump and 19 ± 11% for the small Archimedes screw pump. Most injuries were caused by striking or grinding. The results demonstrate that pumping stations may significantly threaten escapement targets set in eel management plans (Buysse *et al*., 2014).

Research in progress into the possibilities for glass eel migration to the Diversion Canal of the Leie (DCL) and the Leopold Canal (LC) in Zeebrugge

Previous research conducted by INBO (commissioned by W&Z) near the Ganzepoot in Nieuwpoort and the Sas Slijkens in Ostend showed that reverse drain management significantly increases the upstream migration of glass eels from the sea to fresh water. Hence this study investigated the applicability of this reverse drain management on another fresh water/sea transition of the Diversion Canal of the Leie and that of the Leopold Canal in Zeebrugge. These two canals with a sharp salt/fresh water transition are two potentially important land inwards routes for glass eels in Flanders.

We looked at how many glass eels migrated upstream in the LC by applying the reverse lock management. In this study the arriving glass eels were quantified when doors were 'slightly opened'. Quantification was done by sampling at one of the LC lock slides with a glass eel net which is inserted into the groove of the lock orifice.

The goal of this research was also to assess whether the measures taken are efficient, i.e. do the glass eels that enter via reversed drain management grow and spread in the LC?

Therefore, we examined whether the glass eels that were admitted by modified drain management also lead to a significant increase in the eel population. In a relatively well-sealed trajectory of the LC between the lock slide in Zeebrugge and the weir in St Laureins, eels will be sampled in at least two consecutive years with different methods (electrofishing, fykenetting). This study should provide an answer to the following research question: Is there a significant increase in eel density in the LC between Zeebrugge and St Laureins by applying the reverse lock management?

9 Scientific surveys of the stock

9.1 Glass eel

See Section 3.1.1.3 Glass eel recruitment at Nieuwpoort at the mouth of River Yser (Yser basin).

Evaluation of the efficiency of the glass eel restoking and dispersal and habitat use of glass eel

The University of Liege is carrying out a research project on the efficiency of restocking glass eel in three small rivers of Wallonia, affluents of rivers Méhaigne, Meuse and Vesdre, in order to increase our knowledge about the potential of restocking programmes in the framework of the international eel management. Preliminary results are reported by Tarrago-Bes (2014).

9.2 Yellow eel

Fish stock monitoring network in Flanders

Since 1994, INBO runs a freshwater fish monitoring network consisting of ca. 1500 stations in Flanders. These stations are subject to fish assemblage surveys on regular basis (on average every two to four years depending of the typology of the station). This network includes all water types, head streams as well as tributaries (stream width ranging from 0.5 m to 40 m), canals, disconnected river meanders, water retaining basins, ponds and lakes, in all of the three major basins in Flanders (Yser, Scheldt and Meuse). Techniques used for analysing fish stocks are standardized as much as possible, but can vary with water types. In general electrofishing was used, sometimes completed with additional techniques, mostly fyke fishing. All fish are identified, counted and at each station 200 specimens of each species were individually weighed and total length was measured. As much as possible biomass (kg/ha) and density (individuals/ha) is calculated. Other data available are number (and weight) of eels per 100 m electrofished river bank length or number (and weight) of eels per fyke per day. The data for this fish monitoring network are available via the website http://vis.milieu-info.be/.

This fish monitoring network is now been further developed to cope with the guidelines of the Water Framework Directive.

A temporal trend analysis has been performed based on a dataset including fish stock assessments on locations assessed during the periods 1994–2000, 2001–2005 and 2006–2009. 334 locations were assessed in those three periods (30 on canals and 304 on rivers). These results have been reported in the 2011 Country Report; see Belpaire *et al*. (2011) for further details.

In 2012–2013 a new data-analysis has been carried out for the most recent period, in the framework of updating the Red List status of Flanders' fresh water fishes. In the new Flemish Red List of Freshwater Fishes and Lampreys (Verreycken *et al*., 2014), eel was placed in the Critically Endangered category. The number of eel individuals, steeply decreased with 75% between the periods 1996–2003 and 2004–2011 and this despite the yearly restocking with glass eel.

Reporting for the Eel Regulation and the Fish stock monitoring network in Flanders

According to the EU Eel Regulation, each Member State has to report every three years on the progress of the implementation of the eel management plans. One of the things

that need to be reported is the effective escapement of silver eels to sea. Both the calculations for the eel management plan and the first interim report are based on data on yellow eel abundances collected by the Flemish Fish Monitoring Network Freshwater. However, the current Monitoring Network for Freshwater Fish was evaluated and merged into a new monitoring network for the Water Framework Directive (Stevens *et al*., 2013). This report discusses the methodology for calculating the escapement of silver eel in Flanders. The suitability of the new Monitoring Network Freshwater Fish for the European Eel Regulation reporting is discussed and recommendations are made to improve the methodology and validate the model results.

It was concluded that the new Monitoring Network Freshwater Fish covers satisfactorily the watercourses of the eel management plan and is suitable for reporting on the distribution of eel in Flanders. However, the number of sampling points in the new monitoring network is strongly reduced. As a result, the estimators for the calculation of the density of yellow eel will be based on a limited number of measurements, resulting in a lower reliability of these estimators. The new monitoring network can be used to calculate estimators per basin and per stratum (instead of current classification per basin and typology). This limits the number of combinations and avoids the double spatial component for the small streams in the ecological typology. Possibly a number of combinations can be grouped to increase the number of points per estimator. An analysis of the data from the Monitoring Network Freshwater Fish is necessary to determine which classification of watercourses is best suited to determine these estimators.

Large rivers, canals and estuaries represent a significant portion of the surface area of watercourses in the eel management plan. However, electric fishing is less efficient or impossible (brackish waters) in these watercourses, as a result of which the density estimators are less reliable. Therefore a method should be developed to improve the density estimators for these watercourses and for the Scheldt estuary in particular.

The methodology for calculating the escapement of silver eel is sufficiently suitable for reporting to Europe (see Stevens *et al*., 2009). However, the method and model parameters need to be refined to reduce the uncertainty in the model output and the results of the model should be validated with real data on the escapement of silver eels.

The report suggests two approaches:

- First, desk studies can be used (1) to improve the calculations of eel mortality and (2) to refine the classification of the freshwater eel habitat (analysis of the habitat and fish data from the Monitoring Network Freshwater Fish). In addition, the habitat analysis is also important to underpin the conversion of eel cpue to eel density.

- On the other hand, field studies are necessary to calibrate the conversion of eel cpue to eel density, to improve the model parameters and to validate the model results.

Finally, supporting research can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of measures in the management plan and to improve the model (e.g. research on the impact of eel quality and on the contribution of the Scheldt estuary in the production and migration of silver eels in Flanders) (Stevens *et al*., 2013).

River Scheldt fish monitoring at the power station of Doel

Between 1991 and 2012, INBO has been following the numbers of impinged fish at the nuclear power station of Doel on the Lower Scheldt. We refer to the 2012 Country Report (Belpaire *et al*., 2012) for a presentation of results and trends. Unfortunately, due to a shortness of means this monitoring series has been stopped in 2012.

Estuarine fish monitoring by fykes

A fish monitoring network has been put in place to monitor fish stock in the Scheldt estuary using paired fykenets. Campaigns take place in spring and autumn. At each site, two paired fykenets were positioned at low tide and emptied daily; they were placed for two successive days. Data from each survey per site were standardized as number of fish per fyke per day. Figure 8 gives the time trend of eel catches in four locations along the Scheldt (Zandvliet, Antwerpen, Steendorp and Kastel). In the mesohaline zone (Zandvliet) catches are generally low. This could be due to the applied methodology. However, a decline is apparent as no eel was caught in Zandvliet since 2007 (except for fall 2013). Catches in 2012 were very low, but at the more upstream sites in 2013 and 2014 catches are increasing towards normal levels (Data Jan Breine, INBO).


Zandvliet
Mean number of eels per fyke per day
14
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
1995
1997
1998
1999
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
Spring
Fall


Antwerpen
Mean number of eels per fyke per day
50
45
40
35
30
25
20
15
10
5
0
1995
1997
1998
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
Spring
Fall


Steendorp
Mean number of eels per fyke per day
30
25
20
15
10
5
0
1997
1998
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
Spring
Fall



Figure 8. Time trend of fyke catches of eel along the River Scheldt estuary. Numbers are expressed as mean number of eels per fyke per day. Data are split up in spring catches and fall catches. Years without monitoring data are excluded from the X-axis. Data Jan Breine, INBO.

Yellow eel telemetry study in the Méhaigne (Meuse RBD)

In 2009, University of Liège started up a telemetry study on 50–80 cm yellow eels in the Méhaigne, tributary of the river Meuse. The objectives are the evaluation of home range, mobility, habitat choice, impact of alterations of water regime by hydropower stations and the assessment of up and downstream migration. This study aims to study habitat choice of eels in support of the management of river habitat in Walloon rivers.

The movements and habitat use of resident yellow eels were studied in a stream stretch having both natural and minimum flow zones. N = 12 individuals (total length 505–802 mm) were surgically tagged with radio transmitters and released at their capture sites. They were located using manual radio receivers during the daytime from 2 to 5 days/week over periods ranging from 200 to 329 days, for a total of 1098 positions. Eels showed home ranges ranging from 33 to 341 m (median value, 62 m), displayed strong fidelity to sites and demonstrated a great degree of plasticity in habitat use. Eels were slightly mobile throughout the year, but their movements were season and temperature dependent, with a maximum during the spring (mean water temperature, 12°C) and a minimum in winter (3°C). Stones and roots (utilization rate greater than 50% of eels for more than 30% of location days) were significantly the most frequently used habitats. Between the two flow zones, the natural flow was the most occupied, with a significantly higher proportion of resident eels (66.7% of radio-tagged yellow eels) and longer occupation (81% of location days) than the minimum flow zone with less suitable habitats (Ovidio *et al*., 2013).

Eel population study in the Lesse (Meuse RBD)

An ongoing research program financed by the Fonds Européen pour la Pêche (FEP) and the Service Public de Wallonie (SPW), aims to estimate the resident stock of eels in the Lesse River, sub-basin of the Belgian river Meuse. The stock is estimated by the method of capture–recapture sampling and densities are calculated according to the Petersen method. On each sampling site, electrofishing is performed and fykenets are placed. The eels captured are individually tagged with passive integrated transponders. Morphometric measurements such as total length, weight, length of pectoral fins

and eye diameters allowed to determine the stages of eels. As their migration can be compromised by their health state, eel blood samplings are also made on each fish in order to evaluate the physiological and immunological state of the stock. The results of thyroïd hormones (T3 and T4), growth hormone (GH) and Insulin Like Growth Factor 1 (IGF1) measurements will be compared with the stages previously defined. Lysozyme and complement activities measurements will give us some indications on the health state of fish individuals. The detection of herpes virus (HVA) is also done in each fish (Roland and Kestemont, 2014).

9.3 Silver eel

Verbiest *et al*. (2012) published the results of a study on the downstream migration of female silver eel by remote telemetry in the lower part of the River Meuse (Belgium and the Netherlands) using a combination of nine detection stations and manual tracking. N = 31 eels (LT 64–90 cm) were implanted with active transponders and released in 2007 into the River Berwijn, a small Belgian tributary of the River Meuse, 326 km from the North Sea. From August 2007 till April 2008, 13 eels (42%) started their downstream migration and were detected at two or more stations. Mean migration speed was 0.62 m/s (or 53 km/day). Only two eels (15%) arrived at the North Sea, the others being held up or killed at hydroelectric power stations, caught by fishermen or by predators or stopped their migration and settled in the river delta. A majority (58%) of the eels classified as potential migrants did not start their migration and settled in the River Berwijn or upper Meuse as verified by additional manual tracking. More details are to be found in the paper.

See under 9.2 for information on a starting FEP research project assessing downstream migration of silver eel at the confluence of the Lesse and the Meuse.

De Canet *et al*. (2014) estimated the actual and historical eel stock and escapement to the sea estimated for French and Belgium Meuse by applying the EDA.2.0 model (Jouanin *et al*., 2012, Eel Density Analysis). A total of 19 980 yellow eels and 1000 silver eels was estimated in 2013 in the Belgian part of the Meuse. This number is 5.8 times lower than the estimated number in 1980. Eel presence and abundance are decreasing linearly with the distance to the sea and the cumulative height of dams. As part of this work, a first attempt to estimate the anthropogenic mortality and biomass according to a pristine state has provided some results. However the lack of data and proper biological parameters limited the results to plots used to illustrate the possible outputs. The numbers estimated by the model are fairly lower than previous estimates for this area, and the reasons for this result are discussed.

9 Data collected for the DCF

Not applicable for Belgium as there are no commercial catches in inland waters. Commercial catches of eel in coastal waters or marine fisheries are not reported to DCF.

See Section 11.1 for data on length and weight gained from research sampling.

There are no routine surveys on age of eels. Some silver eels from Flanders have been aged in the framework of the Eeliad program.

10 Life history and other biological information

10.1 Growth, silvering and mortality

Von Bertalanffy parameters: Linf, K, t0

L50 = the length at which 50% of the population has silvered (my interpretation of 50% maturity)

Length and age at silvering

Fecundity

Weight-at-age

Length–weight relationship

Length and weight and growth (DCF)

Flemish Region

Length and weight data of individual eel collected through the freshwater fish monitoring network are available via the website http://vis.milieuinfo.be/.

An analysis of the length of yellow eels per catchment has been made for the EMP and is presented there.

Verreycken *et al*. (2011) describe the length–weight relationship ($W = aL^b$) in eel (and other species) from Flanders. Nearly 263 000 individual length–weight (L/W) data, collected during 2839 fish stock assessments between 1992 and 2009, were used to calculate L/W relationships of 40 freshwater fish species from Flanders. Those stock assessments were performed by INBO in the framework of the Flemish Freshwater Fish Monitoring Network. The study area includes 1426 sampling locations characterized as lacustrine as well as riverine habitats, including head streams, tributaries, canals, disconnected river meanders, water retaining basins, ponds and lakes. Eel was the fifth most abundant species in our surveys. The equation was based on 17 586 individual eels recorded for total length and weight (Figure 9).

Following equation was found:

$W = 0.0011\ L^{3.130}$
$r^2 = 0.98$



Figure 9. Length–weight relation of European eel (n = 17 586) sampled over Flanders in the period 1992–2009.

In order to ascertain to what extent the log10a and b values calculated for the Flemish populations fell within the range available from other studies, we compared the Flemish values with the values available in FishBase (Froese and Pauly, 2010) from other countries. Flemish *a* and *b* values both fell within the 95% CL of the mean European *a* and *b* values (Figure 10).

Our data originate from over almost two decades, irrespective of sampling sites, dates and seasons. Because of the dense sampling network in a small geographic area over a long sampling period, extremes are balanced out. Therefore and through the fact that Flanders is situated centrally in Europe, our *a* and *b* values may be applicable as reference marks for an European L/W relation for eel. Moreover, our TL range covered the whole range between minimum and maximum length in sufficient numbers, making *a* and *b* values valid as mean values for all length ranges (Verreycken *et al*., 2011).



Figure 10. Estimated intercepts (log10a; Y-axis) versus estimated slope (b; X-axis) for the log10 transformed L/W regression and regression line for European eel from European datasets, as available in Fishbase (Froese and Pauly, 2010), compared to the Flemish populations (2009 2011). Linear regression equation and r² are given (n = number of L/W relationships, including Flanders). (Verreycken *et al.*, 2011).

Results from a study on head dimorphism (Ide *et al.*, 2011) are presented in the 2011 Country Report (See Belpaire *et al.*, 2011) for details).

Walloon Region

An analysis of the length of yellow eels in some rivers of the Meuse catchment has been made for the EMP and is presented there.

Head shape dimorphism in glass eel

Recently (De Meyer *et al.*, under review) studied head shape dimorphism in glass eel (*A. anguilla*). Two phenotypes are present in the yellow eel stage, broadheads and narrowheads. While this has been linked to dietary differences, with broadheads feeding on harder and larger prey than narrowheads, very little is known about how and when this dimorphism arises during their ontogeny. Therefore, the authors examined head shape variation at an earlier ontogenetic stage, the glass eel stage, as at this stage, the eels are considered to be non-feeding. Head shape was studied in glass eels from different sampling sites (Leopold Canal and the rivers Yser, Severn, Trent and Parret) by both taking measurements and using an outline analysis. We found that there's already considerable variation in head broadness and bluntness, but no unambiguous support for head shape dimorphism at the glass eel stage was found. Variation in head width/head length ratios in non-feeding glass eels had, however, a similar range as in feeding yellow eels, indicating that head shape in European eel might be at least partially determined through other mechanisms than trophic segregation.

10.2 Parasites and pathogens

Flemish Region

See for results on a pan European survey on the actual status of *Anguillicola* in silver eels (Faliex *et al*., 2012), 2012 Country Report (Belpaire *et al*., 2012).

Walloon Region

No new information compared to earlier reports.

10.3 Contaminants

Some recent work (recently published papers and contributions to international meetings) is summarized below.

In order to meet the requirements of the European Commission, De Jonghe *et al*. (2014) measured bioaccumulation of hydrophobic micropollutants in muscle tissue of eel (*Anguilla anguilla*) and perch (*Perca fluviatilis*) from Flemish waterbodies. Quantified pollutants included mercury (Hg), hexachlorobenzene (HCB), hexachlorobutadiene (HCBd), Polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDE), Hexabromocyclododecane (HBCDD), perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS) and its derivates, dicofol, heptachlor and heptachlorepoxide. Measured Hg and HCB concentrations were compared between species and in time, based on historical data of eel pollutant monitoring in Flanders. In addition two polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH), fluoranthene and benzo(a)pyrene, were measured in zebra mussels (*Dreissena polymorpha*), which were caged for six weeks. At all sample sites eel could be captured, however this was not possible for perch. For perch only (too) small individuals could be captured. An exceeding of the biota environmental quality standard (EQS) was observed for HCB, HBCDD and PFOS at some sample sites. For Hg and PBDE, biota-EQS were exceeded at all sample sites. EQS evaluation for HCB depended on fish species, since more elevated HCB concentrations were measured in eel compared to roach. Measured Hg concentrations were dependent on fish size, and strong relations were observed between Hg accumulation in eel and perch. HCB concentrations in eel were found to decrease in time. In contrast, Hg concentrations seem to increase, although measured Hg bioaccumulation was comparable with levels found in other European studies. Based on results from the present study and data from literature, biota EQS for both Hg and PBDE seem unrealistically low for Flemish and European watercourses. This study recommends eel as the most suitable species to monitor bioaccumulation of hydrophobic micropollutants in Flanders. The latter is based on both practical aspects (spatial distribution and amount of biomass) and species-specific aspects of the immature eel related to biomonitoring (sedentary, no gender issues, no reproduction). Furthermore, this study also highlights the need for intercalibration studies relating pollutant concentraties between different species (De Jonghe *et al*., 2014).

Van Ael *et al*. (2014) investigated the relationships between the presence of PCBs, OCPs and metals in aquatic ecosystems and the ecological water quality by combining datasets of long-term monitoring of chemicals in European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*, N = 1156) in Flanders (Belgium) and the Ecological Quality Ratio (EQR), based on the assessment of fish assemblages at 185 locations. For most pollutants, EQR scores were lower when pollutant levels were higher. Threshold concentrations for a good quality could be formulated for PCB's, most metals and OCPs. Mixed models suggested that the ecological water quality was significantly correlated with the presence of PCBs. However, the low R2 indicates that other environmental pressures may significantly influence the biotic integrity of fish communities. Empirical data and their analyses are

essential to enable defining threshold values of bioaccumulated levels to allow better protection of the aquatic environment and its biota through associated food webs as demanded by the Water Framework Directive.

In a study by Malarvannan *et al*. (2014), pooled yellow European eel (*Anguilla anguilla* (L.)) samples, consisting of 3–10 eels, collected between 2000 and 2009 from 60 locations in Flanders (Belgium) were investigated for persistent contaminants, such as polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDEs), hexabromocyclododecanes (HBCDs), polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane and its metabolites (DDTs). The current study expands the knowledge regarding these contaminant concentrations, their patterns and distribution profiles in aquatic ecosystems. PBDEs, HBCDs, PCBs, and DDTs were detected in all eel samples and some samples had high concentrations (up to 1400, 9500, 41 600 and 7000 ng/g lw, respectively). PCB levels accounted for the majority of the contamination in most samples. The high variability in PBDE, HBCD, PCB and DDT concentrations reported here is likely due to the variety in sampling locations demonstrating variable local pollution pressures, from highly industrialised areas to small rural creeks. Among PBDEs, BDE-47 (57% contribution to the sum PBDEs), −100 (19%) and −99 (15%) were the predominant congeners, similar to the composition reported in the literature in eel samples. For HBCDs, α-HBCD (74%) was predominant followed by γ-(22%) and β-HBCD (4%) isomers in almost all eel samples. CB-153 (19%) was the most dominant PCB congener, closely followed by CB-138 (11%), CB-180 (9%), CB-187 (8%) and CB-149 (7%). The contribution to the total human exposure through local wild eel consumption was also highly variable. Intake of PBDEs and HBCDs, through consumption of wild eel, was below the RfD values for the average population (consuming on average 2.9 g eel/day). At 16 out 60 sites, eels exceeded largely the new EU consumption threshold for PCBs (300 ng/g ww for the sum of six indicator PCBs). The current data show an on-going exposure of Flemish eels to PBDEs, HBCDs, PCBs and DDTs through indirect release from contaminated sediments or direct releases from various industries.

10.4 Predators

Flemish Region

Information on the occurrence and distribution of the cormorant has been provided for Flanders in the Belgian EMP.

It was estimated that the yearly consumption of eels by cormorants amounts 5.6–5.8 tonnes for Flanders.

Walloon Region

For the Walloon region, no new data were available. See 2008 report and the Belgian Eel Management Plan.

11 Other sampling

Information on habitat, water quality, migration barriers, turbines is available in the Belgian Eel Management Plan.

12 Stock assessment

This section does not contain new information compared to the 2013 Country Report. Information from last year is copied here.

12.1 Method summary

12.2 Summary data

12.2.1 Stock indicators and targets

Note that not all targets may be available, for example the Reg does not set a mortality rate target. The mortality rate target from WGEEL 2012 corresponds to (0.92 if '$B_{current}/B_0$' >40%, or 0.92 * $B_{current}/(40\%*B_0)$ if '$B_{current}/B_0$'<40%).

EMUcode	Indicator	biomass (T)	Mortality (rate)			Target		
	B0	Bbest	Bcurr	∑A	∑F	∑H	Source	Biomass (t)	∑A (rate)
BE_Scheldt	169	45	33	0.3101	0.2879	0.02218	EMP		
	187	41	34	0,1872	0.1788	0.00841	EU Reg (Progress report)		
							WGEEL		
BE_Meuse	53	41	16	0.9409	0.1520	0.78896	EMP		
	54	39	14	1.0245	0.11242	0.91209	EU Reg (progress Rep)		
							WGEEL		

12.2.2 Habitat coverage

Area corresponds to the wetted area of eel-producing habitat. "A'd" asks whether or not eel are assessed in that habitat type.

EMU code	River		Lake		Estuary		Lagoon		Coastal	
	Area (ha)	A'd Y/N)	Area (ha)	A'd Y/N)	Area (ha)	A'd Y/N)	Area (ha)	A'd Y/N)	Area (ha)	A'd Y/N)
BE_Scheldt	8978	Y	3505*	Y	4130**	Y	/	N	/	N
BE_Meuse	987	Y	452*	Y	0	/	/	N	/	N

*** Lake = WFD waterbodies type 'lake', including the docks of the ports of Antwerp and Zeebrugge.**

**** Estuary = Scheldt estuary + IJzer estuary**

12.2.3 Impact

For each EMU, provide an overview of the assessed impacts per habitat type or for 'All' habitats where the assessment is applied across all relevant habitats. Barriers includes habitat loss. Indirect impacts are anthropogenic impacts on the ecosystem but only indirectly on eel (e.g. eutrophication).

A = assessed, MI = not assessed, minor, MA = not assessed major, AB = impact absent.

EMU code	Habitat	Fish com	Fish rec	Hydro & pumps	Barriers	Restocking	Predators	Indirect impacts*
BE-Scheldt	Riv	AB	A	A	A	A	A	Nr/MA
	Lak	AB	A	Nr	Nr	A	A	Nr/MA
	Est	AB	A	Nr	A	A/Nr	A	Nr/MA
	Lag	Nr	Nr	Nr	Nr	Nr	Nr	Nr
	Coa	Nr	Nr	Nr	Nr	Nr	Nr	Nr
	All							
BE-Meuse	Riv	AB	A	A	A	A	A	Nr/MA
	Lak	AB	A	Nr	Nr	A	A	Nr/MA
	Est	Nr	Nr	Nr	Nr	Nr	Nr	Nr
	Lag	Nr	Nr	Nr	Nr	Nr	Nr	Nr
	Coa	Nr	Nr	Nr	Nr	Nr	Nr	Nr
	All							

*** indirect impacts were not assessed as such, but the calculated eel densities implicitly account for the current habitat conditions. I.e. the eel density in rivers is the result of water quality and habitat structures.**

Express the loss in tonnes (t) for each impact per developmental stage or MI = not assessed, minor, MA = not assessed major, AB = impact absent. Where available, also report the total loss as silver eel equivalents, and explain the method used to calculate equivalents in Section 13.1.

EMU code	Stage	Fish com	Fish rec	Hydro & pumps	Barriers	Restocking	Predators**	Indirect impacts*
BE_Scheldt	Glass	AB	MI	AB	MA	MA ?	MI ?	
	Yellow	AB	27	MI ?	MA	MI	5.2	
	Silver	AB	6	1.27	MI	MI	1.51	
	Silver EQ	AB						
BE_Meuse	Glass	AB	MI	AB	MA	MA ?	MI ?	
	Yellow	AB	3	MI ?	MA	MI	0.58	
	Silver	AB	0.7	0.24	MI	MI	0.18	
	Silver EQ	AB						

*** See previous table.**

**** Predation by cormorants. Scheldt = 90% of total silver eel biomass in Flanders → impact of predation calculated for Meuse & Scheldt together and then divided over both basins according to their contribution to overall biomass.**

12.2.4 Precautionary diagram



France-total is in this plot as a bubble without color. It influences the scaling.

12.2.5 Management measures

No new information compared to last year's report.

12.3 Summary data on glass eel

See Chapters 3.1.1 and 3.5.1.

13 Sampling intensity and precision

No new data available.

14 Standardisation and harmonisation of methodology

No new data available.

14.1 Survey techniques

14.2 Sampling commercial catches

14.3 Sampling

14.4 Age analysis

14.5 Life stages

14.6 Sex determinations

14.7 Data quality issues

15 Overview, conclusions and recommendations

Recent (2011–2014) data from recruitment-series or other scientific stock indicators in Belgium indicate a further decrease of the stock, although the glass eel recruitment at Nieuwpoort (River Yzer) showed an increase with recent years.

Special fisheries management actions to restore the stocks in Flanders are confined to the prohibition of the semi-professional fyke fisheries in the Lower Scheldt. In the Walloon region eel fishing is prohibited to avoid human consumption of contaminated eels. In Flanders the eel has been listed as *Critically Endangered* on the Red List of Fishes.

In Flanders, restocking practises with glass eel are going as in former years. Glass eel restocking activities are not taking account of the variation in eel quality (diseases/contamination) of the restocking sites. A significant higher quantity has been restocked in 2014 compared to the years before, due to the lower prices. In the Walloon Region restocking with glass eel has been initiated in 2011 and in 2012, but was temporarily stopped in 2013 for financial reasons. The Walloon region did not indicate if glass eel was restocked in Wallonia during 2014.

In Belgium, habitat and water quality restoration is a (slow) ongoing process within the framework of other regulations, especially the Water Framework Directive and the Benelux Decision for the Free Migration of Fish (which has been reformulated in 2009). Numerous migration barriers, pumps and hydropower stations still affect the free movement of eels and many rivers and brooks still have an insufficient water quality to allow normal fish life.

Specific programs for eel sampling and other biological sampling for stock assessment purposes of eel as required in the context of the Belgian EMP have been initiated in Wallonia under co-financing of EFF.

Some research programs focusing on habitat, migration and eel quality are being initiated or ongoing. Several scientific results have been published. A pilot project to monitor contamination in eel and perch for reporting about the chemical status of water bodies within the WFD has been reported in Flanders.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the sampling programmes as required in the Belgian EMP and the European restoration plan is initiated asap.

Considering further downward trend of most stock indicators, additional protection of the local stock is required. In the Walloon Region the harvest of eels by recreational fishermen is prohibited for human health considerations (as the eels are contaminated).

Similarly Flanders could envisage the same management option. Eels from many places in Flanders are considerably contaminated and their consumption presents risks for human health. Furthermore apparently recreational fishermen are not reluctant for a limitation in eel fishing. Putting in place a catch and release obligation in Flanders would save 30 tons of eel on annual basis.

16 Literature references

Agentschap voor Natuur en Bos. 2013. Officieuze coördinatie van de visserijreglementering. 19 April 2013.

Belpaire C., Breine J., Ovidio M., Stevens M., Rollin X and Vlietinck K. 2012. Report on the eel stock and fishery in Belgium 2011/12. In FAO European Inland Fisheries Advisory Commission; International Council for the Exploration of the Sea, 2012. Report of the Joint EIFAAC/ICES Working Group on Eels (WGEEL), 3–9 September 2012, Copenhagen, Denmark. ICES CM 2012/ACOM:18, pp. 202–240.

Belpaire, C. 2002. Monitoring of glass eel recruitment in Belgium. In: Dekker W. (Ed.) Monitoring of glass eel recruitment. Netherlands Institute of Fisheries research, report C007/02-WD, Volume 2B, pp. 169–180.

Belpaire, C. 2006. Report on the eel stock and fishery in Belgium 2005. In FAO European Inland Fisheries Advisory Commission; International Council for the Exploration of the Sea. Report of the 2006 session of the Joint EIFAC/ICES Working Group on Eels. Rome, 23–27 January 2006. EIFAC Occasional Paper. No. 38, ICES CM 2006/ACFM:16. Rome, FAO/Copenhagen, ICES. 2006. 352p., 217–241.

Belpaire, C. and Coussement, M. 2000. Nota omtrent het uitzetten van paling in de Vlaamse openbare waters. [Note on the restocking of glass eel in Flandrian public waters]. Advice for the High Fisheries Council (March 20, 2000). Institute for Forestry and Game Management, Vlaamse Vereniging van Hengelsport Verbonden, IBW.Wb.V.ADV.2000.070 (in Dutch).

Belpaire, C., Adriaens, D., Breine, J., Buysse, D., Geeraerts, C., Ide, C., Lebel, A., Philippart, J.C., Stevens, M., Rollin, X., Vlietinck, K. 2011. Report on the eel stock and fishery in Belgium 2010/'11. 44 pages.

Belpaire, C., Stevens, M., Breine, J., Verreycken, H., Ovidio, M., Nzau Matondo, B., Roland, K., Rollin, X., and Vlietinck, K. 2013. Report on the eel stock and fishery in Belgium 2012/'13. In: ICES. 2013. Report of the Joint EIFAAC/ICES Working Group on Eels (WGEEL), 18–22 March 2013 in Sukarietta, Spain, 4–10 September 2013 in Copenhagen, Denmark. ICES CM 2013/ACOM:18. 851 pp.

Belpaire, C., Buysse, D., Coeck, J., Geeraerts, C.,Ovidio, M., Philippart, J.C., Reyns, T., Stevens, M., Van Thuyne, G., Vlietinck, K., and Verreycken, H. 2010. Report on the eel stock and fishery in Belgium 2009/'10. In FAO European Inland Fisheries Advisory Commission; International Council for the Exploration of the Sea. Report of the 2010 Session of the Joint EIFAC/ICES Working Group on Eels, Hamburg, 9–14 September 2010, EIFAC Occasional Paper No. 41, ICES CM 2010/ACOM: 18. Rome, FAO/Copenhagen, ICES. 2010. 721p. (Online).

Belpaire, C., Geeraerts, C., Verreycken, H., Van Thuyne, G., Cuveliers, E., Stevens, M., Coeck, J., Buysse, D., Gomes da Silva, S., Demol, T., Vlietinck, K., Rollin, X., Guelinckx, J. and Philippart, J.C. 2008. Report on the eel stock and fishery in Belgium 2007. In FAO European Inland Fisheries Advisory Commission; International Council for the Exploration of the Sea. Report of the 2008 Session of the Joint EIFAC/ICES Working Group on Eels, Leuven, 3–9 September 2008, EIFAC Occasional Paper No. 43, ICES CM 2009/ACOM: 15. Rome, FAO/Copenhagen, ICES. 2009. 192p. (Includes a CD-ROM).

Belpaire, C., Gomes da Silva, S., Demol, T., Vlietinck, K., Van Thuyne, G., Goemans, G., Geeraerts, C., Cuveliers, E. and Philippart, J.C. 2007. Report on the eel stock and fishery in Belgium

2006. In FAO European Inland Fisheries Advisory Commission; International Council for the Exploration of the Sea. Report of the 2007 Session of the Joint EIFAC/ICES Working Group on Eels, Bordeaux, 3–7 September 2007, EIFAC Occasional Paper No. 39, ICES CM 2007/ACFM: 23. Rome, FAO/Copenhagen, ICES. 2008. 138p. (Includes a CD-ROM).

Belpaire, C., Vlietinck, K., Stevens, M., Buysse, D. and Philippart, J.C. 2009. Report on the eel stock and fishery in Belgium 2008/'09. In FAO European Inland Fisheries Advisory Commission; International Council for the Exploration of the Sea. Report of the 2009 Session of the Joint EIFAC/ICES Working Group on Eels, Göteborg, 7–12 September 2009, EIFAC Occasional Paper No. 45, ICES CM 2009/ACOM: 15. Rome, FAO/Copenhagen, ICES. 2010. 540p. (Online).

Benelux. 2009. Beschikking van het Comité van Ministers van de Benelux Economische Unie tot opheffing en vervanging van Beschikking M (96) 5 van 26 april 1996 inzake de vrije migratie van vissoorten in de hydrografische stroomgebieden van de Beneluxlanden (16 juni 2009).

Buysse, D., A. M. Mouton, M. Stevens, T. Van den Neucker, J. Coeck, 2014. Mortality of European eel after downstream migration through two types of pumping stations. Fisheries Management and Ecology, 21, 13-21 online doi: 10.1111/fme.12046.

de Canet, L., Briand, C., Beaulaton, L., Roland, K., Kestemont, P. 2014. Eel density analysis (EDA 2.0), Silver eel (*Anguilla anguilla*) escapement in the Meuse basin (DRAFT). Draft Report Université de Namur, EPTB-Vilaine, ONEMA.

De Jonge M., Belpaire C., Verhaert V., Dardenne F., Blust R. en Bervoets L. 2014. Veldstudie naar de monitoring van biota in het kader van de rapportage van de chemische toestand voor de Kaderrichtlijn Water. Universiteit Antwerpen (UA) in samenwerking met het Instituut voor Natuur- en Bosonderzoek (INBO), in opdracht van de Vlaamse Milieumaatschappij (VMM). Antwerpen, België.

De Meyer J., Ide C., Belpaire C., Goemans G. and Adriaens D. 2014. Head shape dimorphism in European glass eels (*Anguilla anguilla*). Under review.

Eel Management Plan for Belgium. 2009. 172 pages.

Malarvannan, G., Belpaire, C., Geeraerts, C., Eulaers, I., Neels, H., Covaci, A. 2014. Assessment of persistent brominated and chlorinated organic contaminants in the European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*) in Flanders, Belgium: Levels, profiles and health risk. Science of the Total Environment 482–483 (2014) 222–233.

Nzau Matondo, B., Benitez, J-P., Dierckx, A., Philippart, J-C., Ovidio, M. 2014. Arrival of European eel in Belgian part of the Meuse: who and how are they? Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Ecohydraulics, Trondheim, Norway http://hdl.handle.net/2268/170392.

Ovidio, M., A. Seredynski, J-C Philippart, B. N. Matondo. 2013. A bit of quiet between the migrations: the resting life of the European eel during their freshwater growth phase in a small stream. Aquat Ecol 47:291–301. DOI 10.1007/s10452-013-9444-1.

Ovidio, M., Nzau Matondo, B., Philippart, J.C. 2012. Estimation de l'abondance du stock des anguilles recrutées dans la Meuse en Wallonie et réalisation des essais de repeuplement en juvéniles (civelles et anguillettes). Projet 32-1102-002 du Fonds Européen pour la pêche de l'Université de Liège, Laboratoire de Démographie des Poissons et d'Hydroécologie.

Philippart, J.C and Rimbaud G. 2005. L'efficacité de la nouvelle grande échelle à poissons du barrage de Visé-Lixhe sur la Meuse. Eléments du suivi scientifique 1999–2004. [Efficiency of the new large fish pass at the Visé-Lixhe dam on the river Meuse. Follow-up 1999–2004]. Draft report: 50 years of Fonds Piscicole.

Philippart, J-C. 2006. *L'érosion de la biodiversité: les poissons*. Dossier Scientifique réalisé dans le cadre de l'élaboration du rapport analytique 2006–2007 sur l'état de l'environnement Wallon. Université de Liège. 306 pp.

Roland, K., Kestemont, P. 2014. Estimation of the resident European eel stock in the Lesse river, sub-basin of the Belgian river Meuse, and evaluation of the physiological and immunological state of fish using non-invasive methods. FEP Project research abstract. Research Unit in Environmental and Evolutionary Biology (URBE), Narilis (Namur Research Institute for Life Sciences), University of Namur, Belgium.

Stevens M, Van Daele T, Belpaire C, Mouton A, Geeraerts C, De Bruyn L, Bauwens D, Coeck J, Pollet M 2013. Evaluatie van de methodologie voor de berekening van het ontsnappingspercentage zilverpaling ten behoeve van de rapportage voor de Palingverordening. Rapporten van het Instituut voor Natuur- en Bosonderzoek 2013 (32). Instituut voor Natuur- en Bosonderzoek, Brussel.

Stevens M., Coeck J. and van Vessem J. 2009. Wetenschappelijke onderbouwing van de palingbeheerplannen voor Vlaanderen. Rapporten van het Instituut voor Natuur- en Bosonderzoek 2009 (INBO.R.2009.40). Instituut voor Natuur- en Bosonderzoek, Brussel.

Tarrago-Bes, F. 2014. Evaluation de l'efficacité du repeuplement en civelles (*Anguilla anguilla* L.) dans trois rivières du Sud de la Belgique; Université de Bordeaux, Unité de Formation Biologie, Master Sciences de la Terre, Ecologie, Environnement.

Van Ael, E., Belpaire, C., Breine, J., Geeraerts, C., Van Thuyne G., Eulaers, I., Blust, R., Bervoets, L. 2014. Are persistent organic pollutants and metals in eel muscle predictive for the ecological water quality? Environmental Pollution 186 (2014) 165–171.

Verbiest, H., A. Breukelaar, M. Ovidio, J.-C. Philippart and C. Belpaire. 2012. Escapement success and pattern of downstream migration of female silver eel *Anguilla anguilla* in the River Meuse. Ecology of Freshwater Fish, 21, 395–403 doi :10.1111/j.1600-0633.2012.00559.x.

Verreycken, H., Belpaire, C., Van Thuyne, G., Breine, J., Buysse, D., Coeck, J., Mouton, A., Stevens, M., Van den Neucker, T., De Bruyn, L., Maes, D. 2014. An IUCN Red List of freshwater fishes and lampreys in Flanders. Fisheries Management and Ecology, 21, 122–132.

Verreycken, H., Van Thuyne, G., Belpaire, C. 2011. Length–weight relationships of 40 freshwater fish species from two decades of monitoring in Flanders (Belgium). Journal of Applied Ichthyology doi: 10.1111/j.1439-0426.2011.01815.x.

Vlietinck, K. 2010. Agentschap voor Natuur en Bos – Resultaten van de enquête bij hengelaars op openbaar water in 2008.

Vlietinck, K. Nature and Forest Agency, Groupe de travail pour l'anguille européenne coordonné par le Service de la pêche du Service public de Wallonie. Council Regulation (EC) No 1100/2007 of 18 September 2007 establishing measures for the recovery of the stock of European eel. Eel Management Plan for Belgium. First report to be submitted in line with Article 9 of the eel Regulation 1100/2007. June 2012.

Walloon Government. 2006. Walloon Government Order of 15th June 2006 modifying the Walloon Regional Executive Order of 11th March 1993 concerning angling, in order to impose no-kill practices for the European eel.