

Council

CNL(08)10

Report of the Ad Hoc Review Group on Implementation Plans

CNL(08)10

Report of the *Ad Hoc* Review Group on 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 take into account NASCO's various guidelines. Draft Implementation Plans were presented at a Special Session at the Twenty-Third Annual Meeting in 2006 and were then submitted for review by an *Ad Hoc* Review Group comprising Mary Colligan, Ted Potter, Andras Kristiansen and Arni Isaksson for NASCO's Parties and Chris Poupard and Gareth Porter for the NGOs. I served as the Coordinator and the Secretariat facilitated the Group's work and provided the rapporteur. The Group's first report with its initial assessment of the plans was presented at the Twenty-Fourth Annual Meeting. The focus of the review was the structure of the plans and their conformity to the guidelines; it was not about the adequacy or otherwise of each jurisdiction's record of salmon management.
2. Last year the Council concluded that the review process had been a very valuable process and in the light of the *Ad Hoc* Review Group's assessments decided that the plans should be submitted in final form for further review by the Group. The Group, therefore, met in London during 11-14 December 2007 and reviewed a total of sixteen plans, two of which had not previously been reviewed. Following this review, consistent with its Terms of Reference, the Group asked that the President write to jurisdictions providing specific comments and inviting them to make any further amendments to their plans by 11 February 2008. These revised plans were then reviewed by correspondence, and the group's final assessments of all sixteen plans are contained in Section 5 of its report which is attached.
3. A report on the Group's findings will be presented during a Special Session at the Twenty-Fifth Annual Meeting. While most of the Plans are now considered to be satisfactory and form a sound basis for future reporting, for some plans there are still shortcomings that the group proposes be addressed through the Focus Area Reports and/or Annual Progress reports.
4. The Group welcomes the progress that has been made. In particular, the contributions are very welcome from those jurisdictions that had in the past made limited information available to NASCO on the resource, the threats to it and the management regimes to address these. The Group stresses the importance of developing, refining and improving the Implementation Plans which, although applying for a period of five years without major change, may be subject to changes which would be reported to the Council in the annual progress reports. This should not be seen as a bureaucratic chore but an essential part of the 'Next Steps' process. The Group urges those jurisdictions that have not yet submitted plans to do so at the earliest opportunity.

4. The Council is asked to consider the report of the first *Ad Hoc* Review Group, which has now completed its work, and decide on appropriate action. The Council will also be asked to decide on the second focus area for the reports by the Parties due in 2009 and agree Terms of Reference and composition for an *Ad Hoc* Group to review these reports.

Secretary
Edinburgh
9 April 2008

IP(07)26

Report of the Second Meeting of the Ad Hoc Review Group on Implementation Plans

***NEAFC Headquarters, London
11 - 14 December, 2007***

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 London. He referred to the progress made by the Group at its first meeting in March 2007, at which it had agreed its working methods and had undertaken initial reviews of fifteen Implementation Plans. The Group's report had been presented at NASCO's Twenty-Fourth Annual Meeting and the Council had concluded that the review process to date had been very valuable. He thanked the members of the Group for their excellent work in undertaking the initial reviews and in presenting the findings in a critical, but fair, manner. He noted that in the light of the Group's findings the Council had agreed that all jurisdictions be requested to provide their final plans to the Secretariat by 1 November 2007 so that these could be reviewed or re-reviewed by the Group. The challenge for the Group now would be to re-review plans that had been re-submitted to ensure that the changes requested by the Group had been made and to conduct a review of new plans using the format and procedures agreed at the first meeting. Under the Group's Terms of Reference (see Section 3) if the Group continued to have concerns about any Implementation Plan the President could be asked to liaise with the Party concerned.
- 1.2 A list of participants is contained in Annex 1. Mr Andras Kristiansen (Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)) and Dr Gareth Porter (NGOs) were unable to participate in the Group's second meeting but had contributed to its work.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

- 2.1 The *Ad Hoc* Review Group adopted an agenda for its second meeting, IP(07)27 (Annex 1).

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

- 3.1 The original Terms of Reference for the Group, agreed by Heads of Delegations in 2007, are contained in Annex 2.
- 3.2 The Council had subsequently revised these Terms of Reference by asking that final plans be submitted by 1 November 2007 and that the *Ad Hoc* Review Group report on its assessment of these plans by 1 March 2008.
- 3.3 The Group discussed its working methods and agreed that in the case of new plans (see 4.1 below) it would first conduct a detailed review using the review format and

the approach agreed at its first meeting in order to assess consistency of these plans with the guidelines, NSTF(06)10. Those plans that had been reviewed at the Group's first meeting would be re-reviewed to assess if the elements in these plans previously identified as unsatisfactory had been improved. The Group agreed that it would not, however, present its findings using the review form. It was likely to be more helpful to identify those plans it considered to be satisfactory as a basis for future reporting and provide specific comments on those plans that the Group felt would benefit from further improvement.

- 3.4 Consistent with its Terms of Reference the Group agreed that, where necessary, it would ask that the President write to jurisdictions providing specific comments and inviting them to make any further amendments to their plans by 11 February 2008. Thereafter the Group would finalise its report including its assessments of the plans, which would be issued to all delegates as a Council paper. In the event that further revisions were made by any jurisdiction by 11 February, the Group would work by correspondence to assess the changes made and to finalise its assessment. Where a jurisdiction did not respond by this deadline the Group's assessment developed at its second meeting would be included in its report.
- 3.5 The Group recommends that the final plans be allocated Council paper numbers, collated by the Secretariat and issued to all delegates before the next Annual Meeting of NASCO.

4. Review of New and Revised Implementation Plans

- 4.1 The Group emphasised the importance of developing, refining and improving Implementation Plans which, although applying for a period of five years without major change, may be subject to changes which would be reported to the Council in the annual progress reports. This should not be considered as a bureaucratic chore, but an essential part of the 'Next Steps' process. Implementation Plans will provide a measure of how jurisdictions are progressing in implementing NASCO's resolutions and agreements over the next five years and consequently in achieving NASCO's objectives of conserving and restoring Atlantic salmon. Unless the Implementation Plans are satisfactory, with an action plan of measurable outputs and timescales, the next stage of the process, in which focus area reports are submitted for individual agreements, will be compromised. The Group is encouraged by the overall progress that has been made since the initial assessments and by the fact that plans are now available for most jurisdictions. The Group believes that the process of developing Implementation Plans will stimulate further progress in developing management approaches consistent with NASCO's agreements and in some cases is likely to lead to improved coordination within jurisdictions. The process should also stimulate an exchange of information on best practice among NASCO's Parties.
- 4.2 In developing its assessments, the Group has striven to be fair. The Group recognised that the range of jurisdictions in NASCO has different legal structures, management methods, languages, resources and culture and that they will approach salmon conservation in somewhat different ways. Nevertheless, the same principles as outlined in the NASCO resolutions and agreements should apply and the Implementation Plans should all be able to detail specific management actions with timescales for their implementation. While most jurisdictions have made

considerable improvements to their plans, in the interests of fairness the Group felt that it had a duty to highlight shortcomings in some plans, particularly the lack of specific management actions with timescales. In this regard, the Group stressed that an action specifies what will be done in a given period of time rather than identifying general goals. For example, the goal may be to reduce illegal fishing but the actions that could be used to achieve that goal might be to increase enforcement effort, introduce carcass tagging, etc., within a specified period of time. The Group developed definitions of terms (including actions, measurable outputs, deliverables) that might assist the Parties in revising their plans and in reporting on them, IP(07)25 (Annex 3).

4.3 The Group reviewed a total of sixteen Implementation Plans. Two of these plans (EU (France) and EU (Germany)) had not previously been reviewed by the Group, which greatly welcomed these contributions. In the past, limited information has been provided to NASCO by these jurisdictions so the details of the resource and threats to it, the current management regimes in place and the future commitments to implement measures consistent with NASCO's resolutions and agreements are very welcome. An Implementation Plan for the Faroe Islands had been reviewed at the Group's first meeting but it referred only to the situation in four small rivers in which salmon populations have been established. The revised plan now includes details of the offshore marine fishery although this has not been conducted for some years. These three new plans were therefore reviewed using the approach and review format developed at the Group's first meeting to assess consistency with the guidelines, NSTF(06)10. The new and revised Implementation Plans reviewed by the Group were for the following jurisdictions:

- Canada;
- Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands);
- Denmark (in respect of Greenland);
- EU - Denmark;
- EU - Finland;
- EU - France;
- EU - Germany
- EU - Ireland;
- EU - Sweden;
- EU - UK (England and Wales);
- EU - UK (Northern Ireland);
- EU - UK (Scotland);
- Iceland;
- Norway;
- Russian Federation;
- USA

4.4 At its first meeting the Group had recognised that the extent of the salmon stocks and the resources available to manage them vary markedly among jurisdictions. While the Group took no account of these differences in undertaking its reviews, it did accept that the Implementation Plans for jurisdictions with a small number of salmon stocks might be relatively brief, although they should still contain the core elements identified in the guidelines and specify management actions with timescales for their

implementation. Furthermore, while it would not be reasonable to expect management actions to be implemented to address every threat to the resource within the next five years, the Group felt that all the plans should contain a reasonable number of specific actions, clearly numbered to allow referencing when reporting on progress, with clear timescales for their implementation.

- 4.5 The Group considered that some plans still contain aspirational elements rather than specific actions. The Group recognises that the extent to which management actions specified in the plans can be implemented within the five year period of the plan will depend on the availability of adequate resources at the time of their implementation. The availability of these resources may not have been guaranteed when the plan was developed. The objective of the Implementation Plans is to demonstrate how NASCO's Agreements, Resolutions and Guidelines are being implemented, but the Group noted that many plans make limited reference to NASCO or to any of these commitments. Furthermore many plans provided only limited linkages between actions and specific aspects of the Agreements. The Group noted that these issues will need to be followed up in more detail in the appropriate Focus Area Reports.
- 4.6 The Review Group also identified the following formatting and content elements that greatly assisted in the clarity and understanding of Plans and which might be taken into account in subsequent revisions to the Plans:
- Maps: A map illustrating the major salmon rivers within a Party or jurisdiction provided some orientation and greater context to the descriptions within the text.
 - Numbering of Actions: Unique numbering for each planned action made the actions more obvious within the Plan and will greatly facilitate further reporting against these actions.

5. Development of Recommendations on Adequacy of Implementation Plans

Jurisdictions Submitting Plans

- 5.1 The Group's final recommendations on each of the sixteen plans it reviewed are listed below. These final recommendations were developed by correspondence after the Group's second meeting. In accordance with its Terms of Reference, the Group had reviewed three new plans and re-reviewed thirteen plans at its second meeting. Its assessments of these plans were made available to the President who liaised, where appropriate, with the jurisdictions concerned and asked that any further revisions proposed by the *Ad Hoc* Review Group be sent back to the Secretariat by 11 February. Although some revised plans were not submitted by this deadline, all have been re-examined by the Group. The final review was conducted by the Group by correspondence and the assessments below are of the final plans submitted following the President's communication. The final plans will be compiled by the Secretariat and issued to all delegates prior to the Twenty-Fifth Annual Meeting.

Canada - IP(07)17 FINAL

This plan shows considerable improvement following the initial assessment by the Review Group; the plan and is considered to be satisfactory.

Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands) - IP(07)22 FINAL

This plan shows considerable improvement following the initial assessment by the Review Group and is now considered to be satisfactory in most areas. However, in relation to the areas of fishery management and management of aquaculture, introductions and transfers the Plan says only that relevant NASCO agreements will be applied and does not provide any actions stating what will actually be done or when. This will make it difficult to determine whether satisfactory progress is being achieved. These issues will need to be addressed in more detail in the appropriate Focus Area Reports.

Denmark (in respect of Greenland) - IP(07)18 FINAL

This plan shows considerable improvement following the initial assessment by the Review Group; the plan is considered to be satisfactory. However, additional details on the management of the fishery should be provided in the Focus Area Report on Fishery Management.

EU – Denmark – IP(07)12 FINAL

This plan shows some improvement following the initial assessment by the Review Group but it is suggested that the following points be addressed in future Focus Area Reports and Annual Progress Reports:

1. The objective of the Implementation Plan is to demonstrate how NASCO's Agreements, Resolutions and Guidelines are being implemented, but the plan makes no reference to NASCO or any of these commitments. It should, therefore, refer to these commitments in the context of fisheries management, habitat protection and restoration, and aquaculture, introductions and transfers.
2. A clear indication of expected outputs and delivery dates should be provided for each intended management action
3. There should be a summary of monitoring and evaluation activities.

EU - Finland - IP(07)13 FINAL

This plan shows some improvement following the initial assessment by the Review Group but it is suggested that the following points be addressed in future Focus Area Reports and Annual Progress Reports:

1. The Plan is complicated by the fact that all rivers lie on borders with other NASCO Parties. There is therefore a need to clarify which agencies are responsible for addressing the various management challenges that arise.
2. The objective of the Implementation Plan is to demonstrate how the NASCO Agreements, Resolutions and Guidelines will be implemented. There is therefore a need to explain how this will be addressed over the coming five year period.

3. The Plan should describe specific actions that will be undertaken, both cooperatively and within Finland, to address the threats relating to fisheries management, habitat protection and restoration and aquaculture introductions and transfers. The Review Group noted that Finland felt unable to specify actions at this stage but recommends that Finland provides appropriate updates to their Implementation Plan, including a clear list of actions (with expected outputs and delivery dates) in their Annual Progress Reports for 2008 and 2009.

EU - France - IP(07)20 FINAL

This new Plan is considered to be satisfactory.

EU - Germany - IP(07)21 FINAL

This new Plan is considered to be satisfactory. However, the status of stocks is described in a general way that will make future comparison difficult. It is suggested that more detail be provided in future Focus Area Reports.

EU - Ireland - IP(07)23 FINAL

This Plan shows considerable improvement following the initial assessment by the Review Group; the plan is considered to be satisfactory. However, the Group notes that parts of the Plan, including the summary table of fishery management actions, are still labeled draft. It will be important that the status of the Plan is confirmed in the 2008 Progress Report.

EU - Sweden - IP(07)14 FINAL

This Plan shows considerable improvement following the initial assessment by the Review Group and is now largely satisfactory, but it is suggested that the following points be addressed in future Focus Area Reports and Annual Progress Reports:

1. The objective of the Implementation Plan is to demonstrate how NASCO's Agreements, Resolutions and Guidelines are being implemented, but the plan makes no reference to NASCO or any of these commitments. It should, therefore, refer to these commitments in the context of fisheries management, habitat protection and restoration, and aquaculture, introductions and transfers.
2. The Plan describes a number of threats relating to aquaculture, introductions and transfers, but it is not clear what actions will be taken to address these, and when they will be completed. This will make it difficult to determine whether satisfactory progress is being achieved.

EU - UK (England and Wales) - IP(07)10 FINAL

Further refinements have been made to this plan following the initial assessment by the Review Group; the plan is considered to be satisfactory.

EU - UK (Northern Ireland) - IP(07)11 FINAL

This Plan shows considerable improvement following the initial assessment by the Review Group; the plan is considered to be satisfactory.

EU-UK (Scotland) - IP(07)19 FINAL

This Plan shows considerable improvement following the initial assessment by the Review Group; the plan is considered to be satisfactory.

Iceland - IP(07)8 FINAL

This plan shows considerable improvement following the initial assessment by the Review Group; the plan is now considered to be satisfactory in most areas. However, while the Review Group recognises the success of existing salmon management in Iceland, the Plan still makes little reference to the various NASCO agreements that it should be designed to address, and while it includes over thirty actions most of these do not state clearly what will be done or when. These issues will need to be addressed in more detail during the appropriate Focus Area Reports.

Norway - IP(07)9 FINAL

Further refinements have been made to this plan following the initial assessment by the Review Group; the plan is considered to be satisfactory.

Russia - IP(07)15 FINAL

This plan shows considerable improvement following the initial assessment by the Review Group; the plan is considered to be satisfactory.

USA - IP(07)16 FINAL

Further refinements have been made to this plan following the initial assessment by the Review Group; the plan is considered to be satisfactory.

Jurisdictions not Submitting Plans

- 5.3 The Group noted, with concern, the lack of Implementation Plans for EU (Portugal) and EU (Spain). In the case of Portugal, the Group is aware that representatives from the Portuguese authorities rarely attend NASCO meetings although they do receive mailings on NASCO matters. Furthermore, the Group recognises that the Atlantic salmon may occur in very few rivers in Portugal and the status in those rivers is uncertain. Nevertheless, salmon are known to occur in the River Minho, which is a border river with Spain.
- 5.4 In the case of Spain, the Group had reviewed a plan for Asturias at its first meeting and had hoped that a more comprehensive plan covering all the autonomous regions with salmon interests (Asturias, Cantabria, Galicia, Navarra, and the Basque Country) would be made available for review. The Group is aware that these regions do have management programmes in place for Atlantic salmon and that the resource is highly

prized in these communities. Following the Group's meeting, a letter was received from the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food in Madrid concerning future development of an Implementation Plan for Spain. This letter, and the response from the Secretary of NASCO, are contained in Annex 4.

- 5.5 The Group does not take the view that because the stocks of salmon in Spain and Portugal are relatively small, it is acceptable to omit them from the Implementation Plan process. It could be argued that the challenges facing the conservation and management of salmon populations at the southern end of the range of the species in Europe are particularly great and that they represent an important component of genetic diversity. The Group therefore asks that the Council requests, through the European Commission, that the authorities in these jurisdictions develop Implementation Plans at the earliest opportunity.
- 5.6 NASCO has a major role in fostering international cooperation on salmon matters and the Group is eager to see the development of these plans, and is willing to assist with their development and assessment. The Group is also aware from the German Implementation Plan that activities in the Netherlands may have an impact on salmon populations returning to spawning grounds in the Rhine. The Group noted that there could be potential salmon production or fisheries in other EU Member States and recommends that the Council seek clarification from the Head of the EU Delegation on the status of salmon populations and fisheries in other EU Member States, including the Netherlands and Belgium.

6. Arrangements for Special Session during the Twenty-Fifth Annual Meeting

- 6.1 The Group noted that at the Twenty-Fifth Annual Meeting there will be an opportunity for it to present a brief report of its findings during a Special Session. This session would also allow for a report of the Second *Ad Hoc* Review Group on the first focus area, management of fisheries, and for contributions by the Parties on these reports. The Group felt that it would be useful to briefly summarise the process by which it completed the reviews and their outcome. It would also be appropriate to highlight that the standard of the plans has improved since the process started and that most jurisdictions have now developed plans. Finally it might be useful to identify lessons learned that might benefit future review groups, such as the approach used to ensure compatibility of the reviews and the importance of developing guidance to the jurisdictions to assist in preparing their plans and subsequent reports. The Group agreed to finalise arrangements for this presentation by correspondence.

7. Report of the Meeting

- 7.1 The *Ad Hoc* Review Group agreed a report of its meeting.

8. Any Other Business

- 8.1 There was no other business.

9. Close of Meeting

- 9.1 The Coordinator closed the meeting and thanked all members of the Group for their very valuable and conscientious contributions to the two meetings. He was very much aware of their efforts to be consistent and fair. He indicated that any remaining work for the Group would be conducted by correspondence.

IP(07)27

**Second Meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Review Group on Implementation Plans
NEAFC Headquarters, London, UK
11 - 14 December, 2007**

Agenda

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 New and Revised Implementation Plans
5. Development of Recommendations on Adequacy of Implementation Plans
6. Arrangements for Special Session during the Twenty-Fifth Annual Meeting
7. Report of the Meeting
8. Any Other Business
9. Close of Meeting

IP(07)28

Terms of Reference

- (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.

IP(07)25 Definition of Terms

During the review of the draft Implementation Plans, it became apparent that terms and words had been interpreted differently by various Plan authors. In an effort to achieve consistency across the Plans, the Review Group worked to the following principles which are based on the Guidelines for the Preparation of NASCO “Implementation Plans and for Reporting on Progress, NSTF(06)10.

Actions are the core of the Implementation Plans. The actions are specific tangible activities that a Party or jurisdiction intends to undertake during the five year term of the Implementation Plan. After reading the section of an Implementation Plan describing management actions, the reader should clearly understand what will be done, how it will be done, when it will be done and how taking these actions contribute to the implementation of the relevant NASCO resolutions and agreements.

In contrast, **aspirations, goals** and **visions** identify longer term, desired end points and ideals. In general, actions are implemented as part of a strategy or plan to achieve a desired goal or vision.

To compare these two terms with an example:

A **vision** may be the elimination of escapes from aquaculture cages;

An **action** may be to require containment management systems for all marine cages by 2009.

Measurable outputs may be the **deliverables** that will result from taking the actions identified in the Implementation Plan or a **measure of success** of the action. If an action is taken by a Party or jurisdiction it should result in a change – this change is the measurable output, result or deliverable that flows from that action. The Guidelines state that in order for Implementation Plans to be effective it will be important for proposed actions and activities to have measurable outputs.

To further use the example above, a **measurable output** of the action of requiring containment management systems could be the demonstration that an auditable containment management system is in operation for all cage sites. Alternatively - or additionally – the measure of success may be the reduction in escapees detected in salmon rivers.

The Plans are intended to cover a five year period. It is important to identify the specific **timeframe** or **delivery date** for each action within the period of the Plan in order that progress with commitments can be tracked in the Annual Progress Reports submitted to the Council. This is not possible if all actions are expected to be delivered at the completion of the Plan.

The Guidelines further emphasize the importance of a process and measurable outputs that are open to critical evaluation and assessment in subsequent reporting. In advancing Implementation Plans, NASCO had a stated desire to increase the transparency and accountability of Parties and jurisdictions in implementing NASCO agreements. This can only be accomplished if the Plans make it very clear what will be done and when it will be

accomplished and if subsequent reports indicate whether the planned actions were implemented how and when planned and if they achieved the intended output.



MINISTERIO
DE AGRICULTURA, PESCA
Y ALIMENTACION

*El Director General de Estructuras
y Mercados Pesqueros*

Mr. Malcolm Windsor
Secretary
NASCO
Scotland UK

Madrid, December 14th, 2007

The North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization has been asking its Parties to report on their implementation plans in order to ensure the protection and conservation of salmon stocks.

The Implementation Plans are presented by Nasco as the best way to provide a general picture of the resource and to outline the existing management requirements, in place in different jurisdictions.

Spain is aware of the importance of that exercise and has fully agreed with the adoption of those plans for an appropriate management of salmon stocks.

The Spanish regions involved in salmon matters have recently undertaken the preparation of an Atlas of Salmon Rivers in Spain, that will probably be achieved in 2008. This document should be essential to adopt the management approaches according to Nasco Resolutions and Agreements in our country.

But, unfortunately, Spain has not developed for the moment any Implementation Plan as an overall strategy to protect the resource. Nevertheless, it's our intention to provide as soon as we can, the information required by Nasco on this subject.

Thanking you for your comprehension, I wish you a very happy Christmas and the best for 2008.

Yours faithfully,

CORREO ELECTRÓNICO:

depesmar@mapya.es


SECRETARIA GENERAL DE PESCA
MARITIMA
JOSE ORTEGA Y GASSET, 57
28006 - MADRID
TEL: 91347 60 50-347 60 51
FAX: 91347 6054

NASCO 11 Rutland Square Edinburgh EH1 2AS Scotland UK
Telephone: (Int+44) 131 228 2551 Fax: (Int+44) 131 228 4384
e-mail: hq@nasco.int website: www.nasco.int

CNL40.614

2 January, 2008

El Director General de Estructuras y Mercados Pesqueros
Secretaria General de Pesca Maritima
Jose Ortega Y Gasset, 57
28006 - Madrid
Spain



Dear Director General

This will acknowledge, with sincere thanks, your communication regarding the request by the NASCO Council that member Parties and their jurisdictions submit Implementation Plans to ensure conservation of wild salmon stocks.

We are very glad to hear that Spain recognises the importance of this exercise and agrees with it.

We understand the complexities of salmon management in Spain, with several Autonomous Regions involved, and are glad to hear that an inventory or atlas of salmon rivers is being drawn up as the first step in developing Implementation Plans for conservation measures. It is a pity that this was not ready for the December 2007 Review Group, but I feel sure that Spain will be able to make another statement on progress when we meet in Gijon next June. We are all very much looking forward to that meeting.

In the meantime, please accept my very best wishes for 2008.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, which appears to read 'Malcolm Windsor', is positioned below the typed name.

Dr Malcolm Windsor
Secretary

NASCO is an inter-government organization established by an international Convention