



Council

CNL(11)46

Special Session Presentation

(Tim Sheehan)

Report of the Meeting of the
Ad Hoc Review Group
on Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers
and Transgenics



Review Group Members

- Torfinn Evensen
 - Heidi Hansen
 - Marita Rasmussen
 - Bob Steinbock
 - Tim Sheehan
 - Boyce Thorne Miller
-
- Brief biographies in **Annex 1**.

Timeline Overview

- NASCO Annual Meeting – June 2009
 - Review Group formed and ToRs developed
- Review Group 1st Meeting – February 2010
 - Draft Report produced
- Liaison Group Meeting – April 2010
 - Draft Report presented
- NASCO Annual Meeting Special Session – June 2010
 - Draft Report presented
- Review Group 2nd Meeting – November 2010
 - Final Report produced
 - Incorporated comments from the Parties, ISFA and NGOs
- Liaison Group Meeting – March 2011
 - Present Final Report
- NASCO Annual Meeting Special Session – June 2011
 - Present Final Report

Review Group Terms of Reference

- Focus Area Reports (FARs)
 - Prepared by each Party/Jurisdiction
 - Provide in-depth assessment of measures, as reflected in Implementation Plans, to implement NASCO Agreements (i.e. The Williamsburg Resolution)
- Review and analyze the FARs on Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers, and Transgenics
 - Do the steps in the FARs fully comply with NASCO's agreements to protect the wild stocks from genetic, disease, parasite and other impacts?
- Prepare a report which includes the following:
 - Identification of common challenges;
 - Identification of common management and scientific approaches to these challenges;
 - Compilation of recommended best practice; and
 - Recommendations and/or feedback to help ensure implementation of the Williamsburg Resolution.

Best Management Practice (BMP)

- Adopted by both ISFA and NASCO (2009)
- Basic Principle
 - Salmon stocks in areas with farms should be as healthy as stocks in areas without farms
- Sea Lice
 - 100% of farms to have effective management so that there is no increase in lice loads or lice induced mortality of wild salmonids
- Containment
 - 100% of farmed fish to be retained in all production facilities
- BMP Guidance was intended to:
 - Assist NASCO Parties in framing the management of salmon aquaculture, in cooperation with their industries, and in developing future NASCO Implementation Plans and FARs in 2010
 - BMP Guidance was incorporated into FAR preparation guidance
- Review Group welcomed the BMP guidance and suggested it fulfilled their ToR of compiling best practice

Review and analysis of FARs

- Jurisdictions that didn't submitted a FAR (3)
 - Denmark in respect of Greenland, EU-Portugal, and EU-Spain
- Jurisdictions that did submitted a FAR (14)
 - Canada
 - Denmark in respect of the Faroe Islands
 - EU – Denmark
 - EU – Finland
 - EU – France
 - EU – Germany
 - EU – Ireland
 - EU – Sweden
 - EU – UK (England and Wales)
 - EU – UK (Northern Ireland)
 - EU – UK (Scotland)
 - Norway
 - Russian Federation
 - USA

General Comments on the FARs

- *Structure and content*
 - Future FARs should focus on outcomes of measures taken to implement the Williamsburg Resolution as to demonstrate progress towards achieving the international goals
- *Action Plans on Containment*
 - Most FARs did not clearly identify the existence of an Action Plan(s) through which internationally agreed guidelines on containment would be implemented via existing or new voluntary codes of practice or regulations
- *International cooperation to minimize adverse impacts on wild stocks*
 - Better reporting of ongoing efforts encouraged

General Comments on the FARs cont'd

- *Salmon ranching*
 - No ranching presented being undertaken, but “*ranching to the rod*” needs to be categorised
- *Risk Assessments*
 - In general, impacts on the marine environment (particularly benthic impacts) or exposure of the site are considered, there appears to be little consideration of the health, genetic diversity and status of wild salmonid stocks
- *Transgenic salmonids*
 - Few FARs clearly described if controls exist to ensure future use is consistent with the NASCO Guideline
 - Given the possibility of commercial production of transgenic salmon, the Council should ensure thorough discussions on all the related issues and the guidance in The Williamsburg Resolution should be applied through out North America.

General Comments on the FARs cont'd

- *River Classification*
 - Few FARs referred to how river classification was used for developing management measures
- *Corrective measures*
 - Most FARs did not clearly report on the nature of the measures to be taken to protect wild stocks when unforeseen impacts are detected
- *Socio-economic information*
 - Most FARs did not provide a clear indication of how socio-economic factors are incorporated into management decisions

General Comments on the FARs cont'd

- *Evaluation of the effectiveness of measures taken*
 - Many of the FARs reported that measures taken are consistent with NASCO's agreements, but they did not describe if the measures are effective in safeguarding the wild stocks and achieving the international goals contained in the BMP Guidance
- *Research, Development and Data Collection*
 - A lack of scientific information should not be used as a reason for failing to take conservation measures and therefore further research and development on a number of topics is desired

General Comments Relating to the Assessments

- *Introduction*
 - Many FARs failed to provide information to demonstrate progress towards achieving the international goals for sea lice and containment
- *Scale of Activities*
 - Size matters, but low levels of salmon farming and poorly planned introductions/transfers have the potential for adversely affects
- *Responsibility for setting standards*
 - Suggest that government should set technical and environmental standards and oversee monitoring requirements and schedules

General Comments Relating to the Assessments cont'd

- *Containment*
 - Provided comments supporting the recommendations in the BMP Guidance and suggestions to help with future FAR reporting and assessment
- *Sea lice*
 - Provided comments supporting the recommendations in the BMP Guidance and suggestions to help with future FAR reporting and assessment
- *NGO Statements*
 - Report was unanimously agreed by the Review Group
 - NGOs provided statements (**Annex 4**), that were not unanimously agreed upon by the Review Group

Feedback on Draft Report

- 5 Parties/Jurisdictions – **Annex 5**
- ISFA – **Annex 6**
 - NGOs response to ISFA – **Annex 7**
- 2010 Special Session

- All taken into account in finalizing report
 - Where appropriate, final assessments (**Annex 3**) were updated

Additional responses to Feedback

- *Template concerns*
 - Template was developed by the Council, not the Review Group, and combined the elements in the Williamsburg Resolution with those in the BMP Guidance
- *NGO circulation of FARs*
 - NGOs had circulated the FARs prior to the industry or jurisdictions seeing them
 - Review Group recommends consideration be given to making all FARs available online prior to review. To be considered by the 'Next Steps' Review Group

Response to feedback from the Jurisdictions

- Feedback carefully reviewed
- In some cases, assessments from the Draft Report were modified
- Feedback on new initiatives introduced subsequent to the submission of the FARs (i.e. during 2010), was not taken into account

Response to feedback from ISFA

- Feedback carefully reviewed
- Some new information presented that was not presented within the FARs submitted by the Parties/Jurisdictions
 - Assessments from Draft Report were not changed as the Review Group felt it was more appropriate for the Jurisdictions to consider the comments from the industry rather than the Review Group
- Heavy criticism of the process

Response to feedback from ISFA cont'd

- Review Group reiterated that the process used was developed by the Council and applied to all three previous FAR reviews
 - These were internal reviews intended to assess progress in implementing NASCO's agreements
- Council worked to keep ISFA informed and to allow for comments on both the Draft and Final Reports
- Suggestions for reformatting the report were incorporated

Response to feedback from ISFA cont'd

- Review Group reviewed any opinions expressed in the report to ensure they were justified
- Council's intention in conducting the review was to assess progress in implementing its agreements to conserve the wild salmon stocks and encourage sustainable salmon farming practices
 - Review Group's only concern was if NASCO Parties/Jurisdictions are implementing the NASCO agreements

Response to feedback from ISFA cont'd

- Review Group was confused by the statement that the international goals in the BMP Guidance are 'inherently unachievable and unrealistic'
 - BMP Guidance was adopted by NASCO and ISFA in 2009
- Review Group highlighted the progress made by the Liaison Group in recent years
 - Guidelines on Containment of Farmed Salmon
 - BMP Guidance
 - International goals for sea lice and containment.
- Review Group fully endorses the general principle outlined by the BMP Guidance
 - Salmon stocks in areas with farms should be as healthy as stocks in areas without farms

Identification of common challenges-approaches

- Intended to facilitate information exchange among Parties (**Annex 8**)
 - Point by point discussion of Williamsburg Resolution and the BMP Guidance, following the FAR reporting format, with overviews, assessments and examples taken from the FARs to highlight common challenges and approaches
- Includes recommendations on future reporting and approaches for improving information exchange

Annexes

- **Annex 1**
 - Biographies of the Members of the Review Group
- **Annex 2**
 - Terms of Reference and Working Methods
- **Annex 3**
 - Assessments of the FARs
- **Annex 4**
 - NGO Statements to the Review Group
- **Annex 5**
 - Responses from Parties to the Review Group's Draft Report
- **Annex 6**
 - ISFA Comments on the Draft Report of Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers and Transgenics Focus Area Review Group
- **Annex 7**
 - NGO Response to ISFA Comments on the NASCO Draft Aquaculture Focus Area Review Report
- **Annex 8**
 - Comparative overview of approaches used to address challenges in minimizing the adverse impacts of salmon aquaculture, introductions and transfers and transgenics on wild salmon stocks