

**CNL(07)15**

**Council**

***Report of the Ad Hoc Review Group  
on the Parties' Implementation Plans***

## CNL(07)15

### *Report of the Ad Hoc Review Group on the Parties' Implementation Plans*

1. The Strategic Approach for NASCO's 'Next Steps' requires that each Party or jurisdiction develop an Implementation Plan focused around NASCO's three main agreements (which address fishery management, habitat protection and restoration, and aquaculture and associated activities) and which also takes into account NASCO's various guidelines. Guidelines for the preparation of these Implementation Plans, NSTF(06)10, were agreed by the Council and last June the Parties and relevant jurisdictions presented draft plans. It was agreed that the final plans would be provided to the Secretariat by October 2006 and these would then be subject to review by an *Ad Hoc* Review Group. The Implementation Plans submitted by the Parties are contained in document CNL(07)22. The report of the *Ad Hoc* Review Group is attached.
2. The Review Group was asked to assess the uniformity of the plans with the Council's Guidelines for their preparation, NSTF(06)10, and assess how well the plans lend themselves to evaluation in relation to NASCO's Resolution and Agreements. The Review Group comprised Mary Colligan, Ted Potter, Andras Kristiansen and Arni Isaksson from NASCO's Parties and Chris Poupard and Gareth Porter from the NGOs. I served as Coordinator, which meant that I chaired the meeting. The Secretariat also facilitated the Group's work and provided the rapporteur but we did not review the plans. The task before the Group was somewhat daunting but the Group was an excellent team that worked in a very conscientious and fair way.
3. The focus of the assessment was the structure of the plan and its conformity to the guidelines. Consequently, to receive a favourable review a plan had to contain the key elements identified in the guidelines. So the reviews are not about the adequacy or otherwise of each jurisdiction's record of salmon management, they are simply about the structure and content of the plans.
4. The Group's assessments of the 15 plans available to it are contained in Annexes 3 and 4 of the attached report. A report on the Group's findings will be presented in a Special Session during the Twenty-Fourth Annual Meeting. There will then be an opportunity for a discussion under Special Session rules (i.e. all delegates and all NGOs may participate freely). The Parties may respond to these reviews if they so wish. Any revisions to the plans will then be subject to final review by the *Ad Hoc* group.
5. The Council is asked to consider the report of the *Ad Hoc* Review Group and decide on appropriate action. The Council will also be asked to decide on the focus area for the first reports by the Parties under their Implementation Plans, to be made in 2008, and agree the Terms of Reference and composition of a further *Ad Hoc* Group to review these reports.

Secretary  
Edinburgh  
11 April 2007

## IP(07)4

### *Report of the Ad Hoc Review Group on Implementation Plans*

*Palomar Hotel, Washington DC, USA  
12 – 16 March 2006*

#### **1. Opening of the Meeting by the Coordinator**

1.1 The Coordinator, Dr Malcolm Windsor, opened the meeting and welcomed members of the *Ad Hoc* Review Group to Washington. He indicated that the Group had a unique task before it in that NASCO is probably the first inter-governmental fishery organization to undertake such an in-depth review of progress in implementing its agreements. Furthermore, the review is unique in that NASCO's NGOs are part of the process. He noted that the Group's task was complicated because it involves assessment of compliance with internationally agreed NASCO agreements and guidelines concerning management of habitat, aquaculture, introductions and transfers and fisheries and this task will involve judgments, a critical mind set and presentations of the findings in a diplomatic way. He indicated that it would be necessary to spend some time developing a sound basis for the reviews so that they are well constructed and fair and will, therefore, be accepted by the Parties, even where they are critical of them. He stressed that the Group's Terms of Reference state that "the group is not required to produce a unanimous report but to reflect all positions taken by members on the adequacy of the Implementation Plans presented and their alignment with the NASCO agreements and guidelines". He noted that the members of the Group were participating as individuals representing the interests of the wild salmon as interpreted by NASCO's agreements and guidelines and not representing the interests of their Parties. He referred to his role as Coordinator of the Group in that he would not be a reviewer and the Secretariat's role was only to facilitate and support the Group's work. He concluded that there are many challenges for the Group in developing a strong foundation for its work, in developing reviews that reflect the interests of the salmon and in agreeing how to present the findings in a public forum. He indicated that he was looking forward to the next few days and to a valuable and thought-provoking report by the Group which will play a central role for the years to come in influencing the actions that NASCO's Parties take to conserve the wild stocks.

1.2 The representatives of the NGOs indicated that they very much welcome and appreciate the manner in which NASCO has undertaken the review of its activities and in particular the approach to assessing progress with implementation of its agreements. They indicated that NASCO deserves much credit for the transparent and inclusive way in which it has undertaken this work and they greatly appreciated being invited to participate in the process.

1.3 A list of participants is contained in Annex 1.

#### **2. Adoption of the Agenda**

2.1 The Group adopted its agenda, IP(07)3 (Annex 2), but changed item 5 to 'Adequacy of Implementation Plans'.

### 3. Review of Terms of Reference and Consideration of Working Methods

- 3.1 The Coordinator indicated that the Terms of Reference developed by the Council at its Twenty-Third Annual Meeting, CNL(06)39, had subsequently been revised through correspondence among NASCO's Heads of Delegations so as to improve the transparency of the review process. Under the revised Terms of Reference the functions of the Group are described as follows.
- (a) The *Ad Hoc* Review Group shall review and provide feedback to the Council on the adequacy of Implementation Plans submitted by the Parties or relevant jurisdictions.
  - (b) In carrying out this task the *Ad Hoc* Review Group should *inter alia* seek to assess the conformity of these plans with the "Guidelines for the Preparation of NASCO Implementation Plans and for Reporting on Progress", NSTF(06)10, and how well the plans lend themselves to evaluation in relation to the objectives of NASCO's Resolutions and Agreements.
  - (c) The *Ad Hoc* Review Group's report will be issued to the Parties and NGOs at the earliest opportunity and presented at a Special Session during the 2007 Annual Meeting. At this Special Session the Parties will have the opportunity to respond to the *Ad Hoc* Review Group's findings by reporting on any steps they have taken, or intend to take, to address the Group's suggestions. Any revisions to the Implementation Plans will be submitted by the Parties within a period of two months after the 2007 Annual Meeting for final review by the *Ad Hoc* Review Group. In the event that the *Ad Hoc* Review Group still has concerns about an Implementation Plan the President would be asked to liaise with the Party concerned.
  - (d) The *Ad Hoc* Review Group is not required to produce a unanimous report but to reflect all positions taken by members on the adequacy of the Implementation Plans presented and their alignment with the NASCO agreements and guidelines.
- 3.2 The Group discussed its working methods. Prior to the meeting the Group had agreed, by correspondence, a format designed to ensure consistency in the reviews, to facilitate assessment of the plans with regard to their conformity with the guidelines, NSTF(06)10, and to allow evaluation of the adequacy of the Implementation Plans in relation to NASCO's Resolutions and Agreements. A lead reviewer was assigned to each plan from among the NASCO representatives and the NGOs also undertook initial reviews of all the plans. The NGO Chairman had sent the plans to the NGOs in each country and where a country had more than one NGO a lead organization had been appointed to coordinate the responses. These initial reviews from the NASCO representatives and the NGOs formed the basis for the Group's initial deliberations.
- 3.3 At the meeting the Group made a number of changes to the original review format. Although the original format contained a numerical scoring system the Group found that this was not particularly useful and decided not to use it in its assessments of the plans. The Group decided that it would conduct its assessment of the adequacy of the measures detailed in the Implementation Plans on the basis of the information provided on the status of stocks, the threats to these stocks, the existing management measures in place and the commitments made for future management measures. The initial review format had also contained a question about data deficiencies and

research needs. This was removed as it had not been clearly emphasized in the guidelines, NSTF(06)10. The Group decided to base its assessments on the key elements of the guidelines, NSTF(06)10, which detail the structure and format of, and outline the contents to be included in, the Implementation Plans. The Group also made some amendments to the format used for the initial reviews to ensure that it conformed precisely with the guidelines, NSTF(06)10. In the interests of providing succinct reviews the questions addressed by the Group are abbreviated in the reviews but are detailed in full below.

**A. Structure and Format of the Plan**

- A1 Does the plan apply to all stocks/fisheries managed within a jurisdiction?
- A2 Does the plan apply for a period of at least 5 years and will it generally require no annual modification unless circumstances change significantly?
- A3 Is the plan consistent with, and adopt approaches specified within, NASCO Resolutions and Agreements, and does it take account of NASCO Guidelines as appropriate to the management approach?
- A4 Is the plan written in a clear and concise form for easy accessibility and reference (e.g. use of numbered paragraphs)?
- A5 Does the plan describe a process and outputs that are open to critical evaluation?

**B. Content of the Plan**

- B1 Introduction: Does the plan provide a general picture of the resource and the management structure in place within the relevant jurisdiction?
- B2 Status of stocks: Does the plan describe the current status of stocks for future comparison?
- B3 Threats to stocks and current management measures: Does the plan provide a summary of the threats and outline the existing management measures, with specific reference to the extent to which NASCO's Resolutions and Agreements have been applied?
- B4 Management approach to fisheries: Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to review and modify fishery regulations, both routine periodic reviews and the introduction of emergency measures, to include reference to/use of the NASCO Decision Structure for Management of Fisheries with measurable outputs against which subsequent reports can be assessed?
- B5 Management approach to habitat protection and restoration: Does the plan provide a clear summary of the approach that will be adopted to assess estuarine and freshwater habitat quality, identify problems and prioritise remedial actions, taking account of the guidance in the NASCO Plan of Action for the Protection and Restoration of Atlantic Salmon Habitat, with measurable outputs against which subsequent reports can be assessed?
- B6 Management approach to aquaculture and introductions and transfers: Does the plan provide a clear summary of the approach that will be adopted to minimise any adverse impacts from aquaculture and to control introductions and transfers, in line with the Williamsburg Resolution, with measurable outputs against which subsequent reports can be assessed?
- B7 Addressing other influences: Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to address other influences affecting salmon abundance or diversity, including those that may be reducing marine survival of stocks (e.g. collaborative action through the SALSEA programme)?

- B8 Evaluation: Does the plan provide a summary of monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess status of stocks and efficacy of management measures?
- B9 Socio-Economic Issues: Does the plan consider the social and economic implications of the actions proposed under B4 – B7?

3.4 The Group clarified its interpretation of some of these questions as follows:

- Question A1: the Group noted that while the Implementation Plans often referred to the number of salmon rivers in a country, it was not always clear if the plan applied to them all, but this was assumed to be the case;
- Question A3: the Group decided that in its assessment of this aspect of the guidelines, NSTF(06)10, it would assess only whether or not the Implementation Plans contained appropriate references to NASCO's Agreements, Resolutions and Guidelines. The Group felt that such references were important in making clear the linkage between national measures and the NASCO agreements. The extent to which these Agreements, Resolutions and Guidelines had been applied by the Parties in their existing and proposed management measures, as detailed in the Implementation Plans, was assessed in developing responses to questions B3-B7;
- Question A4: the Group felt that the assessment should focus on the need for outputs to be clearly identified and numerically referenced so as to facilitate future reporting and cross-referencing;
- Question A5: the Group interpreted the term 'process and outputs' to mean that there was a need for clearly expressed commitments in the form of specific management actions with timescales so that progress on their implementation could be followed in future;
- Question B2: the guidelines, NSTF(06)10, seek a description of the current status of stocks for future comparison. The Group agreed that it should assess this aspect of the plans on the basis of whether information had been presented on the status of stocks at a national or local level together with an indication of the process that would provide a basis for future comparison;
- Questions B4 – B6: the Group decided that it would interpret the term 'measurable outputs' to mean specific management actions with timescales for their implementation;
- Question B7: the Group had some difficulty in assessing this aspect because some Implementation Plans contained no information on other influences while some others did identify other influences but did not indicate how they would be addressed. The Group was unable to assess if plans should have identified and addressed other influences and so did not make an assessment for those plans that did not identify any other influences;
- Question B8: In assessing if the Implementation Plans provided a summary of monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess status of stocks and efficacy of management measures, the Group did not attempt to assess if appropriate actions had been taken to allow the efficacy of management measures in all the focus areas in the plans to be evaluated. Instead, the Group primarily based its assessment on whether the plans made provision for an evaluation of stock status that would provide an indication of the success or otherwise of the overall Implementation Plan. However, some plans did indicate how the efficacy of specific management measures would be evaluated;
- Question B9: the Group did not assign an assessment to this question because it was not clearly emphasized in the guidelines, NSTF(06)10, and few Parties had provided details of the social and economic implications of the actions proposed. Nonetheless,

the Council has adopted ‘Guidelines for Incorporating Social and Economic Factors in Decisions under the Precautionary Approach’ and the Group believes that an exchange of information among the Parties on how social and economic factors are considered in reaching management decisions would be valuable when reports on progress in implementing plans are made. The Group felt that this element might be given further consideration by each jurisdiction in reviewing their plans.

- 3.5 For each of the questions above, each section of the plans was classed as satisfactory if it required no changes or only minor modifications; it was classed as not satisfactory if significant changes or additions were required. Where N/A is shown, the Group considers that the question concerned is not applicable.
- 3.6 The Group agreed on a number of ‘ground rules’ to guide its work in undertaking the reviews. These were as follows:
- (a) The lead reviewers were asked to lead the discussion within the Group and where unanimity emerged, to produce a final assessment to take into account any views from the Group;
  - (b) The lead reviewers would remain anonymous in the report and in the event that one or more members of the Group did not agree with a particular aspect or aspects of the review then the report would indicate that there were dissenting views but not disclose which members of the Group expressed the dissenting views unless they desired to do so;
  - (c) The Group would base its reviews only on the information presented in the Implementation Plan;
  - (d) Because not all jurisdictions were represented on the Group, it was agreed that a member of the Group from a country whose Implementation Plan was being reviewed would not be present during the review of that plan;
  - (e) While the Group recognized that the extent of the salmon stocks and the resources available to manage them varies markedly between jurisdictions, the Group took no account of these differences in undertaking its reviews;
  - (f) The Group recognized that in some jurisdictions the responsibility for management of salmon stocks rests with the riparian owners while in others the resource is managed by the public sector. The Group felt that, nonetheless, governments have or should have powers to conserve the resource and it should therefore be possible to summarise in the Implementation Plans the management actions that are expected to be taken by the appropriate bodies in the coming years.. This difference was not, therefore, taken into account in reviewing the Implementation Plans;
  - (g) In some cases Implementation Plans expressed aspirations for certain objectives but these were not considered as commitments to implement measures under the plans since they lacked specific actions and timescales;
  - (h) Following an initial review of all the plans and their revision in the light of the Group’s suggestions, all the reviews were re-examined to ensure consistency.

#### **4. Review of Implementation Plans**

4.1 Implementation Plans were received from, and reviewed by, the Group for the following jurisdictions:

- Canada, IP(06)11
- Denmark, IP(06)10
- England and Wales, IP(06)3
- Faroe Islands, IP(06)15
- Finland, IP(06)5
- Greenland, IP(06)8
- Iceland, IP(06)7
- Ireland, IP(06)14
- Northern Ireland, IP(06)1
- Norway, IP(06)12
- Russian Federation, IP(06)9
- Scotland, IP(06)2
- Spain, IP(06)13
- Sweden, IP(06)6
- USA, IP(06)4

4.2 The Group noted that the Implementation Plan for Spain applied only to the Principality of Asturias and the other Autonomous Regions with salmon interests, such as Cantabria and Galicia, had not submitted information for inclusion in the plan for Spain. Nonetheless, the Group decided to proceed with a review of the information presented since it felt this might assist the other regions in presenting information for inclusion in the Implementation Plan.

4.3 In the case of the Faroese Implementation Plan there had evidently been a communication failure and information had only been provided in relation to the management of four small rivers supporting populations of Atlantic salmon but not for the marine salmon fishery. This had not operated for several years although it is subject to decisions agreed in NASCO's North-East Atlantic Commission. The Group reviewed the plan as submitted and pointed out this discrepancy.

4.4 Implementation Plans were not received from the following jurisdictions and could not, therefore, be reviewed:

- France
- Germany
- Portugal

4.5 The lack of these plans is a concern and the Group recommends that the Council strongly urges the EU Member States concerned to submit plans without further delay so that they can be reviewed by the Group.

4.6 All of the plans differed markedly in length, clarity and content. The Group noted that the Council's intention had been that the draft Implementation Plans presented at NASCO's Twenty-Third Annual Meeting would be further developed inter-sessionally and made available to the Group by the end of October 2006 so as to allow



adequate time for their review. However, several plans were received just prior to the Group's meeting, restricting the time available for the initial reviews. The Group noted that the guidelines, NSTF(06)10, state that Implementation Plans should apply for a period of at least five years and generally require no annual modification unless circumstances change significantly. However, some Implementation Plans were labelled as 'draft' or 'provisional'. The assessment of these plans was necessarily conducted on the basis of their current content.

- 4.7 The Group noted that the majority of Implementation Plans failed to make any reference to NASCO's Agreements, Resolutions and Guidelines or the extent to which they had been applied. This is a concern, given that the purpose of the plans is to detail how the approaches in these internationally agreed measures have been incorporated into domestic management regimes.
- 4.8 The Group noted that most plans failed to include clearly identifiable measurable outputs in the form of specific management actions with timescales for their implementation.
- 4.9 The Group noted that in accordance with the NASCO Plan of Action for the Protection and Restoration of Atlantic Salmon Habitat, the Parties should establish inventories of salmon rivers. The Council has established a web-based database to hold information on salmon rivers, the habitat they contain and salmon production data provided by the Parties and relevant jurisdictions. Few of the Implementation Plans contained reference to the establishment of inventories or commitments to contribute to the NASCO database.
- 4.10 While the Group may have inadvertently missed points of detail, it believes that its overall assessments of the strengths and weaknesses of the plans are broadly correct. While the Group's Terms of Reference allow for different views to be expressed in presenting its findings, there was unanimous agreement on the assessment of all of the Implementation Plans. The Group was aware that to agree its working methods and thoroughly review fifteen plans, amounting to approximately 300 pages, was a somewhat daunting task in a four-day meeting. It believes, however, that by developing its initial working methods and completing the initial reviews before the meeting it was able to work efficiently during its meeting and undertake checks to ensure consistency in the reviews.

## **5. Adequacy of Implementation Plans**

- 5.1 The Group's assessments of the fifteen Implementation Plans are presented in alphabetical order by jurisdiction in document IP(07)5, Annex 3. The Group's assessments for each of the questions referred to in paragraph 3.3 above for all jurisdictions are presented in document IP(07)6, Annex 4.
- 5.2 It is clear from these reviews that the guidelines, NSTF(06)10, have been interpreted differently by the different jurisdictions. The plans that were assessed to be most satisfactory contained clear references to the NASCO Agreements and Resolutions and contained an action plan of measures to be implemented over the next five years, clearly referenced and with specific timescales for implementation of each measure. The Group believes that if there is to be progress with implementation of NASCO's Resolutions and Agreements, as proposed under the Next Steps for NASCO strategy,

it will be important that all the Implementation Plans provide a clear statement of the management actions, consistent with the NASCO Resolutions and Agreements, that are to be implemented over the next five years, with specific timescales for each action. This would then enable progress towards these goals to be assessed through the annual reports by the Parties.

## **6. Arrangements for Special Session during the Twenty-Fourth Annual Meeting**

6.1 The Group discussed the presentation of its findings during the Special Session at NASCO's Twenty-Fourth Annual Meeting. It was recognised that the review of Implementation Plans was a central element of the "Next Steps for NASCO" Strategy and that it would be important to present the findings in a stimulating, diplomatic and informative manner. The Group discussed the content of its presentation, which might consist of an introduction by the Coordinator, setting the scene and describing the approach used by the Review Group in conducting its assessments. The results of the review would then be presented and it was suggested that this might be best achieved by grouping the Implementation Plans according to, for example, whether or not they contained references to NASCO agreements, to action plans or to action plans with timescales. The presentation might then select particular aspects of the plans and highlight examples of best practice in these plans, e.g. with regard to describing stock status, threats to the resource, existing management measures and future management approaches. Mary Colligan and Chris Poupard were asked to liaise in developing an outline of the presentation for consideration by the Group, which would then need to resolve who would deliver the presentation.

6.2 The Group noted that its Terms of Reference indicated that at the Special Session the Parties would have the opportunity to respond to the *Ad Hoc* Review Group's findings by reporting on any steps they have taken, or intend to take, to address the Group's suggestions.

## **7. Arrangements for the Future Work of the Group**

7.1 The Group agreed that a further meeting would not be necessary at this stage but might be required in the autumn to review the revised plans and any additional plans received. It was noted that the Council had decided to appoint a further *Ad Hoc* Review Group in relation to assessing the reports by the Parties on the first focus area but that the topic of this focus area and the Terms of Reference for that group and its participants would be agreed at the Twenty-Fourth Annual Meeting.

## **8. Report of the Meeting**

8.1 The Group agreed a report of its meeting.

## **9. Any Other Business**

9.1 There was no other business.

## **10. Close of Meeting**

10.1 The Coordinator thanked participants for their contributions and closed the meeting.

***Ad Hoc Review Group on Implementation Plans***

**Palomar Hotel, Washington DC, USA**

**12 – 16 March 2006**

***List of Participants***

**Reviewers:**

Ms Mary Colligan, National Marine Fisheries Service, USA

Mr Arni Isaksson, Agricultural Authority of Iceland, Iceland

Mr Andras Kristiansen, Ministry of Fisheries and Maritime Affairs, Faroe Islands

Dr Gareth Porter, WWF (US), USA

Mr Ted Potter, CEFAS, UK

Mr Chris Poupard, Chairman of NASCO's NGOs, UK

**Secretariat:**

Dr Malcolm Windsor, NASCO, UK (Coordinator)

Dr Peter Hutchinson, NASCO, UK (Rapporteur)

**IP(07)3**

***Ad Hoc Review Group on Implementation Plans***  
**Palomar Hotel, Washington DC, USA**  
**12 – 16 March 2006**

**A G E N D A**

1. Opening of the Meeting by the Coordinator
2. Adoption of the Agenda
3. Review of Terms of Reference and Consideration of Working Methods
4. Review of Implementation Plans

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Paper No.</b>
Canada	IP(06)11
Denmark	IP(06)10
England and Wales	IP(06)3
Faroe Islands	IP(06)15
Finland	IP(06)5
Greenland	IP(06)8
Iceland	IP(06)7
Ireland	IP(06)14
Northern Ireland	IP(06)1
Norway	IP(06)12
Russian Federation	IP(06)9
Scotland	IP(06)2
Spain	IP(06)13
Sweden	IP(06)6
USA	IP(06)4

5. Adequacy of Implementation Plans
6. Arrangements for Special Session during the Twenty-Fourth Annual Meeting
7. Arrangements for the Future Work of the Group
8. Report of the Meeting
9. Any Other Business
10. Close of Meeting

## IP(07)5

### Review of Implementation Plan CANADA

The following assessment of the Plan refers to the key requirements detailed in the Guidelines for the Preparation of NASCO ‘Implementation Plans’ and for Reporting on Progress (NSTF(06)10). Under each of these headings the Plan has been classed as satisfactory if it requires no changes or only minor modifications; it has been classed as not satisfactory if significant changes or additions are required. Where N/A is shown the Group considers that the question concerned is not applicable.

<b>A. Structure and Format of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
The Guidelines indicate a number of general criteria for the Plan and indicate that they should be clearly understandable by both managers and stakeholders:		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>A1</b>	<b>Does the plan apply to all stocks/fisheries managed within the jurisdiction?</b> ○ <i>The plan describes approximately 900 salmon rivers and associated fisheries in four management areas</i>	X	
<b>A2</b>	<b>Does the plan apply for a period of at least 5 years?</b> ○ <i>The plan describes measures to be implemented for 2006-2010</i>	X	
<b>A3</b>	<b>Does the plan make reference to NASCO’s Guidelines, Resolutions and Agreements?</b> ○ <i>Specific reference is made to the appropriate NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines</i>	X	
<b>A4</b>	<b>Is the plan written in a clear and concise form for easy accessibility and reference [e.g. to facilitate future reporting and cross-referencing to the plan]?</b> ○ <i>The text is clearly written, but proposed activities are not presented in a way that will facilitate reporting and cross-referencing to the plan</i>		X
<b>A5</b>	<b>Does the plan describe a process and outputs that are open to critical evaluation?</b> ○ <i>The plan describes the science well but does not describe outputs that will allow critical evaluation, due to the lack of clear commitments and timescales</i>		X

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
The Guidelines propose that the plans should contain the elements below, and should describe measurable outputs and include reference to appropriate NASCO agreements.		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B1</b>	<b>Does the plan provide a general picture of the resource and the management structure in place?</b> ○ <i>Includes a description of the salmon resource and the management structures</i>	X	

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B2</b>	<p><b>Does the plan describe the current status of stocks that will allow for future comparison?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan summarises the abundance of stocks at a provincial level. Assessments are based on 75 rivers and these are used as indicators for other rivers within a region</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan includes a description of stock diversity and other aspects of stock status</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>B3</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the threats to stocks and outline current management measures?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Identifies a range of factors which may impact upon salmon stocks and outlines current management measures</i></li> <li>○ <i>An explanation of how threats have been prioritized would be useful</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>B4</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to review and modify fishery regulations?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>References to measurable outputs against which subsequent reports can be assessed are limited and do not go beyond 2008</i></li> <li>○ <i>Outputs and timescales for managing recreational fisheries in the future are not described</i></li> <li>○ <i>The process and timescale for evaluating the effectiveness of the measures introduced in 2006 to reduce the catch of 2SW fish in coastal areas of Labrador lack specificity</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B5</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to assess habitat quality, identify problems and prioritise actions?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan indicates a continuation of the current approach to habitat management, but with the exception of the acid rain program, references to measurable outputs by which subsequent reports can be assessed are missing</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B6</b>	<p><b>Does the plan include a summary of the approaches that will be adopted to minimise adverse effects of aquaculture and control introductions and transfers?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan describes fairly clearly the current management approach to aquaculture and introductions and transfers already in place, but specific future actions and timescales are lacking</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B7</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to address other influences?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Activities are identified in relation to SALSEA with schedules for reporting. Other influences are identified (contaminants and invasive species), but no actions are identified</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B8</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Identifies monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>B9</b>	<p><b>How does the plan consider socio-economic issues?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Reference is made to the commitments of federal Canada to Aboriginals for food, social and ceremonial purposes as a first priority after conservation</i></li> </ul>		

## Review of Implementation Plan DENMARK

The following assessment of the Plan refers to the key requirements detailed in the Guidelines for the Preparation of NASCO 'Implementation Plans' and for Reporting on Progress (NSTF(06)10). Under each of these headings the Plan has been classed as satisfactory if it requires no changes or only minor modifications; it has been classed as not satisfactory if significant changes or additions are required. Where N/A is shown the Group considers that the question concerned is not applicable.

<b>A. Structure and Format of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The Guidelines indicate a number of general criteria for the Plan and indicate that they should be clearly understandable by both managers and stakeholders:			
<b>A1</b>	<b>Does the plan apply to all stocks/fisheries managed within the jurisdiction?</b> ○ <i>The plan describes 9 rivers (which historically had salmon) and associated fisheries</i>	X	
<b>A2</b>	<b>Does the plan apply for a period of at least 5 years?</b> ○ <i>There is no indication of a clear timescale for the plan, although reference is made to a National Management Plan</i>		X
<b>A3</b>	<b>Does the plan make reference to NASCO's Guidelines, Resolutions and Agreements?</b> ○ <i>There is no specific reference to the NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines</i>		X
<b>A4</b>	<b>Is the plan written in a clear and concise form for easy accessibility and reference [e.g. to facilitate future reporting and cross-referencing to the plan]?</b> ○ <i>The plan has limited information and proposed activities are not presented in a way that will facilitate reporting and cross-referencing to the plan</i>		X
<b>A5</b>	<b>Does the plan describe a process and outputs that are open to critical evaluation?</b> ○ <i>The plan does not describe outputs that will allow critical evaluation, due to the lack of clear commitments and timescales</i>		X

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The Guidelines propose that the plans should contain the elements below, and should describe measurable outputs and include reference to appropriate NASCO agreements.			
<b>B1</b>	<b>Does the plan provide a general picture of the resource and the management structure in place?</b> ○ <i>Includes a limited description of the salmon resource and management entities</i>	X	
<b>B2</b>	<b>Does the plan describe the current status of stocks that will allow for future comparison?</b> ○ <i>The plan does not describe a system in place to assess the status of stocks</i>		X

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B3</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the threats to stocks and outline current management measures?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Limited information is provided on threats and current management measures are not described</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B4</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to review and modify fishery regulations?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>There is very limited information on fisheries management and no measurable outputs or timescales</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B5</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to assess habitat quality, identify problems and prioritise actions?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan identifies some actions, but lacks specific timescales</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B6</b>	<p><b>Does the plan include a summary of the approaches that will be adopted to minimise adverse effects of aquaculture and control introductions and transfers?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan identifies some actions, but these are not very clear and lack specific timescales</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B7</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to address other influences?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No other influences are identified</i></li> </ul>	N/A	
<b>B8</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not address this issue</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B9</b>	<p><b>How does the plan consider socio-economic issues?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not mention consideration of socio-economic factors</i></li> </ul>		



## Review of Implementation Plan ENGLAND AND WALES

The following assessment of the Plan refers to the key requirements detailed in the Guidelines for the Preparation of NASCO ‘Implementation Plans’ and for Reporting on Progress (NSTF(06)10). Under each of these headings the Plan has been classed as satisfactory if it requires no changes or only minor modifications; it has been classed as not satisfactory if significant changes or additions are required. Where N/A is shown the Group considers that the question concerned is not applicable.

<b>A. Structure and Format of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The Guidelines indicate a number of general criteria for the Plan and indicate that they should be clearly understandable by both managers and stakeholders:			
<b>A1</b>	<b>Does the plan apply to all stocks/fisheries managed within the jurisdiction?</b> ○ <i>The plan describes 78 salmon rivers and associated fisheries</i>	X	
<b>A2</b>	<b>Does the plan apply for a period of at least 5 years?</b> ○ <i>The plan states that each Salmon Action Plan (SAP) contains an agreed list of actions over a 5-year lifetime</i>	X	
<b>A3</b>	<b>Does the plan make reference to NASCO’s Guidelines, Resolutions and Agreements?</b> ○ <i>Specific reference is made to the appropriate NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines</i>	X	
<b>A4</b>	<b>Is the plan written in a clear and concise form for easy accessibility and reference [e.g. to facilitate future reporting and cross-referencing to the plan]?</b> ○ <i>The text is clearly written, with numbered actions</i> ○ <i>Identification of references or source data would be useful</i>	X	
<b>A5</b>	<b>Does the plan describe a process and outputs that are open to critical evaluation?</b> ○ <i>The Actions to be undertaken are very clearly specified in the plan; although the overall schedule is for 5 years the timescale associated with each individual action is not always clear</i>	X	

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The Guidelines propose that the plans should contain the elements below, and should describe measurable outputs and include reference to appropriate NASCO agreements.			
<b>B1</b>	<b>Does the plan provide a general picture of the resource and the management structure in place?</b> ○ <i>Includes a description of the salmon resource and the management structures</i>	X	

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B2</b>	<p><b>Does the plan describe the current status of stocks that will allow for future comparison?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan summarises the abundance of stocks at a national level based upon the ICES PFA model and the status of individual stocks assessed against conservation limits</i></li> <li>○ <i>There are clear and measurable objectives for each river that the stock should be meeting or exceeding its CL in at least 4/5 years</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>B3</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the threats to stocks and outline current management measures?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Identifies a range of factors which may impact upon salmon stocks and outlines current management measures</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>B4</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to review and modify fishery regulations?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>In general the plan contains specific actions and associated timescales, but additional specificity would be helpful in the following areas</i></li> <li>○ <i>Plan notes that 53% of rivers are not meeting CLs, but the plan does not appear to prioritize action on these rivers</i></li> <li>○ <i>Plan states that there is a national policy to phase out mixed stock fisheries, but a specific timescale is not specified and the plan lacks urgency in dealing with this issue</i></li> <li>○ <i>Plan indicates limited regulatory control over some fishing effort, which raises question of how goals will be achieved</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>B5</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to assess habitat quality, identify problems and prioritise actions?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan describes the process of reviewing and updating Salmon Action Plans as the approach for addressing habitat</i></li> <li>○ <i>These plans cover a 5-year timescale and contain specific actions and progress against these actions is reviewed annually and will be provided to NASCO</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>B6</b>	<p><b>Does the plan include a summary of the approaches that will be adopted to minimise adverse effects of aquaculture and control introductions and transfers?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does include specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan comprehensively addresses all of the relevant issues and has appropriate references to NASCO guidelines and resolutions</i></li> <li>○ <i>It would be useful to identify what, in Action 13, is considered a “significant” increase in the incidence of salmon farm escapees in monitored rivers that would trigger “appropriate action” (Note: England and Wales does not have marine aquaculture)</i></li> <li>○ <i>It would be useful to provide detail on the terms of current national policies for introductions and transfers and how they are consistent with NASCO principles and it is not clear how reporting on Action 12 will be completed</i></li> <li>○ <i>Action 14 includes completion and reporting, but no commitment to take action in light of that report</i></li> </ul>	X	

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>	<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B7 Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to address other influences?</b> ○ <i>Reporting on research into factors affecting marine survival is identified</i>	X	
<b>B8 Does the plan provide a summary of monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures?</b> ○ <i>Identifies monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures</i> ○ <i>The plan clearly sets out a process for evaluating river by river progress within Salmon Action Plans</i>	X	

<b>B9 How does the plan consider socio-economic issues?</b> ○ <i>One of the main objectives identified is to optimize the total economic value of surplus stocks and the plan identifies when socio-economic values are addressed in developing fishing controls for salmon fisheries</i> ○ <i>Salmon Action Plans include identification of main factors limiting performance and drawing up and costing a list of options to address these</i> ○ <i>Plan states that existing licensees who are dependent upon fishing for their livelihood retain the right to receive a licence as long as they wish</i>		
---	--	--

## Review of Implementation Plan FAROE ISLANDS

The following assessment of the Plan refers to the key requirements detailed in the Guidelines for the Preparation of NASCO ‘Implementation Plans’ and for Reporting on Progress (NSTF(06)10). Under each of these headings the Plan has been classed as satisfactory if it requires no changes or only minor modifications; it has been classed as not satisfactory if significant changes or additions are required. Where N/A is shown the Group considers that the question concerned is not applicable.

<b>A. Structure and Format of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The Guidelines indicate a number of general criteria for the Plan and indicate that they should be clearly understandable by both managers and stakeholders:			
<b>A1</b>	<b>Does the plan apply to all stocks/fisheries managed within the jurisdiction?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan states that the Faroe Islands has no rivers with historic/natural salmon stocks, but the plan describes four stocks that have been established (and may be maintained) by stocking programmes</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan makes no mention of the large mixed stock of salmon within the Faroese EEZ or the fishery that has operated in the area in the past but not in recent years</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>A2</b>	<b>Does the plan apply for a period of at least 5 years?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>There is no indication of a clear timescale for the plan</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>A3</b>	<b>Does the plan make reference to NASCO’s Guidelines, Resolutions and Agreements?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>There is no specific reference to the NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>A4</b>	<b>Is the plan written in a clear and concise form for easy accessibility and reference [e.g. to facilitate future reporting and cross-referencing to the plan]?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The text is clearly written, but proposed activities are not presented in a way that will facilitate reporting and cross-referencing to the plan</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>A5</b>	<b>Does the plan describe a process and outputs that are open to critical evaluation?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not describe outputs that will allow critical evaluation, due to the lack of clear commitments and timescales</i></li> </ul>		X

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The Guidelines propose that the plans should contain the elements below, and should describe measurable outputs and include reference to appropriate NASCO agreements.			
<b>B1</b>	<b>Does the plan provide a general picture of the resource and the management structure in place?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The description of the salmon resource is limited to a description of the four artificially established river stocks and limited information is provided on the authorities or legislation by which they are managed</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan makes no mention of the presence of stocks from many European countries in Faroese waters and the management structure that controls fishing activities</i></li> </ul>		X

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B2</b>	<p><b>Does the plan describe the current status of stocks that will allow for future comparison?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Status of the river stocks is assessed by catches and stocking levels, which are both stable, but the extent of natural production in the rivers is unclear and no information is provided on the status of stocks in Faroese marine waters</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B3</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the threats to stocks and outline current management measures?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Limited information is provided on threats and current management measures are not described</i></li> <li><i>The plan considers the fisheries affecting the river stocks but not the potential marine fishery</i></li> <li><i>There are said to be no external factors affecting freshwater and estuarine habitat, but it is unclear how this has been assessed</i></li> <li><i>The plan mentions potential effects of aquaculture, but the effects of continued stocking are not considered</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B4</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to review and modify fishery regulations?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The plan lacks specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li><i>The plan makes no mention of the management regime for controlling legal or illegal fishing for salmon in the sea</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B5</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to assess habitat quality, identify problems and prioritise actions?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The plan does not include specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B6</b>	<p><b>Does the plan include a summary of the approaches that will be adopted to minimise adverse effects of aquaculture and control introductions and transfers?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The plan does not include specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B7</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to address other influences?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>No other influences are identified</i></li> </ul>	N/A	
<b>B8</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The plan does include a reference to evaluation, but does not describe any specific activities</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B9</b>	<p><b>How does the plan consider socio-economic issues?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The plan does not mention consideration of socio-economic factors</i></li> </ul>		

## Review of Implementation Plan FINLAND

The following assessment of the Plan refers to the key requirements detailed in the Guidelines for the Preparation of NASCO ‘Implementation Plans’ and for Reporting on Progress (NSTF(06)10). Under each of these headings the Plan has been classed as satisfactory if it requires no changes or only minor modifications; it has been classed as not satisfactory if significant changes or additions are required. Where N/A is shown the Group considers that the question concerned is not applicable.

<b>A. Structure and Format of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The Guidelines indicate a number of general criteria for the Plan and indicate that they should be clearly understandable by both managers and stakeholders:			
<b>A1</b>	<b>Does the plan apply to all stocks/fisheries managed within the jurisdiction?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan describes three rivers and associated fisheries, one of which has an impassable barrier in its lower reaches in Russia. The most important river is the Teno</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>A2</b>	<b>Does the plan apply for a period of at least 5 years?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>There is no indication of a clear timescale for the plan</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>A3</b>	<b>Does the plan make reference to NASCO’s Guidelines, Resolutions and Agreements?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Limited reference is made to the Decision Structure</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>A4</b>	<b>Is the plan written in a clear and concise form for easy accessibility and reference [e.g. to facilitate future reporting and cross-referencing to the plan]?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The text is clearly written, but proposed activities are not presented in a way that will facilitate reporting and cross-referencing to the plan</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>A5</b>	<b>Does the plan describe a process and outputs that are open to critical evaluation?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not describe outputs that will allow critical evaluation, due to the lack of clear commitments and timescales</i></li> </ul>		X

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The Guidelines propose that the plans should contain the elements below, and should describe measurable outputs and include reference to appropriate NASCO agreements.			
<b>B1</b>	<b>Does the plan provide a general picture of the resource and the management structure in place?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Includes a description of the salmon resource and the management structures</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>B2</b>	<b>Does the plan describe the current status of stocks that will allow for future comparison?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The method for assessing the status of stocks is described, but there are conflicting statements on stock status, and the basis for future comparison is not clear</i></li> </ul>		X

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B3</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the threats to stocks and outline current management measures?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan identifies fisheries and aquaculture as current threats</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan is unclear with respect to the management of the recreational fishery and threats to habitat because it refers to enhancement work carried out</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B4</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to review and modify fishery regulations?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan lacks specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan does not refer to the NASCO Decision Structure and there is no reference to future management measures to address either the coastal fishery in Norway or the recreational fishery</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B5</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to assess habitat quality, identify problems and prioritise actions?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan lacks specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B6</b>	<p><b>Does the plan include a summary of the approaches that will be adopted to minimise adverse effects of aquaculture and control introductions and transfers?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>All aquaculture activities and transfers of live fish and eggs from other catchment are strictly forbidden in the catchments area of the rivers Teno and Näätäinjoki, but it would be useful to describe the actions planned to enforce this prohibition</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan identifies issues with escaped farmed salmon that would appear to warrant cooperative action with Norway</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>B7</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to address other influences?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No other influences are identified</i></li> </ul>	N/A	
<b>B8</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not address this issue</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B9</b>	<p><b>How does the plan consider socio-economic issues?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan highlights the socio-economic importance of salmon to the local communities</i></li> </ul>		

## Review of Implementation Plan GREENLAND

The following assessment of the Plan refers to the key requirements detailed in the Guidelines for the Preparation of NASCO ‘Implementation Plans’ and for Reporting on Progress (NSTF(06)10). Under each of these headings the Plan has been classed as satisfactory if it requires no changes or only minor modifications; it has been classed as not satisfactory if significant changes or additions are required. Where N/A is shown the Group considers that the question concerned is not applicable.

<b>A. Structure and Format of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The Guidelines indicate a number of general criteria for the Plan and indicate that they should be clearly understandable by both managers and stakeholders:			
<b>A1</b>	<b>Does the plan apply to all stocks/fisheries managed within the jurisdiction?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan focuses on the mixed stock fishery off West Greenland and makes mention of one salmon river, the Kapisillit, in Godthab Fjord</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>A2</b>	<b>Does the plan apply for a period of at least 5 years?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The quota for the mixed stock fishery is subject to negotiation within NASCO so the provision for a 5-year timescale does not apply</i></li> </ul>	N/A	
<b>A3</b>	<b>Does the plan make reference to NASCO’s Guidelines, Resolutions and Agreements?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>There is no specific reference to the NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>A4</b>	<b>Is the plan written in a clear and concise form for easy accessibility and reference [e.g. to facilitate future reporting and cross-referencing to the plan]?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The text is clearly written, but proposed activities are not presented in a way that will facilitate reporting and cross-referencing to the plan</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>A5</b>	<b>Does the plan describe a process and outputs that are open to critical evaluation?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>It is recognized that the scope of the plan is limited to the monitoring and management of the internal-use-only fishery in Greenland, but identifies several actions related to improving catch data</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan does not describe outputs that will allow critical evaluation, due to the lack of clear commitments and timescales</i></li> </ul>		X

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The Guidelines propose that the plans should contain the elements below, and should describe measurable outputs and include reference to appropriate NASCO agreements.			
<b>B1</b>	<b>Does the plan provide a general picture of the resource and the management structure in place?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Includes a description of the salmon resource at sea and the management structures</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan identifies, but does not describe, the river Kapisillit in Godthab Fjord</i></li> </ul>	X	



<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B2</b>	<p><b>Does the plan describe the current status of stocks that will allow for future comparison?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Status of stocks are well described, based on the ICES advice, and the importance of diversity is recognized</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>B3</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the threats to stocks and outline current management measures?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Threats are not discussed in detail because these principally impact stocks in rivers of origin</i></li> </ul>	N/A	
<b>B4</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to review and modify fishery regulations?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The plan identifies the importance of providing reliable data on the fishery and provides a measurable indicator as the number of licensees reporting compared with the number of licences issued, but does not identify specific future actions to address this issue and the associated timescales</i></li> <li><i>While not the responsibility of Greenlandic authorities, we note that the WGC does not utilize the NASCO Decision Structure</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B5</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to assess habitat quality, identify problems and prioritise actions?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The plan does not identify any threats to the marine habitat in West Greenland</i></li> <li><i>As noted previously, the plan is necessarily limited in scope to the management and reporting on the fishery in Greenland</i></li> </ul>	N/A	
<b>B6</b>	<p><b>Does the plan include a summary of the approaches that will be adopted to minimise adverse effects of aquaculture and control introductions and transfers?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>As noted previously, the plan is necessarily limited in scope to the management and reporting on the internal use fishery in Greenland</i></li> <li><i>There are no salmon aquaculture facilities in Greenland</i></li> </ul>	N/A	
<b>B7</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to address other influences?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>No other influences are identified</i></li> </ul>	N/A	
<b>B8</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Identifies measurable indicator for efficacy of management measures designed to improve accuracy of estimates of the fishery</i></li> <li><i>No mention is made of the international sampling program</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>B9</b>	<p><b>How does the plan consider socio-economic issues?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The plan does not mention consideration of socio-economic factors and their role in fishery management decisions</i></li> </ul>		

## Review of Implementation Plan ICELAND

The following assessment of the Plan refers to the key requirements detailed in the Guidelines for the Preparation of NASCO ‘Implementation Plans’ and for Reporting on Progress (NSTF(06)10). Under each of these headings the Plan has been classed as satisfactory if it requires no changes or only minor modifications; it has been classed as not satisfactory if significant changes or additions are required. Where N/A is shown the Group considers that the question concerned is not applicable.

<b>A. Structure and Format of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The Guidelines indicate a number of general criteria for the Plan and indicate that they should be clearly understandable by both managers and stakeholders:			
<b>A1</b>	<b>Does the plan apply to all stocks/fisheries managed within the jurisdiction?</b> ○ <i>The plan describes 250 rivers in Iceland and addresses management of salmon in ‘about 80 rivers’</i>	X	
<b>A2</b>	<b>Does the plan apply for a period of at least 5 years?</b> ○ <i>The plan refers to ‘A five year management plan’, and the proposed activities would appear to address such a period</i>	X	
<b>A3</b>	<b>Does the plan make reference to NASCO’s Guidelines, Resolutions and Agreements?</b> ○ <i>There is only one reference to NASCO Resolutions Agreements or Guidelines in the plan, which is specific to aquaculture</i>		X
<b>A4</b>	<b>Is the plan written in a clear and concise form for easy accessibility and reference [e.g. to facilitate future reporting and cross-referencing to the plan]?</b> ○ <i>The text is clearly written, and includes bullet points for proposed activities, but the use of numbers would facilitate reporting and cross-referencing to the plan</i>	X	
<b>A5</b>	<b>Does the plan describe a process and outputs that are open to critical evaluation?</b> ○ <i>The plan does not describe outputs that will allow critical evaluation, due to the lack of timescales</i>		X

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The Guidelines propose that the plans should contain the elements below, and should describe measurable outputs and include reference to appropriate NASCO agreements.			
<b>B1</b>	<b>Does the plan provide a general picture of the resource and the management structure in place?</b> ○ <i>Includes a description of the salmon resource and the management structures</i>	X	
<b>B2</b>	<b>Does the plan describe the current status of stocks that will allow for future comparison?</b> ○ <i>The plan summarises the abundance of stocks at a national level based primarily upon catch statistics and the reliability of these data is considered to provide a basis for future comparison at a river level</i>	X	

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B3</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the threats to stocks and outline current management measures?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan provides a list and brief explanation of the 10 main factors affecting the salmon habitat and prioritises these across Icelandic rivers as a whole. It also indicates areas where specific problems are more prevalent</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>B4</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to review and modify fishery regulations?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan identifies specific actions, but does not provide associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>Seven management actions are listed; two refer to maintaining the status quo; and three simply refer to ‘encouraging’ specific activities. The remaining two refer to limiting mixed stock netting and by-catches, but do not indicate timescales, nor the actions that will be taken or the mechanisms that will be used</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B5</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to assess habitat quality, identify problems and prioritise actions?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan includes actions, but lacks specific timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>National authorities have limited powers to carry out remedial habitat work, but through licensing there are restrictions on owners so as to control damaging activities such as gravel removal</i></li> <li>○ <i>Some of the actions are vague (e.g. “explore the possibility...”)</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B6</b>	<p><b>Does the plan include a summary of the approaches that will be adopted to minimise adverse effects of aquaculture and control introductions and transfers?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does include objectives, but would benefit from specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>Despite lack of timescales there is a robust management system in place for a limited salmon farming industry</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan highlights a challenge related to introductions, and it is not clear how this will be addressed</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan indicates that Iceland has been reviewing and updating its laws and regulations on aquaculture in line with the NASCO agreements</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>B7</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to address other influences?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No other influences are identified</i></li> </ul>	N/A	
<b>B8</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Identifies monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>B9</b>	<p><b>How does the plan consider socio-economic issues?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan identifies the economic value of angling</i></li> <li>○ <i>It is clear that decisions about the balance of exploitation between rod and net fisheries has been driven in large part by economic considerations</i></li> </ul>		

## Review of Implementation Plan IRELAND

The following assessment of the Plan refers to the key requirements detailed in the Guidelines for the Preparation of NASCO ‘Implementation Plans’ and for Reporting on Progress (NSTF(06)10). Under each of these headings the Plan has been classed as satisfactory if it requires no changes or only minor modifications; it has been classed as not satisfactory if significant changes or additions are required. Where N/A is shown the Group considers that the question concerned is not applicable.

<b>A. Structure and Format of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		Yes	No
The Guidelines indicate a number of general criteria for the Plan and indicate that they should be clearly understandable by both managers and stakeholders:			
<b>A1</b>	<b>Does the plan apply to all stocks/fisheries managed within the jurisdiction?</b> ○ <i>The plan describes 148 salmon rivers and associated fisheries</i>	X	
<b>A2</b>	<b>Does the plan apply for a period of at least 5 years?</b> ○ <i>The plan does mention 2007 and beyond, but there is no indication of a clear timescale for the plan</i>		X
<b>A3</b>	<b>Does the plan make reference to NASCO’s Guidelines, Resolutions and Agreements?</b> ○ <i>The plan has a special section on NASCO obligations, which mentions the Precautionary Approach</i>	X	
<b>A4</b>	<b>Is the plan written in a clear and concise form for easy accessibility and reference [e.g. to facilitate future reporting and cross-referencing to the plan]?</b> ○ <i>The text is clearly written, but proposed activities are not presented in a way that will facilitate reporting and cross-referencing to the plan</i>		X
<b>A5</b>	<b>Does the plan describe a process and outputs that are open to critical evaluation?</b> ○ <i>The plan can be evaluated with respect to fisheries management, but management of habitat, aquaculture and introductions do not have measurable outputs</i>		X

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		Yes	No
The Guidelines propose that the plans should contain the elements below, and should describe measurable outputs and include reference to appropriate NASCO agreements.			
<b>B1</b>	<b>Does the plan provide a general picture of the resource and the management structure in place?</b> ○ <i>Includes a description of the salmon resource and the management structures</i>	X	
<b>B2</b>	<b>Does the plan describe the current status of stocks that will allow for future comparison?</b> ○ <i>The plan summarises the abundance of stocks at a national level based upon the ICES PFA model and the status of individual stocks assessed against conservation limits, and recognizes the importance of diversity of stocks</i>	X	

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B3</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the threats to stocks and outline current management measures?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan describes threats from fisheries and aquaculture in detail, but provides very little information on other threats</i></li> <li>○ <i>Figure 5 is informative, but the description of current management measures for habitat is very limited</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>B4</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to review and modify fishery regulations?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan includes specific actions and near-term associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>There is a detailed description of harvest guidelines before and after the closure of the drift net fishery</i></li> <li>○ <i>While there are no detailed plans for future actions after 2007, this is understandable given the major changes currently taking place in fisheries management</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>B5</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to assess habitat quality, identify problems and prioritise actions?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not include specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>There is reference to the development of a GIS database to link river habitat and water quality</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B6</b>	<p><b>Does the plan include a summary of the approaches that will be adopted to minimise adverse effects of aquaculture and control introductions and transfers?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not include specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>There is a description of the influences that aquaculture may have on wild stocks but it contains no commitments</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B7</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to address other influences?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No other influences are identified</i></li> </ul>	N/A	
<b>B8</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Identifies monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures, but there is a lack of monitoring and evaluation specific to aquaculture</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B9</b>	<p><b>How does the plan consider socio-economic issues?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>A hardship fund to compensate those that lost their livelihood through the closure of the drift net fishery</i></li> </ul>		

## Review of Implementation Plan NORTHERN IRELAND

The following assessment of the Plan refers to the key requirements detailed in the Guidelines for the Preparation of NASCO ‘Implementation Plans’ and for Reporting on Progress (NSTF(06)10). Under each of these headings the Plan has been classed as satisfactory if it requires no changes or only minor modifications; it has been classed as not satisfactory if significant changes or additions are required. Where N/A is shown the Group considers that the question concerned is not applicable.

<b>A. Structure and Format of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The Guidelines indicate a number of general criteria for the Plan and indicate that they should be clearly understandable by both managers and stakeholders			
<b>A1</b>	<b>Does the plan apply to all stocks/fisheries managed within the jurisdiction?</b> ○ <i>The plan describes 27 salmon rivers and associated fisheries</i>	X	
<b>A2</b>	<b>Does the plan apply for a period of at least 5 years?</b> ○ <i>There is no indication of a clear timescale for the plan</i>		X
<b>A3</b>	<b>Does the plan make reference to NASCO’s Guidelines, Resolutions and Agreements?</b> ○ <i>An introductory reference is made to the NASCO agreements</i>	X	
<b>A4</b>	<b>Is the plan written in a clear and concise form for easy accessibility and reference [e.g. to facilitate future reporting and cross-referencing to the plan]?</b> ○ <i>The text is clearly written, but proposed activities are not presented in a way that will facilitate reporting and cross-referencing to the plan</i>		X
<b>A5</b>	<b>Does the plan describe a process and outputs that are open to critical evaluation?</b> ○ <i>The plan does not describe outputs that will allow critical evaluation, due to the lack of clear commitments and timescales</i>		X

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The Guidelines propose that the plans should contain the elements below, and should describe measurable outputs and include reference to appropriate NASCO agreements.			
<b>B1</b>	<b>Does the plan provide a general picture of the resource and the management structure in place?</b> ○ <i>Includes a description of the salmon resource and the management structures</i>	X	
<b>B2</b>	<b>Does the plan describe the current status of stocks that will allow for future comparison?</b> ○ <i>The plan summarises the abundance of stocks at a national level based upon the ICES PFA model and indicates the use of specific targets for most individual rivers</i>	X	
<b>B3</b>	<b>Does the plan provide a summary of the threats to stocks and outline current management measures?</b> ○ <i>Identifies a range of factors which may impact upon salmon stocks and outlines current management measures</i>	X	

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B4</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to review and modify fishery regulations?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan lacks specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>Specific actions and timescales are needed for the following:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>“Work continues” to extend CL setting to all salmon-producing rivers in the FCB area of Northern Ireland, and to install fish counters to enable compliance to be assessed in key indicator rivers</i></li> <li>○ <i>“Further work” to refine these CLs by using available river-specific habitat data is “in progress”</i></li> <li>○ <i>The Loughs Agency has established CLs and “is planning” to extend the compliance monitoring</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>○ <i>Section 4.1.2 describes the review process generally, but lacks specificity as to what will happen over the next 5 years and what the output will be</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B5</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to assess habitat quality, identify problems and prioritise actions?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan lacks specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan states that a process is being developed for instream habitat restoration but no timescale or outputs are identified</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan does not identify the process and procedures in place to prevent impacts to habitat</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B6</b>	<p><b>Does the plan include a summary of the approaches that will be adopted to minimise adverse effects of aquaculture and control introductions and transfers?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not include specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>States “work is underway” to develop a stocking policy for Northern Ireland, but no timescale is specified</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B7</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to address other influences?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan identifies other influences, including exploitation by mammals and birds, low marine survival, and cormorant predation, but does not include any specific actions to address these other influences</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B8</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Identifies monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>B9</b>	<b>How does the plan consider socio-economic issues?</b>		
	○ <i>There is no specific mention of socio-economic issues in the plan</i>		

## Review of Implementation Plan NORWAY

The following assessment of the Plan refers to the key requirements detailed in the Guidelines for the Preparation of NASCO 'Implementation Plans' and for Reporting on Progress (NSTF(06)10). Under each of these headings the Plan has been classed as satisfactory if it requires no changes or only minor modifications; it has been classed as not satisfactory if significant changes or additions are required. Where N/A is shown the Group considers that the question concerned is not applicable.

<b>A. Structure and Format of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The Guidelines indicate a number of general criteria for the Plan and indicate that they should be clearly understandable by both managers and stakeholders:			
<b>A1</b>	<b>Does the plan apply to all stocks/fisheries managed within the jurisdiction?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan describes 446 salmon rivers and associated fisheries, of which 45 stocks are thought to be extinct</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>A2</b>	<b>Does the plan apply for a period of at least 5 years?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan describes management measures extending until 2012 and beyond</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>A3</b>	<b>Does the plan make reference to NASCO's Guidelines, Resolutions and Agreements?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Specific reference is made to the appropriate NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>A4</b>	<b>Is the plan written in a clear and concise form for easy accessibility and reference [e.g. to facilitate future reporting and cross-referencing to the plan]?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The text is clearly written and the format of the management goals and milestones is clear, but the use of numbering would be helpful</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>A5</b>	<b>Does the plan describe a process and outputs that are open to critical evaluation?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan includes clear lists of milestones and indicates who is responsible and when they should be completed</i></li> <li>○ <i>The milestones generally only relate to 2007-2008 and it is not clear how the list will be updated in future years to address actions planned in subsequent periods</i></li> </ul>	X	

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The Guidelines propose that the plans should contain the elements below, and should describe measurable outputs and include reference to appropriate NASCO agreements.			
<b>B1</b>	<b>Does the plan provide a general picture of the resource and the management structure in place?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Includes a description of the salmon resource and the management structures</i></li> <li>○ <i>A table usefully links challenges facing salmon to the responsible authorities and relevant legislation</i></li> </ul>	X	



<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B2</b>	<p><b>Does the plan describe the current status of stocks that will allow for future comparison?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan summarises the abundance of stocks for three large regions based upon the ICES PFA model but provides no information on the assessment of stocks at a more detailed level and recognizes the importance of diversity</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>B3</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the threats to stocks and outline current management measures?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan provides an outline of a comprehensive inventory of factors affecting salmon stocks and describes the number of rivers in each of 16 counties affected by each factor</i></li> <li>○ <i>This has provided the basis for prioritising the factors which will be the focus of management action</i></li> <li>○ <i>In each area the plan identifies the main issues, the management approach and the responsible authorities</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>B4</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to review and modify fishery regulations?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan includes specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan sets a clear management goal for fisheries, identifies five areas for specific attention and sets eight milestones to be completed in the period 2006 – 2009. This includes establishing CLs for all rivers and applying these through a Decision Structure</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan does not specifically refer to the application of the NASCO Decision Structure to the coastal fishery off the Teno (see Finland)</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>B5</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to assess habitat quality, identify problems and prioritise actions?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan includes specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>B6</b>	<p><b>Does the plan include a summary of the approaches that will be adopted to minimise adverse effects of aquaculture and control introductions and transfers?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan identifies actions to be taken to address the three main issues of escapes, sea lice and G. salaris. In each case a vision is identified, along with a list of milestones to be met in the coming years</i></li> <li>○ <i>In relation to sea lice, it might be considered whether levels of infestation on wild sea trout should also be used as an indicator, since in other areas this has presented a greater problem</i></li> <li>○ <i>Actions only extend to 2007 and it is not clear what happens after that date</i></li> <li>○ <i>The Finnish and Swedish plans have identified problems with escaped Norwegian farmed salmon that would appear to warrant specific actions</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>B7</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to address other influences?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No other influences are identified</i></li> </ul>	N/A	
<b>B8</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Identifies monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures</i></li> </ul>	X	

**B9 How does the plan consider socio-economic issues?**

- *The socio-economic value of the most important salmon rivers is included*
- *The fishery management goal refers to safeguarding the interests of different user groups*

## Review of Implementation Plan RUSSIAN FEDERATION

The following assessment of the Plan refers to the key requirements detailed in the Guidelines for the Preparation of NASCO ‘Implementation Plans’ and for Reporting on Progress (NSTF(06)10). Under each of these headings the Plan has been classed as satisfactory if it requires no changes or only minor modifications; it has been classed as not satisfactory if significant changes or additions are required. Where N/A is shown the Group considers that the question concerned is not applicable.

<b>A. Structure and Format of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		Yes	No
The Guidelines indicate a number of general criteria for the Plan and indicate that they should be clearly understandable by both managers and stakeholders:			
<b>A1</b>	<b>Does the plan apply to all stocks/fisheries managed within the jurisdiction?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan describes salmon stocks and associated fisheries in three areas: the Kola Peninsula (79 rivers); the Republic of Karelia (17 rivers); and an eastern area comprising the Archangelsk Region, Nenets National Okrug and Komi Republic (mainly based on four large rivers)</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>A2</b>	<b>Does the plan apply for a period of at least 5 years?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>There is no indication of a clear timescale for the plan</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>A3</b>	<b>Does the plan make reference to NASCO’s Guidelines, Resolutions and Agreements?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>There are two references to “NASCO recommendations”</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>A4</b>	<b>Is the plan written in a clear and concise form for easy accessibility and reference [e.g. to facilitate future reporting and cross-referencing to the plan]?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The text is clearly written, and includes bullet points for proposed activities but the use of numbers would facilitate reporting and cross-referencing to the plan</i></li> <li>○ <i>The detailed description of the fisheries and stocks might be assisted by providing a map and putting some of the data in tabular form</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>A5</b>	<b>Does the plan describe a process and outputs that are open to critical evaluation?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not describe outputs that will allow critical evaluation, due to the lack of timescales</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		Yes	No
The Guidelines propose that the plans should contain the elements below, and should describe measurable outputs and include reference to appropriate NASCO agreements.			
<b>B1</b>	<b>Does the plan provide a general picture of the resource and the management structure in place?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Includes a description of the salmon resource and the management structures</i></li> <li>○ <i>It would be helpful to clarify how the various authorities involved in the management of salmon rivers/fisheries interact</i></li> </ul>	X	

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B2</b>	<p><b>Does the plan describe the current status of stocks that will allow for future comparison?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan summarises the abundance of stocks at a national level based upon the ICES PFA model and indicates the availability of more detailed information on individual rivers in some areas</i></li> <li>○ <i>The importance of diversity is recognized</i></li> <li>○ <i>No stock assessments are available for the Republic of Karelia, although the stocks are thought to be in a depleted state based on catch data</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>B3</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the threats to stocks and outline current management measures?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Identifies a range of factors which may impact upon salmon stocks, but the mechanisms for managing these threats is not specified</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan refers to the introduction and transfer of 'humpback' (presumably pink salmon) in 119 rivers across all three areas, but it is not clear whether releases are continuing and, if so, how this is managed</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B4</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to review and modify fishery regulations?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan identifies specific actions but some are not clear and there are no associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>Some of the actions are unclear (e.g. 'addressing socio-economic problems') or open to subjective interpretation</i></li> <li>○ <i>All fisheries are said to be licensed and quota-regulated, but it is not clear how TACs/quotas are set and whether they are consistent with the NASCO Decision Structure</i></li> <li>○ <i>There is an objective to phase out some mixed stock net fisheries operating in the coastal waters of the White Sea, but the process and timescale are not described</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B5</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to assess habitat quality, identify problems and prioritise actions?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan includes some actions, but lacks specific timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>A number of habitat issues are identified, but no actions are proposed for protecting or restoring habitat in the eastern area, and few in other areas</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan does not indicate how habitat quality will be assessed, problems will be identified and actions prioritized</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B6</b>	<p><b>Does the plan include a summary of the approaches that will be adopted to minimise adverse effects of aquaculture and control introductions and transfers?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan includes limited specific actions, but lacks timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>Salmon farming appears to be limited to a small production on the Kola peninsula, although it is not clear whether other enhancement/rearing activities take place elsewhere</i></li> <li>○ <i>It is proposed that regional regulations will be established for operating 'fishing sites' for aquaculture, in line with NASCO recommendations, but there are no measurable outputs or timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>It is not clear what the objective is for the management of fisheries for pink salmon</i></li> <li>○ <i>Gyrodactylus salaris has been identified in one river already but no mitigation or treatment activities are described</i></li> </ul>		X

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B7</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to address other influences?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan refers to measures to assess by-catches in pelagic fisheries in the Norwegian Sea and in herring and pink salmon fisheries in the White Sea, but no timescale is provided</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B8</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Identifies monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>B9</b>	<p><b>How does the plan consider socio-economic issues?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan refers to plans to 'address socio-economic problems', but it is not clear what this is referring to, nor what the implications may be for the management of salmon fisheries</i></li> </ul>		

## Review of Implementation Plan SCOTLAND

The following assessment of the Plan refers to the key requirements detailed in the Guidelines for the Preparation of NASCO ‘Implementation Plans’ and for Reporting on Progress (NSTF(06)10). Under each of these headings the Plan has been classed as satisfactory if it requires no changes or only minor modifications; it has been classed as not satisfactory if significant changes or additions are required. Where N/A is shown the Group considers that the question concerned is not applicable.

<b>A. Structure and Format of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The Guidelines indicate a number of general criteria for the Plan and indicate that they should be clearly understandable by both managers and stakeholders			
<b>A1</b>	<b>Does the plan apply to all stocks/fisheries managed within the jurisdiction?</b> ○ <i>The plan describes 382 salmon rivers and associated fisheries</i>	X	
<b>A2</b>	<b>Does the plan apply for a period of at least 5 years?</b> ○ <i>There is no indication of a clear timescale for the plan</i>		X
<b>A3</b>	<b>Does the plan make reference to NASCO’s Guidelines, Resolutions and Agreements?</b> ○ <i>There is no specific reference to the NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines</i>		X
<b>A4</b>	<b>Is the plan written in a clear and concise form for easy accessibility and reference [e.g. to facilitate future reporting and cross-referencing to the plan]?</b> ○ <i>The text is clearly written, but proposed activities are not presented in a way that will facilitate reporting and cross-referencing to the plan</i>		X
<b>A5</b>	<b>Does the plan describe a process and outputs that are open to critical evaluation?</b> ○ <i>The plan does not describe outputs that will allow critical evaluation, due to the lack of clear commitments and timescales</i>		X

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The Guidelines propose that the plans should contain the elements below, and should describe measurable outputs and include reference to appropriate NASCO agreements.			
<b>B1</b>	<b>Does the plan provide a general picture of the resource and the management structure in place?</b> ○ <i>Includes a description of the salmon resource and the management structures</i>	X	
<b>B2</b>	<b>Does the plan describe the current status of stocks that will allow for future comparison?</b> ○ <i>The plan does not describe the current status of stocks in a way that will allow for future comparisons</i> ○ <i>The plan acknowledges importance of diversity in run-timing and age structure</i>		X

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>	<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<p><b>B3 Does the plan provide a summary of the threats to stocks and outline current management measures?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Identifies a range of factors which may impact upon salmon stocks and outlines current management measures</i></li> <li>○ <i>It was noted that the plan does not address water abstraction, agricultural pollution, avian predation and invasive species</i></li> </ul>	X	
<p><b>B4 Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to review and modify fishery regulations?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan lacks specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan concludes that fishery management action is required to protect early-running populations and ensure maximal spawning escapement, and this is enacted on a voluntary basis, but there are no outputs or milestones identified</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan states that almost all of the Scottish rod fisheries can be classified as mixed stock and that it is not yet possible to assess the impact of mixed stock fisheries on all impacted stocks. Recognizing the role of local management, the plan does not state what is being done to make it possible and when that will be achieved</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan should address how the Decision Structure is applied to the mixed stock coastal fisheries</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan does not specify how the Scottish Minister will determine whether it is necessary or expedient for the conservation of salmon to implement Salmon Conservation Regulations</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan does a good job of describing planned research, but timelines are lacking</i></li> </ul>		X
<p><b>B5 Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to assess habitat quality, identify problems and prioritise actions?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan identifies ongoing actions but does not specify timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>Identifies problems and describes actions that have been taken, but does not identify the approach to prevent future adverse impacts or to organize or direct remedial actions</i></li> </ul>		X
<p><b>B6 Does the plan include a summary of the approaches that will be adopted to minimise adverse effects of aquaculture and control introductions and transfers?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not include specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan states that it is likely that sea lice infestations and escapes of farmed fish have contributed to declines and slowed recovery, but measurable outputs to address this threat are not specified</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan discusses work of the Tripartite Working Group to develop a system of Area Management Agreements to address sea lice monitoring, containment and disease risk, but the monitoring and evaluation of this system is missing</i></li> </ul>		X

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B7</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to address other influences?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Predation by birds and mammals (particularly seals) has been identified as a cause for concern in a number of salmon fishery districts and some limited action is authorized but outputs are lacking</i></li> <li>○ <i>Invasive non-native species may also impact fish and fisheries - mink, North American Signal Crayfish - but there are no specific actions</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan states that a working group has been created on the possible introduction of <i>G. salaris</i> to Scotland and was to report in autumn 2006, but no specific actions have been identified yet</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B8</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan refers to monitoring and evaluation, but does not include a summary of the activities that will be used to assess status of stocks and the efficacy of management measures</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B9</b>	<p><b>How does the plan consider socio-economic issues?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan acknowledges the economic value of the fishery and aquaculture industry but does not describe how the implications are considered when identifying what action to take</i></li> <li>○ <i>Educational activities are identified (Salmon in Schools)</i></li> </ul>		



## Review of Implementation Plan SPAIN

The following assessment of the Plan refers to the key requirements detailed in the Guidelines for the Preparation of NASCO ‘Implementation Plans’ and for Reporting on Progress (NSTF(06)10). Under each of these headings the Plan has been classed as satisfactory if it requires no changes or only minor modifications; it has been classed as not satisfactory if significant changes or additions are required. Where N/A is shown the Group considers that the question concerned is not applicable.

<b>A. Structure and Format of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The Guidelines indicate a number of general criteria for the Plan and indicate that they should be clearly understandable by both managers and stakeholders:			
<b>A1</b>	<b>Does the plan apply to all stocks/fisheries managed within the jurisdiction?</b> ○ <i>The plan describes 8 salmon rivers and associated fisheries in Asturias, but does not address salmon elsewhere in Spain</i>		X
<b>A2</b>	<b>Does the plan apply for a period of at least 5 years?</b> ○ <i>There is no indication of a clear timescale for the plan</i>		X
<b>A3</b>	<b>Does the plan make reference to NASCO’s Guidelines, Resolutions and Agreements?</b> ○ <i>There is no specific reference to the NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines</i>		X
<b>A4</b>	<b>Is the plan written in a clear and concise form for easy accessibility and reference [e.g. to facilitate future reporting and cross-referencing to the plan]?</b> ○ <i>The plan only contains very basic information and proposed activities are not presented in a way that will facilitate reporting and cross-referencing to the plan</i>		X
<b>A5</b>	<b>Does the plan describe a process and outputs that are open to critical evaluation?</b> ○ <i>The plan does not describe outputs that will allow critical evaluation, due to the lack of clear commitments and timescales</i>		X

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The Guidelines propose that the plans should contain the elements below, and should describe measurable outputs and include reference to appropriate NASCO agreements.			
<b>B1</b>	<b>Does the plan provide a general picture of the resource and the management structure in place?</b> ○ <i>The description of the salmon resource is limited to catch records in Asturias and information on management structures is lacking</i>		X
<b>B2</b>	<b>Does the plan describe the current status of stocks that will allow for future comparison?</b> ○ <i>There is some information on catch statistics in the 8 rivers but no reference to their completeness. No other detailed means of evaluating stocks status are mentioned</i>		X

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B3</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the threats to stocks and outline current management measures?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Limited information is provided on threats and current management measures are not described</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B4</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to review and modify fishery regulations?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not adequately describe future fishery management measures and does not include timescales</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B5</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to assess habitat quality, identify problems and prioritise actions?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan identifies some actions, but lacks specific timescales</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B6</b>	<p><b>Does the plan include a summary of the approaches that will be adopted to minimise adverse effects of aquaculture and control introductions and transfers?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>There is no reference to aquaculture but a limited reference to restocking, with objectives but no specific actions and timescales</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B7</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to address other influences?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No other influences are identified</i></li> </ul>	N/A	
<b>B8</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not include any reference to monitoring or evaluation activities</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B9</b>	<p><b>How does the plan consider socio-economic issues?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not mention consideration of socio-economic factors</i></li> </ul>		

## Review of Implementation Plan SWEDEN

The following assessment of the Plan refers to the key requirements detailed in the Guidelines for the Preparation of NASCO ‘Implementation Plans’ and for Reporting on Progress (NSTF(06)10). Under each of these headings the Plan has been classed as satisfactory if it requires no changes or only minor modifications; it has been classed as not satisfactory if significant changes or additions are required. Where N/A is shown the Group considers that the question concerned is not applicable.

<b>A. Structure and Format of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The Guidelines indicate a number of general criteria for the Plan and indicate that they should be clearly understandable by both managers and stakeholders:			
<b>A1</b>	<b>Does the plan apply to all stocks/fisheries managed within the jurisdiction?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan describes 23 west coast salmon rivers and associated fisheries in Sweden as the Baltic stocks are outside the NASCO Convention</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>A2</b>	<b>Does the plan apply for a period of at least 5 years?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The only mention of a 5-year timescale is limited to a plan to increase the smolt output from the rivers</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>A3</b>	<b>Does the plan make reference to NASCO’s Guidelines, Resolutions and Agreements?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>There is no specific reference to the NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>A4</b>	<b>Is the plan written in a clear and concise form for easy accessibility and reference [e.g. to facilitate future reporting and cross-referencing to the plan]?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The text is clearly written, but proposed activities are not presented in a way that will facilitate reporting and cross-referencing to the plan</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>A5</b>	<b>Does the plan describe a process and outputs that are open to critical evaluation?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not describe outputs that will allow critical evaluation, due to the lack of clear commitments and timescales</i></li> </ul>		X

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The Guidelines propose that the plans should contain the elements below, and should describe measurable outputs and include reference to appropriate NASCO agreements.			
<b>B1</b>	<b>Does the plan provide a general picture of the resource and the management structure in place?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Includes a description of the salmon resource, but not of the management structure</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B2</b>	<b>Does the plan describe the current status of stocks that will allow for future comparison?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan describes the current status of stocks and provides a basis for future comparison based on smolt production levels</i></li> </ul>	X	

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B3</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the threats to stocks and outline current management measures?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Identifies a limited range of factors which may impact upon salmon stocks, but with the exception of liming there is little description of management measures</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B4</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to review and modify fishery regulations?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan lacks specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>There is no description of proposed management measures to improve stock status</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan does not explain the basis for the decision to continue the trap fisheries when river stocks are depleted</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B5</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to assess habitat quality, identify problems and prioritise actions?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan lacks specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan does note that liming is occurring on some rivers</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B6</b>	<p><b>Does the plan include a summary of the approaches that will be adopted to minimise adverse effects of aquaculture and control introductions and transfers?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not include specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>There is a sizeable rainbow trout aquaculture industry in this part of Sweden, but no Atlantic salmon aquaculture. A long-term objective of banning rainbow trout is stated, but no specific commitment is provided</i></li> <li>○ <i>There is no specific action identified to address Gyrodactylus salaris</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan identifies escaped farmed salmon as a major threat, but specifies no action</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B7</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to address other influences?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No other influences are identified</i></li> </ul>	N/A	
<b>B8</b>	<p><b>Does the plan provide a summary of monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not address this issue</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>B9</b>	<p><b>How does the plan consider socio-economic issues?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>There is no discussion of socio-economic factors</i></li> </ul>		

## Review of Implementation Plan USA

The following assessment of the Plan refers to the key requirements detailed in the Guidelines for the Preparation of NASCO 'Implementation Plans' and for Reporting on Progress (NSTF(06)10). Under each of these headings the Plan has been classed as satisfactory if it requires no changes or only minor modifications; it has been classed as not satisfactory if significant changes or additions are required. Where N/A is shown the Group considers that the question concerned is not applicable.

<b>A. Structure and Format of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The Guidelines indicate a number of general criteria for the Plan and indicate that they should be clearly understandable by both managers and stakeholders:			
<b>A1</b>	<b>Does the plan apply to all stocks/fisheries managed within the jurisdiction?</b> ○ <i>The plan describes 12 rivers currently with salmon and associated fisheries and another 14 from which they have been lost</i>	X	
<b>A2</b>	<b>Does the plan apply for a period of at least 5 years?</b> ○ <i>The plan sets a number of actions to be taken over a 5-year period</i>	X	
<b>A3</b>	<b>Does the plan make reference to NASCO's Guidelines, Resolutions and Agreements?</b> ○ <i>Specific reference is made to the appropriate NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines</i>	X	
<b>A4</b>	<b>Is the plan written in a clear and concise form for easy accessibility and reference [e.g. to facilitate future reporting and cross-referencing to the plan]?</b> ○ <i>The text is clearly written, with numbered actions</i>	X	
<b>A5</b>	<b>Does the plan describe a process and outputs that are open to critical evaluation?</b> ○ <i>Proposed outputs are clearly specified</i> ○ <i>It would be helpful to translate the years 1-5 into calendar years</i>	X	

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The Guidelines propose that the plans should contain the elements below, and should describe measurable outputs and include reference to appropriate NASCO agreements.			
<b>B1</b>	<b>Does the plan provide a general picture of the resource and the management structure in place?</b> ○ <i>Includes a description of the salmon resource and the management structures</i>	X	
<b>B2</b>	<b>Does the plan describe the current status of stocks that will allow for future comparison?</b> ○ <i>The plan summarises the abundance of stocks at a national level and indicates that, because of the poor status of all stocks, assessment at an individual stock level is based upon replacement rates</i>	X	
<b>B3</b>	<b>Does the plan provide a summary of the threats to stocks and outline current management measures?</b> ○ <i>Identifies a range of factors which may impact upon salmon stocks and outlines current management measures</i>	X	

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>	<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B4 Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to review and modify fishery regulations?</b> ○ <i>In general the plan contains specific actions and associated timescales, but providing specific calendar year dates would be helpful</i>	X	
<b>B5 Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to assess habitat quality, identify problems and prioritise actions?</b> ○ <i>The plan identifies specific actions and associated timescales</i> ○ <i>It would be helpful to define specific actions by calendar years</i> ○ <i>Predation was identified as a threat but no actions have been listed</i>	X	
<b>B6 Does the plan include a summary of the approaches that will be adopted to minimise adverse effects of aquaculture and control introductions and transfers?</b> ○ <i>The plan does include specific actions and associated timescales</i> ○ <i>The plan includes a commitment to an annual audit of containment management systems</i>	X	
<b>B7 Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to address other influences?</b> ○ <i>The plan lists a set of actions in order to get a better understanding of the linkages between the Atlantic salmon and the environment it lives in</i>	X	
<b>B8 Does the plan provide a summary of monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures?</b> ○ <i>Criteria have been identified for evaluation of the efficacy of management measures and identifies monitoring and evaluation activities</i>	X	

<b>B9 How does the plan consider socio-economic issues?</b>
○ <i>An “experimental catch and release fishery” is stated to be consistent with the socio-economic approach to fisheries management by NASCO</i> ○ <i>Mentions the importance of education and outreach activities</i>

## IP(07)6

## Review of Implementation Plans by Question for all Jurisdictions

The following assessment of the Plans refers to the key requirements detailed in the Guidelines for the Preparation of NASCO 'Implementation Plans' and for Reporting on Progress (NSTF(06)10). Under each of these headings a Plan has been classed as satisfactory if it requires no changes or only minor modifications; it has been classed as not satisfactory if significant changes or additions are required. Where N/A is shown the Group considers that the question concerned is not applicable.

A. Structure and Format of the Plan		Is the Plan satisfactory?	
		Yes	No
The Guidelines indicate a number of general criteria for the Plan and indicate that they should be clearly understandable by both managers and stakeholders			
<b>A1 Does the plan apply to all stocks/fisheries managed within the jurisdiction?</b>			
<b>Canada</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The plan describes approximately 900 salmon rivers and associated fisheries in four management areas</li> </ul>	X	
<b>Denmark</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The plan describes 9 rivers (which historically had salmon) and associated fisheries</li> </ul>	X	
<b>England and Wales</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The plan describes 78 salmon rivers and associated fisheries</li> </ul>	X	
<b>Faroe Islands</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The plan states that the Faroe Islands has no rivers with historic/natural salmon stocks, but the plan describes four stocks that have been established (and may be maintained) by stocking programmes</li> <li>○ The plan makes no mention of the large mixed stock of salmon within the Faroese EEZ or the fishery that has operated in the area in the past but not in recent years</li> </ul>		X
<b>Finland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The plan describes three rivers and associated fisheries, one of which has an impassable barrier in its lower reaches in Russia. The most important river is the Teno</li> </ul>	X	
<b>France</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No plan submitted</li> </ul>		
<b>Germany</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No plan submitted</li> </ul>		
<b>Greenland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The plan focuses on the mixed stock fishery off West Greenland and makes mention of one salmon river, the Kapisillit, in Godthab Fjord</li> </ul>	X	
<b>Iceland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The plan describes 250 rivers in Iceland and addresses management of salmon in 'about 80 rivers'</li> </ul>	X	
<b>Ireland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The plan describes 148 salmon rivers and associated fisheries</li> </ul>	X	
<b>Northern Ireland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The plan describes 27 salmon rivers and associated fisheries</li> </ul>	X	
<b>Norway</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The plan describes 446 salmon rivers and associated fisheries, of which 45 stocks are thought to be extinct</li> </ul>	X	
<b>Portugal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No plan submitted</li> </ul>		

		<b>A. Structure and Format of the Plan</b>	<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
			<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>A1 Does the plan apply to all stocks/fisheries managed within the jurisdiction?</b>				
<b>Russian Federation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan describes stocks and associated fisheries in three areas: the Kola Peninsula (79 rivers); the Republic of Karelia (17 rivers); and an eastern area comprising the Archangelsk Region, Nenets National Okrug and Komi Republic (mainly based on four large rivers)</i></li> </ul>	X		
<b>Scotland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan describes 382 salmon rivers and associated fisheries</i></li> </ul>	X		
<b>Spain</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan describes 8 salmon rivers and associated fisheries in Asturias, but does not address salmon elsewhere in Spain</i></li> </ul>			X
<b>Sweden</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan describes 23 west coast salmon rivers and associated fisheries in Sweden as the Baltic stocks are outside the NASCO Convention</i></li> </ul>	X		
<b>USA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan describes 12 rivers currently with salmon and associated fisheries and another 14 from which they have been lost</i></li> </ul>	X		



	<b>A. Structure and Format of the Plan</b>	<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>A2 Does the plan apply for a period of at least 5 years?</b>			
<b>Canada</b>	○ <i>The plan describes measures to be implemented for 2006-2010</i>	X	
<b>Denmark</b>	○ <i>There is no indication of a clear timescale for the plan, although reference is made to a National Management Plan</i>		X
<b>England and Wales</b>	○ <i>The plan states that each Salmon Action Plan (SAP) contains an agreed list of actions over a 5-year lifetime</i>	X	
<b>Faroe Islands</b>	○ <i>There is no indication of a clear timescale for the plan</i>		X
<b>Finland</b>	○ <i>There is no indication of a clear timescale for the plan</i>		X
<b>France</b>	○ <i>No plan submitted</i>		
<b>Germany</b>	○ <i>No plan submitted</i>		
<b>Greenland</b>	○ <i>The quota for the mixed stock fishery is subject to negotiation within NASCO so the provision for a 5-year timescale does not apply</i>	N/A	
<b>Iceland</b>	○ <i>The plan refers to 'A five year management plan', and the proposed activities would appear to address such a period</i>	X	
<b>Ireland</b>	○ <i>The plan does mention 2007 and beyond, but there is no indication of a clear timescale for the plan</i>		X
<b>Northern Ireland</b>	○ <i>There is no indication of a clear timescale for the plan</i>		X
<b>Norway</b>	○ <i>The plan describes management measures extending until 2012 and beyond</i>	X	
<b>Portugal</b>	○ <i>No plan submitted</i>		
<b>Russian Federation</b>	○ <i>There is no indication of a clear timescale for the plan</i>		X
<b>Scotland</b>	○ <i>There is no indication of a clear timescale for the plan</i>		X
<b>Spain</b>	○ <i>There is no indication of a clear timescale for the plan</i>		X
<b>Sweden</b>	○ <i>The only mention of a 5-year timescale is limited to a plan to increase the smolt output from the rivers</i>		X
<b>USA</b>	○ <i>The plan sets a number of actions to be taken over a 5-year period</i>	X	

	<b>A. Structure and Format of the Plan</b>	<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>A3 Does the Plan make reference to NASCO Guidelines, Resolutions and Agreements?</b>			
<b>Canada</b>	○ <i>Specific reference is made to the appropriate NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines</i>	X	
<b>Denmark</b>	○ <i>There is no specific reference to the NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines</i>		X
<b>England and Wales</b>	○ <i>Specific reference is made to the appropriate NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines</i>	X	
<b>Faroe Islands</b>	○ <i>There is no specific reference to the NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines</i>		X
<b>Finland</b>	○ <i>Limited reference is made to the Decision Structure</i>		X
<b>France</b>	○ <i>No plan submitted</i>		
<b>Germany</b>	○ <i>No plan submitted</i>		
<b>Greenland</b>	○ <i>There is no specific reference to the NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines</i>		X
<b>Iceland</b>	○ <i>There is only one reference to NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines in the plan, which is specific to aquaculture</i>		X
<b>Ireland</b>	○ <i>The plan has a special section on NASCO obligations, which mentions the Precautionary Approach</i>	X	
<b>Northern Ireland</b>	○ <i>An introductory reference is made to the NASCO agreements</i>	X	
<b>Norway</b>	○ <i>Specific reference is made to the appropriate NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines</i>	X	
<b>Portugal</b>	○ <i>No plan submitted</i>		
<b>Russian Federation</b>	○ <i>There are two references to “NASCO recommendations”</i>		X
<b>Scotland</b>	○ <i>There is no specific reference to the NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines</i>		X
<b>Spain</b>	○ <i>There is no specific reference to the NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines</i>		X
<b>Sweden</b>	○ <i>There is no specific reference to the NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines</i>		X
<b>USA</b>	○ <i>Specific reference is made to the appropriate NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines</i>	X	

	<b>A. Structure and Format of the Plan</b>	<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>A4</b>	<b>Is the plan written in a clear and concise form for easy accessibility and reference [e.g. to facilitate future reporting and cross-referencing to the plan]?</b>		
<b>Canada</b>	○ <i>The text is clearly written, but proposed activities are not presented in a way that will facilitate reporting and cross-referencing to the plan</i>		X
<b>Denmark</b>	○ <i>The plan has limited information and proposed activities are not presented in a way that will facilitate reporting and cross-referencing to the plan</i>		X
<b>England and Wales</b>	○ <i>The text is clearly written, with numbered actions</i> ○ <i>Identification of references or source data would be useful</i>	X	
<b>Faroe Islands</b>	○ <i>The text is clearly written, but proposed activities are not presented in a way that will facilitate reporting and cross-referencing to the plan</i>		X
<b>Finland</b>	○ <i>The text is clearly written, but proposed activities are not presented in a way that will facilitate reporting and cross-referencing to the plan</i>		X
<b>France</b>	○ <i>No plan submitted</i>		
<b>Germany</b>	○ <i>No plan submitted</i>		
<b>Greenland</b>	○ <i>The text is clearly written, but proposed activities are not presented in a way that will facilitate reporting and cross-referencing to the plan</i>		X
<b>Iceland</b>	○ <i>The text is clearly written, and includes bullet points for proposed activities but the use of numbers would facilitate reporting and cross-referencing to the plan</i>	X	
<b>Ireland</b>	○ <i>The text is clearly written, but proposed activities are not presented in a way that will facilitate reporting and cross-referencing to the plan</i>		X
<b>Northern Ireland</b>	○ <i>The text is clearly written, but proposed activities are not presented in a way that will facilitate reporting and cross-referencing to the plan</i>		X
<b>Norway</b>	○ <i>The text is clearly written and the format of the management goals and milestones is clear, but the use of numbering would be helpful</i>	X	
<b>Portugal</b>	○ <i>No plan submitted</i>		
<b>Russian Federation</b>	○ <i>The text is clearly written, and includes bullet points for proposed activities but the use of numbers would facilitate reporting and cross-referencing to the plan</i> ○ <i>The detailed description of the fisheries and stocks might be assisted by providing a map and putting some of the data in tabular form</i>	X	
<b>Scotland</b>	○ <i>The text is clearly written, but proposed activities are not presented in a way that will facilitate reporting and cross-referencing to the plan</i>		X
<b>Spain</b>	○ <i>The plan only contains very basic information and proposed activities are not presented in a way that will facilitate reporting and cross-referencing to the plan</i>		X

<b>A. Structure and Format of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>A4 Is the plan written in a clear and concise form for easy accessibility and reference [e.g. to facilitate future reporting and cross-referencing to the plan]?</b>			
<b>Sweden</b>	○ <i>The text is clearly written, but proposed activities are not presented in a way that will facilitate reporting and cross-referencing to the plan</i>		X
<b>USA</b>	○ <i>The text is clearly written, with numbered actions</i>	X	

	<b>A. Structure and Format of the Plan</b>	<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>A5 Does the plan describe a process and outputs that are open to critical evaluation?</b>			
<b>Canada</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan describes the science well but does not describe outputs that will allow critical evaluation, due to the lack of clear commitments and timescales</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Denmark</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not describe outputs that will allow critical evaluation, due to the lack of clear commitments and timescales</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>England and Wales</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The Actions to be undertaken are very clearly specified in the plan; although the overall schedule is for 5 years the timescale associated with each individual action is not always clear</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>Faroe Islands</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not describe outputs that will allow critical evaluation, due to the lack of clear commitments and timescales</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Finland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not describe outputs that will allow critical evaluation, due to the lack of clear commitments and timescales</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>France</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No plan submitted</i></li> </ul>		
<b>Germany</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No plan submitted</i></li> </ul>		
<b>Greenland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>It is recognized that the scope of the plan is limited to the monitoring and management of the internal-use-only fishery in Greenland, but identifies several actions related to improving catch data</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan does not describe outputs that will allow critical evaluation, due to the lack of clear commitments and timescales</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Iceland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not describe outputs that will allow critical evaluation, due to the lack of timescales</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Ireland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan can be evaluated with respect to fisheries management, but management of habitat, aquaculture and introductions do not have measurable outputs</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Northern Ireland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not describe outputs that will allow critical evaluation, due to the lack of clear commitments and timescales</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Norway</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan includes clear lists of milestones and indicates who is responsible and when they should be completed</i></li> <li>○ <i>The milestones generally only relate to 2007-2008 and it is not clear how the list will be updated in future years to address actions planned in subsequent periods</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>Portugal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No plan submitted</i></li> </ul>		
<b>Russian Federation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not describe outputs that will allow critical evaluation, due to the lack of timescales</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Scotland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not describe outputs that will allow critical evaluation, due to the lack of clear commitments and timescales</i></li> </ul>		X

<b>Spain</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not describe outputs that will allow critical evaluation, due to the lack of clear commitments and timescales</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Sweden</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not describe outputs that will allow critical evaluation, due to the lack of clear commitments and timescales</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>USA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Proposed outputs are clearly specified</i></li> <li>○ <i>It would be helpful to translate the years 1-5 into calendar years</i></li> </ul>	X	

	<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>	<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
	The Guidelines propose that the plans should contain the elements below, and should describe measurable outputs and include reference to appropriate NASCO agreements.	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B1 Does the plan provide a general picture of the resource and the management structure in place?</b>			
<b>Canada</b>	○ <i>Includes a description of the salmon resource and the management structures</i>	X	
<b>Denmark</b>	○ <i>Includes a limited description of the salmon resource and management entities</i>	X	
<b>England and Wales</b>	○ <i>Includes a description of the salmon resource and the management structures</i>	X	
<b>Faroe Islands</b>	○ <i>The description of the salmon resource is limited to a description of the four artificially established river stocks and limited information is provided on the authorities or legislation by which they are managed</i> ○ <i>The plan makes no mention of the presence of stocks from many European countries in Faroese waters and the management structure that controls fishing activities</i>		X
<b>Finland</b>	○ <i>Includes a description of the salmon resource and the management structures</i>	X	
<b>France</b>	○ <i>No plan submitted</i>		
<b>Germany</b>	○ <i>No plan submitted</i>		
<b>Greenland</b>	○ <i>Includes a description of the salmon resource at sea and the management structures</i> ○ <i>The plan identifies, but does not describe, the river Kapisillit in Godthab Fjord</i>	X	
<b>Iceland</b>	○ <i>Includes a description of the salmon resource and the management structures</i>	X	
<b>Ireland</b>	○ <i>Includes a description of the salmon resource and the management structures</i>	X	
<b>Northern Ireland</b>	○ <i>Includes a description of the salmon resource and the management structures</i>	X	
<b>Norway</b>	○ <i>Includes a description of the salmon resource and the management structures</i> ○ <i>A table usefully links challenges facing salmon to the responsible authorities and relevant legislation</i>	X	
<b>Portugal</b>	○ <i>No plan submitted</i>		
<b>Russian Federation</b>	○ <i>Includes a description of the salmon resource and the management structures</i> ○ <i>It would be helpful to clarify how the various authorities involved in the management of salmon rivers/fisheries interact</i>	X	
<b>Scotland</b>	○ <i>Includes a description of the salmon resource and the management structures</i>	X	
<b>Spain</b>	○ <i>The description of the salmon resource is limited to catch records in Asturias and information on management structures is lacking</i>		X
<b>Sweden</b>	○ <i>Includes a description of the salmon resource, but not of the management structure</i>		X
<b>USA</b>	○ <i>Includes a description of the salmon resource and the management structures</i>	X	

	<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>	<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B2 Does the plan describe the current status of stocks that will allow for future comparison?</b>			
<b>Canada</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan summarises the abundance of stocks at a provincial level. Assessments are based on 75 rivers and these are used as indicators for other rivers within a region</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan includes a description of stock diversity and other aspects of stock status</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>Denmark</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not describe a system in place to assess the status of stocks</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>England and Wales</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan summarises the abundance of stocks at a national level based upon the ICES PFA model and the status of individual stocks assessed against conservation limits</i></li> <li>○ <i>There are clear and measurable objectives for each river that the stock should be meeting or exceeding its CL in at least 4/5 years</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>Faroe Islands</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Status of the river stocks is assessed by catches and stocking levels, which are both stable, but the extent of natural production in the rivers is unclear and no information is provided on the status of stocks in Faroese marine waters</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Finland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The method for assessing the status of stocks is described, but there are conflicting statements on stock status, and the basis for future comparison is not clear</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>France</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No plan submitted</i></li> </ul>		
<b>Germany</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No plan submitted</i></li> </ul>		
<b>Greenland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Status of stocks are well described based on the ICES advice and the importance of diversity is recognized</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>Iceland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan summarises the abundance of stocks at a national level based primarily upon catch statistics and the reliability of these data is considered to provide a basis for future comparison at a river level</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>Ireland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan summarises the abundance of stocks at a national level based upon the ICES PFA model and the status of individual stocks assessed against conservation limits and recognizes the importance of diversity of stocks</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>Northern Ireland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan summarises the abundance of stocks at a national level based upon the ICES PFA model and indicates the use of specific targets for most individual rivers</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>Norway</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan summarises the abundance of stocks for three large regions based upon the ICES PFA model but provides no information on the assessment of stocks at a more detailed level and recognizes the importance of diversity</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>Portugal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No plan submitted</i></li> </ul>		



	<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>	<b>Is the Plan satisfactory ?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B2 Does the plan describe the current status of stocks that will allow for future comparison?</b>			
<b>Russian Federation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan summarises the abundance of stocks at a national level based upon the ICES PFA model and indicates the availability of more detailed information on individual rivers in some areas</i></li> <li>○ <i>The importance of diversity is recognized</i></li> <li>○ <i>No stock assessments are available for the Republic of Karelia, although the stocks are thought to be in a depleted state based on catch data</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>Scotland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not describe the current status of stocks in a way that will allow for future comparisons</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan acknowledges importance of diversity in run-timing and age structure</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Spain</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>There is some information on catch statistics in the 8 rivers but no reference to their completeness. No other detailed means of evaluating stock status are mentioned</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Sweden</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan describes the current status of stocks and provides a basis for future comparison based on smolt production levels</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>USA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan summarises the abundance of stocks at a national level and indicates that, because of the poor status of all stocks, assessment at an individual stock level is based upon replacement rates</i></li> </ul>	X	

<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>		<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B3 Does the plan provide a summary of the threats to stocks and outline current management measures?</b>			
<b>Canada</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identifies a range of factors which may impact upon salmon stocks and outlines current management measures</li> <li>○ An explanation of how threats have been prioritized would be useful</li> </ul>	X	
<b>Denmark</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Limited information is provided on threats and current management measures are not described</li> </ul>		X
<b>England and Wales</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identifies a range of factors which may impact upon salmon stocks and outlines current management measures</li> </ul>	X	
<b>Faroe Islands</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Limited information is provided on threats and current management measures are not described</li> <li>○ The plan considers the fisheries affecting the river stocks but not the potential marine fishery</li> <li>○ There are said to be no external factors affecting freshwater and estuarine habitat, but it is unclear how this has been assessed</li> <li>○ The plan mentions potential effects of aquaculture, but the effects of continued stocking are not considered</li> </ul>		X
<b>Finland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The plan identifies fisheries and aquaculture as current threats</li> <li>○ The plan is unclear with respect to the management of the recreational fishery and threats to habitat because it refers to enhancement work carried out</li> </ul>		X
<b>France</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No plan submitted</li> </ul>		
<b>Germany</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No plan submitted</li> </ul>		
<b>Greenland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Threats are not discussed in detail because these principally impact stocks in rivers of origin</li> </ul>	N/A	
<b>Iceland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The plan provides a list and brief explanation of the 10 main factors affecting the salmon habitat and prioritises these across Icelandic rivers as a whole. It also indicates areas where specific problems are more prevalent</li> </ul>	X	
<b>Ireland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The plan describes threats from fisheries and aquaculture in detail, but provides very little information on other threats</li> <li>○ Figure 5 is informative, but the description of current management measures for habitat is very limited</li> </ul>	X	
<b>Northern Ireland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identifies a range of factors which may impact upon salmon stocks and outlines current management measures</li> </ul>	X	
<b>Norway</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The plan provides an outline of a comprehensive inventory of factors affecting salmon stocks and describes the number of rivers in each of 16 counties affected by each factor</li> <li>○ This has provided the basis for prioritising the factors which will be the focus of management action</li> <li>○ In each area the plan identifies the main issues, the management approach and the responsible authorities</li> </ul>	X	
<b>Portugal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No plan submitted</li> </ul>		

		<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>	<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
			<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B3 Does the plan provide a summary of the threats to stocks and outline current management measures?</b>				
<b>Russian Federation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Identifies a range of factors which may impact upon salmon stocks, but the mechanisms for managing these threats is not specified</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan refers to the introduction and transfer of 'humpback' (presumably pink salmon) in 119 rivers across all three areas, but it is not clear whether releases are continuing and if so how this is managed</i></li> </ul>			X
<b>Scotland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Identifies a range of factors which may impact upon salmon stocks and outlines current management measures</i></li> <li>○ <i>It was noted that the plan does not address water abstraction, agricultural pollution, avian predation and invasive species</i></li> </ul>	X		
<b>Spain</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Limited information is provided on threats and current management measures are not described</i></li> </ul>			X
<b>Sweden</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Identifies a limited range of factors which may impact upon salmon stocks, but with the exception of liming there is little description of management measures</i></li> </ul>			X
<b>USA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Identifies a range of factors which may impact upon salmon stocks and outlines current management measures</i></li> </ul>	X		

	<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>	<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B4 Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to review and modify fishery regulations?</b>			
<b>Canada</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>References to measurable outputs against which subsequent reports can be assessed are limited and do not go beyond 2008</i></li> <li>○ <i>Outputs and timescales for managing recreational fisheries in the future are not described</i></li> <li>○ <i>The process and timescale for evaluating the effectiveness of the measures introduced in 2006 to reduce the catch of 2SW fish in coastal areas of Labrador lack specificity</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Denmark</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>There is very limited information on fisheries management and no measurable outputs or timescales</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>England and Wales</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>In general the plan contains specific actions and associated timescales, but additional specificity would be helpful in the following areas</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan notes that 53% of rivers are not meeting CLs, but the plan does not appear to prioritize action on these rivers</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan states that there is a national policy to phase out mixed stock fisheries, but a specific timescale is not specified and the plan lacks urgency in dealing with this issue</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan indicates limited regulatory control over some fishing effort, which raises question of how goals will be achieved</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>Faroe Islands</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan lacks specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan makes no mention of the management regime for controlling legal or illegal fishing for salmon in the sea</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Finland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan lacks specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan does not refer to the NASCO Decision Structure and there is no reference to future management measures to address either the coastal fishery in Norway or the recreational fishery</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>France</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No plan submitted</i></li> </ul>		
<b>Germany</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No plan submitted</i></li> </ul>		
<b>Greenland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan identifies the importance of providing reliable data on the fishery and provides a measurable indicator as the number of licensees reporting compared with the number of licenses issued, but does not identify specific future actions to address this issue and the associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>While not the responsibility of Greenlandic authorities, we note that the WGC does not utilize the NASCO Decision Structure</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Iceland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan identifies specific actions, but does not provide associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>Seven management actions are listed; two refer to maintaining the status quo; and three simply refer to ‘encouraging’ specific activities. The remaining two refer to limiting mixed stock netting and by-catches, but do not indicate timescales, nor the actions that will be taken or the mechanisms that will be used</i></li> </ul>		X

	<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>	<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B4 Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to review and modify fishery regulations?</b>			
<b>Ireland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan includes specific actions and near-term associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>There is a detailed description of harvest guidelines before and after the closure of the drift net fishery</i></li> <li>○ <i>While there are no detailed plans for future actions after 2007, this is understandable given the major changes currently taking place in fisheries management</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>Northern Ireland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan lacks specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>Specific actions and timescales are needed for the following:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>“Work continues” to extend CL setting to all salmon-producing rivers in the FCB area of Northern Ireland, and to install fish counters to enable compliance to be assessed in key indicator rivers</i></li> <li>○ <i>“Further work” to refine these CLs by using available river-specific habitat data is “in progress”</i></li> <li>○ <i>The Loughs Agency has established CLs and “is planning” to extend the compliance monitoring</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>○ <i>Section 4.1.2 describes the review process generally, but lacks specificity as to what will happen over the next 5 years and what the output will be</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Norway</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan includes specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan sets a clear management goal for fisheries, identifies five areas for specific attention and sets eight milestones to be completed in the period 2006 – 2009. This includes establishing CLs for all rivers and applying these through a Decision Structure</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan does not specifically refer to the application of the NASCO Decision Structure to the coastal fishery off the Teno (see Finland)</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>Portugal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No plan submitted</i></li> </ul>		
<b>Russian Federation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan identifies specific actions but some are not clear and there are no associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>Some of the actions are unclear (e.g. ‘addressing socio-economic problems’) or open to subjective interpretation</i></li> <li>○ <i>All fisheries are said to be licensed and quota-regulated, but it is not clear how TACs/quotas are set and whether they are consistent with the NASCO Decision Structure</i></li> <li>○ <i>There is an objective to phase out some mixed stock net fisheries operating in the coastal waters of the White Sea, but the process and timescale are not described</i></li> </ul>		X

	<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>	<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B4 Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to review and modify fishery regulations?</b>			
<b>Scotland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan lacks specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan concludes that fishery management action is required to protect early-running populations and ensure maximal spawning escapement and this is enacted on a voluntary basis but there are no outputs or milestones identified</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan states that almost all of the Scottish rod fisheries can be classified as mixed stock and that it is not yet possible to assess the impact of mixed stock fisheries on all impacted stocks. Recognizing the role of local management, the plan does not state what is being done to make it possible and when that will be achieved</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan should address how the Decision Structure is applied to the mixed stock coastal fisheries</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan does not specify how the Scottish Minister will determine whether it is necessary or expedient for the conservation of salmon to implement Salmon Conservation Regulations</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan does a good job of describing planned research, but timelines are lacking</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Spain</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not adequately describe future fishery management measures and does not include timescales</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Sweden</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan lacks specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>There is no description of proposed management measures to improve stock status</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan does not explain the basis for the decision to continue the trap fisheries when river stocks are depleted</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>USA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>In general the plan contains specific actions and associated timescales, but providing specific calendar year dates would be helpful</i></li> </ul>	X	

B. Content of the Plan		Is the Plan satisfactory?	
		Yes	No
<b>B5 Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to assess habitat quality, identify problems and prioritise actions?</b>			
Canada	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan indicates a continuation of the current approach to habitat management, but with the exception of the acid rain program, references to measurable outputs by which subsequent reports can be assessed are missing</li> </ul>		X
Denmark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan identifies some actions, but lacks specific timescales</li> </ul>		X
England and Wales	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan describes the process of reviewing and updating Salmon Action Plans as the approach for addressing habitat</li> <li>These plans cover a 5-year timescale and contain specific actions and progress against these actions is reviewed annually and will be provided to NASCO</li> </ul>	X	
Faroe Islands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan does not include specific actions and associated timescales</li> </ul>		X
Finland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan lacks specific actions and associated timescales</li> </ul>		X
France	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No plan submitted</li> </ul>		
Germany	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No plan submitted</li> </ul>		
Greenland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan does not identify any threats to the marine habitat in West Greenland</li> <li>As noted previously, the plan is necessarily limited in scope to the management and reporting on the fishery in Greenland</li> </ul>	N/A	
Iceland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan includes actions, but lacks specific timescales</li> <li>National authorities have limited powers to carry out remedial habitat work, but through licensing there are restrictions on owners so as to control damaging activities such as gravel removal</li> <li>Some of the actions are vague (e.g. "explore the possibility...")</li> </ul>		X
Ireland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan does not include specific actions and associated timescales</li> <li>There is reference to the development of a GIS database to link river habitat and water quality</li> </ul>		X
Northern Ireland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan lacks specific actions and associated timescales</li> <li>The plan states that a process is being developed for instream habitat restoration but no timescale or outputs are identified</li> <li>The plan does not identify the process and procedures in place to prevent impacts to habitat</li> </ul>		X
Norway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan includes specific actions and associated timescales</li> </ul>	X	
Portugal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No plan submitted</li> </ul>		
Russian Federation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan includes some actions, but lacks specific timescales</li> <li>A number of habitat issues are identified, but no actions are proposed for protecting or restoring habitat in the eastern area, and few in other areas</li> <li>The plan does not indicate how habitat quality will be assessed, problems will be identified and actions prioritized</li> </ul>		X

B. Content of the Plan		Is the Plan satisfactory?	
		Yes	No
<b>B5 Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to assess habitat quality, identify problems and prioritise actions?</b>			
<b>Scotland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan identifies ongoing actions but does not specify timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>Identifies problems and describes actions that have been taken, but does not identify the approach to prevent future adverse impacts or to organize or direct remedial actions</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Spain</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan identifies some actions, but lacks specific timescales</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Sweden</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan lacks specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan does note that liming is occurring on some rivers</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>USA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan identifies specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>It would be helpful to define specific actions by calendar years</i></li> <li>○ <i>Predation was identified as a threat but no actions have been listed</i></li> </ul>	X	



	<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>	<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B6</b>	<b>Does the plan include a summary of the approaches that will be adopted to minimise adverse effects of aquaculture and control introductions and transfers?</b>		
<b>Canada</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan describes fairly clearly the current management approach to aquaculture and introductions and transfers already in place, but specific future actions and timescales are lacking</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Denmark</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan identifies some actions, but these are not very clear and lack specific timescales</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>England and Wales</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does include specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan comprehensively addresses all of the relevant issues and has appropriate references to NASCO guidelines and resolutions</i></li> <li>○ <i>It would be useful to identify what, in Action 13, is considered a “significant” increase in the incidence of salmon farm escapees in monitored rivers that would trigger “appropriate action” (Note: England and Wales does not have marine aquaculture)</i></li> <li>○ <i>It would be useful to provide detail on the terms of current national policies for introductions and transfers and how they are consistent with NASCO principles, and it is not clear how reporting on Action 12 will be completed</i></li> <li>○ <i>Action 14 includes completion and reporting, but no commitment to take action in light of that report</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>Faroe Islands</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not include specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Finland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>All aquaculture activities and transfers of live fish and eggs from other catchments are strictly forbidden in the catchment area of the rivers Teno and Näätämöjoki, but it would be useful to describe the actions planned to enforce this prohibition</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan identifies issues with escaped farmed salmon that would appear to warrant cooperative action with Norway</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>France</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No plan submitted</i></li> </ul>		
<b>Germany</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No plan submitted</i></li> </ul>		
<b>Greenland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>As noted previously, the plan is necessarily limited in scope to the management and reporting on the internal-use fishery in Greenland</i></li> <li>○ <i>There are no salmon aquaculture facilities in Greenland</i></li> </ul>		N/A
<b>Iceland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does include objectives, but would benefit from specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>Despite lack of timescales there is a robust management system in place for a limited salmon farming industry</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan highlights a challenge related to introductions, and it is not clear how this will be addressed</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan indicates that Iceland has been reviewing and updating its laws and regulations on aquaculture in line with the NASCO agreements</i></li> </ul>	X	

	<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>	<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B6</b>	<b>Does the plan include a summary of the approaches that will be adopted to minimise adverse effects of aquaculture and control introductions and transfers?</b>		
<b>Ireland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not include specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>There is a description of the influences that aquaculture may have on wild stocks but it contains no commitments</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Northern Ireland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not include specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>States “work is underway” to develop a stocking policy for Northern Ireland, but no timescale is specified</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Norway</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan identifies actions to be taken to address the three main issues of escapes, sea lice and G. salaris. In each case a vision is identified, along with a list of milestones to be met in the coming years</i></li> <li>○ <i>In relation to sea lice, it might be considered whether levels of infestation on wild sea trout should also be used as an indicator, since in other areas this has presented a greater problem</i></li> <li>○ <i>Actions only extend to 2007 and it is not clear what happens after that date</i></li> <li>○ <i>The Finnish and Swedish plans have identified problems with escaped Norwegian farmed salmon that would appear to warrant specific actions</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>Portugal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No plan submitted</i></li> </ul>		
<b>Russian Federation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan includes limited specific actions, but lacks timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>Salmon farming appears to be limited to a small production on the Kola peninsula, although it is not clear whether other enhancement/rearing activities take place elsewhere</i></li> <li>○ <i>It is proposed that regional regulations will be established for operating ‘fishing sites’ for aquaculture, in line with NASCO recommendations, but there are no measurable outputs or timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>It is not clear what the objective is for the management of fisheries for pink salmon</i></li> <li>○ <i>Gyrodactylus salaris has been identified in one river already but no mitigation or treatment activities are described</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Scotland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not include specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan states that it is likely that sea lice infestations and escapes of farmed fish have contributed to declines and slowed recovery, but measurable outputs to address this threat are not specified</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan discusses work of the Tripartite Working Group to develop a system of Area Management Agreements to address sea lice monitoring, containment and disease risk, but the monitoring and evaluation of this system is missing</i></li> </ul>		X

	<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>	<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B6</b>	<b>Does the plan include a summary of the approaches that will be adopted to minimise adverse effects of aquaculture and control introductions and transfers?</b>		
<b>Spain</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>There is no reference to aquaculture but a limited reference to restocking with objectives but no specific actions and timescales</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Sweden</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not include specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>There is a sizeable rainbow trout aquaculture industry in this part of Sweden, but no Atlantic salmon aquaculture. A long-term objective of banning rainbow trout is stated, but no specific commitment is provided</i></li> <li>○ <i>There is no specific action identified to address Gyrodactylus salaris</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan identifies escaped farmed salmon as a major threat, but specifies no action</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>USA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does include specific actions and associated timescales</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan includes a commitment to an annual audit of containment management systems</i></li> </ul>	X	

	<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>	<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B7 Does the plan provide a summary of the approach that will be adopted to address other influences?</b>			
<b>Canada</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Activities are identified in relation to SALSEA with schedules for reporting. Other influences are identified (contaminants and invasive species), but no actions are identified</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Denmark</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No other influences are identified</i></li> </ul>		N/A
<b>England and Wales</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Reporting on research into factors affecting marine survival is identified</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>Faroe Islands</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No other influences are identified</i></li> </ul>		N/A
<b>Finland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No other influences are identified</i></li> </ul>		N/A
<b>France</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No plan submitted</i></li> </ul>		
<b>Germany</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No plan submitted</i></li> </ul>		
<b>Greenland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No other influences are identified</i></li> </ul>		N/A
<b>Iceland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No other influences are identified</i></li> </ul>		N/A
<b>Ireland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No other influences are identified</i></li> </ul>		N/A
<b>Northern Ireland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan identifies other influences including exploitation by mammals and birds, low marine survival, and cormorant predation, but does not include any specific actions to address these other influences</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Norway</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No other influences are identified</i></li> </ul>		N/A
<b>Portugal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No plan submitted</i></li> </ul>		
<b>Russian Federation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan refers to measures to assess by-catches in pelagic fisheries in the Norwegian Sea and in herring and pink salmon fisheries in the White Sea, but no timescale is provided</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Scotland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Predation by birds and mammals (particularly seals) has been identified as a cause for concern in a number of salmon fishery districts and some limited action is authorized but outputs are lacking</i></li> <li>○ <i>Invasive non-native species may also impact fish and fisheries - mink, North American Signal Crayfish - but there are no specific actions</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan states that a working group has been created on the possible introduction of <i>G. salaris</i> to Scotland and was to report in autumn 2006, but no specific actions have been identified yet</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Spain</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No other influences are identified</i></li> </ul>		N/A
<b>Sweden</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No other influences are identified</i></li> </ul>		N/A
<b>USA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan lists a set of actions in order to get a better understanding of the linkages between the Atlantic salmon and the environment it lives in</i></li> </ul>	X	

	<b>B. Content of the Plan</b>	<b>Is the Plan satisfactory?</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B8</b>	<b>Does the plan provide a summary of monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures?</b>		
<b>Canada</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Identifies monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>Denmark</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not address this issue</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>England and Wales</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Identifies monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan clearly sets out a process for evaluating river-by-river progress within Salmon Action Plans</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>Faroe Islands</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does include a reference to evaluation, but does not describe any specific activities</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Finland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not address this issue</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>France</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No plan submitted</i></li> </ul>		
<b>Germany</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No plan submitted</i></li> </ul>		
<b>Greenland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Identifies measurable indicator for efficacy of management measures designed to improve accuracy of estimates of the fishery</i></li> <li>○ <i>No mention is made of the international sampling program</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>Iceland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Identifies monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>Ireland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Identifies monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures, but there is a lack of monitoring and evaluation specific to aquaculture</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Northern Ireland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Identifies monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>Norway</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Identifies monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>Portugal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No plan submitted</i></li> </ul>		
<b>Russian Federation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Identifies monitoring and evaluation activities that will be used to assess stock status and the efficacy of management measures</i></li> </ul>	X	
<b>Scotland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan refers to monitoring and evaluation, but does not include a summary of the activities that will be used to assess status of stocks and the efficacy of management measures</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Spain</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not include any reference to monitoring or evaluation activities</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>Sweden</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not address this issue</i></li> </ul>		X
<b>USA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Criteria have been identified for evaluation of the efficacy of management measures and identifies monitoring and evaluation activities</i></li> </ul>	X	

<b>B9 How does the plan consider socio-economic issues?</b>	
<b>Canada</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Reference is made to the commitments of federal Canada to Aboriginals for food, social and ceremonial purposes as a first priority after conservation</i></li> </ul>
<b>Denmark</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not mention consideration of socio-economic factors</i></li> </ul>
<b>England and Wales</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>One of the main objectives identified is to optimize the total economic value of surplus stocks and the plan identifies when socio-economic values are addressed in developing fishing controls for salmon fisheries</i></li> <li>○ <i>Salmon Action Plans include identification of main factors limiting performance and drawing up and costing a list of options to address these</i></li> <li>○ <i>The plan states that existing licensees who are dependent upon fishing for their livelihood retain the right to receive a license as long as they wish</i></li> </ul>
<b>Faroe Islands</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not mention consideration of socio-economic factors</i></li> </ul>
<b>Finland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan highlights the socio-economic importance of salmon to the local communities</i></li> </ul>
<b>France</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No plan submitted</i></li> </ul>
<b>Germany</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No plan submitted</i></li> </ul>
<b>Greenland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not mention consideration of socio-economic factors and their role in fishery management decisions</i></li> </ul>
<b>Iceland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan identifies the economic value of angling</i></li> <li>○ <i>It is clear that decisions about the balance of exploitation between rod and net fisheries has been driven, in large part, by economic considerations</i></li> </ul>
<b>Ireland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>A hardship fund to compensate those that lost their livelihood through the closure of the drift net fishery</i></li> </ul>
<b>Northern Ireland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>There is no specific mention of socio-economic issues in the plan</i></li> </ul>
<b>Norway</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The socio-economic value of the most important salmon rivers is included</i></li> <li>○ <i>The fishery management goal refers to safeguarding the interests of different user groups</i></li> </ul>
<b>Portugal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>No plan submitted</i></li> </ul>
<b>Russian Federation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan refers to plans to ‘address socio-economic problems’, but it is not clear what this is referring to, nor what the implications may be for the management of salmon fisheries</i></li> </ul>
<b>Scotland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan acknowledges the economic value of the fishery and aquaculture industry but does not describe how the implications are considered when identifying what action to take</i></li> <li>○ <i>Educational activities are identified (Salmon in Schools)</i></li> </ul>
<b>Spain</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The plan does not mention consideration of socio-economic factors</i></li> </ul>
<b>Sweden</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>There is no discussion of socio-economic factors</i></li> </ul>
<b>USA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>An “experimental catch and release fishery” is stated to be consistent with the socio-economic approach to fisheries management by NASCO</i></li> <li>○ <i>Mentions the importance of education and outreach activities</i></li> </ul>