



Agenda Item 5.1
For decision

Council

CNL(19)14

***Interim Report of the Implementation Plan / Annual Progress Report
Review Group for the Review of Implementation Plans under the Third
Cycle of Reporting (2019 – 2024)***

CNL(19)14

Interim Report of the Implementation Plan / Annual Progress Report Review Group for the Review of Implementation Plans under the Third Cycle of Reporting (2019 – 2024)

Hotel London Kensington, London, UK

26 – 28 February 2019

Note: The Review Group met during 26-28 February 2019 and completed its initial evaluations of 9 of the 20 submitted Implementation Plans. Subsequent work in conducting an initial evaluation of the other 11 Implementation Plans was conducted via three conference calls on 15 and 22 March and 5 April, in a further face-to-face meeting on 9 April and a final conference call on 13 May. This report covers all of the Review Group's work.

1. Opening of the Meeting

- 1.1 The Chair, Mr Rory Saunders (USA), opened the meeting and welcomed members of the Review Group to London and thanked them for agreeing to undertake the important work assigned to them. He reminded the Group that, despite the improvements seen in reporting over the second cycle of reporting, the NASCO Council has expressed a wish to strengthen the IP / APR process still further in the third reporting cycle. He then noted their challenging task to undertake a review of each of the Implementation Plans submitted by Parties / jurisdictions to evaluate the quality of the information contained and determine whether it provides a fair and equitable basis for assessing the progress that the Party or jurisdiction will make in implementing NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines throughout the third reporting cycle, from 2019 to 2024.
- 1.2 He reminded the Group that it has been tasked to evaluate the Implementation Plans in three key areas of assessment, as described in detail in the 'Guidelines for the Preparation and Evaluation of NASCO Implementation Plans and for Reporting on Progress', CNL(18)49, by: 1. identifying whether the answers by each Party / jurisdiction to the questions posed in the IP template are satisfactory; 2. identifying clearly that the threats and challenges to the management of wild Atlantic salmon identified under each theme are related to NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines; 3. determining that each action addresses the main (relevant) threats and challenges identified for that Party / jurisdiction and assessing the description of each action to ensure that it adheres to the 'SMART' descriptors such that progress over time can be assessed objectively.
- 1.3 He emphasised that the members of the Review Group had been appointed specifically to represent NASCO not their Party, jurisdiction, or organization. He also noted that the Secretariat's role was to co-ordinate the work and, although the Secretariat had been asked to conduct an initial assessment to ensure there were no gaps in the plans submitted, they would not serve as reviewers. In conclusion, he indicated that there was much to do during the meeting but that the Group's findings would play a central role in demonstrating NASCO's commitment to wild salmon conservation.
- 1.4 The Chair noted that it had not been possible for Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) to provide a member to the Review Group. The Secretary

explained that Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) had identified a salmon specialist to participate in the Review Group but that person was unable to attend the meetings due to extenuating circumstances. The Secretary further explained that the representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) wished to reiterate their commitment to the Implementation Plan and Annual Progress Report review process.

1.5 The Chair gave the floor to the NGOs to make a short opening statement which was distributed to the members of the Review Group and is attached as Annex 1.

1.6 A list of the members of the Review Group is contained in Annex 2.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

2.1 The Review Group adopted its Agenda, IP(19)04 (Annex 3).

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

3.1 The Review Group noted that while no separate Terms of Reference had been provided by the Council, the Group's assessments would rely upon instructions for evaluation given in the 'Guidelines for the Preparation and Evaluation of NASCO Implementation Plans and for Reporting on Progress', CNL(18)49, hereinafter the 'IP Guidelines'. This document states that the purpose of the Implementation Plan evaluations is to ensure that the Plans provide a fair and equitable account of the actions that each Party or jurisdiction plans to take to implement NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines and, among other things, emphasises the importance of:

- identifying clearly that the threats and challenges identified under each theme are related to NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines;
- including at least one action on sea lice management for those jurisdictions with salmon farms;
- including at least one action on containment of farmed salmon for those jurisdictions with salmon farms;
- including at least one action on mixed-stock fisheries for those jurisdictions that prosecute mixed-stock fisheries;
- assessing and rating answers to each of the questions in the Implementation Plan template as either:
 1. Satisfactory answers / information; or
 2. Unsatisfactory (including unclear or incomplete answers / information or clear omissions or inadequacies); and
- developing 'SMART' actions.

3.2 In accordance with the IP Guidelines, an initial assessment of each Implementation Plan had been conducted by the Secretariat prior to the Group's meeting. The aim of this assessment was to ensure that time was not spent on a full critical review of Implementation Plans that clearly contained significant omissions. The Implementation Plans were checked to ensure that they provided: an answer to all questions, except where these are indicated to be inappropriate for the Party or jurisdiction; a list of threats to wild salmon and challenges for management related to the three theme areas; and actions to address the main threats and challenges, which include measurable outcomes,

and monitoring that will be undertaken to assess the effectiveness of the action and planned timescale for the action.

- 3.3 Prior to the meeting, a template to assist with the evaluation of the plans had been developed by the Secretariat (Annex 4) to enable a full and consistent review across the three key areas of assessment set out in the IP Guidelines. These are:
1. identifying whether the answers by each Party / jurisdiction to the questions posed in the IP template are satisfactory;
 2. identifying clearly that the threats and challenges to the management of wild Atlantic salmon identified under each theme are related to NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines; and
 3. determining that each action addresses the main (relevant) threats and challenges identified for that Party / jurisdiction, and then assessing the description of each action to ensure that it adheres to the 'SMART' descriptors such that progress over time can be assessed objectively.
- 3.4 An initial reviewer was assigned to each plan and these initial reviews formed the basis for deliberations by the whole Review Group and the development of feedback to the Parties / jurisdictions.
- 3.5 At its meeting, the Review Group discussed its working methods. The Group agreed to the following 'ground rules' based on those used during the second Implementation Plan cycle:
- (a) the initial reviewers would: develop the initial assessment of the assigned Implementation Plans in advance of the meeting; lead discussion of the assigned Implementation Plans at the meeting; when needed, develop clear guidance for the Party / jurisdiction on how to improve descriptions of actions (or other components of the Implementation Plan) in consultation with the Review Group at the meeting; and lead discussion of that guidance at the meeting;
 - (b) the initial reviewers would remain anonymous in the report and in the event that one or more members of the Review 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 wished to be identified;
 - (c) the Review Group would draw on information arising from the first and second reporting cycles but limit its assessments to the information presented in the Implementation Plans for the third reporting cycle;
 - (d) because not all Parties / jurisdictions were represented on the Review Group, it was agreed that a member of the Group from a NASCO Party / jurisdiction whose Implementation Plan was being reviewed would not be present during the initial review of that Plan;
 - (e) the Review Group recognised that the extent of the salmon stocks and the resources available to manage them varies markedly between Parties / jurisdictions. However, the Review Group based its reviews on an assessment of the level of implementation of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines by each Party / jurisdiction to ensure equality of reviews across all of the Implementation Plans;
 - (f) the Review Group recognised that in some Parties / 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 recognised that, nonetheless, governments have or should have powers to conserve the resource and it should, therefore, be possible to summarise in the Implementation Plan the management actions that are expected to be taken by the appropriate bodies in the coming years. Such differences were not, therefore, taken into account in reviewing the reports;

(g) following the completion of all the initial evaluations, the Review Group would re-examine these to ensure consistency.

3.6 The Review Group noted that the IP Guidelines define ‘SMART’ actions and task the Review Group to assess whether or not the actions contained in each plan are ‘SMART’. The IP Guidelines stipulate that where actions are not ‘SMART’ they should be referred to the relevant Party or jurisdiction with clear guidance on the way the Review Group considers that the Implementation Plan should be improved. To assess whether an action was ‘SMART’, the Review Group posed the following questions in relation to each action:

- **Specific:** is the specific action the Party / jurisdiction will undertake to remove or reduce a given threat to wild salmon both clear and concise and related to the identified threats / challenges?
- **Measurable:** does the expected outcome and proposed monitoring programme provide a suitable platform via which progress can be demonstrated clearly?
- **Ambitious yet achievable:** will the action protect wild salmon? Additionally, is it stated clearly that funding is in place, or is expected to be in place, to allow implementation of proposed actions / monitoring programmes during the specified period covered by the Implementation Plan?
- **Relevant:** what threat or challenge identified in the Implementation Plan will be addressed by this action and is it accounting for NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines?
- **Timely:** under what timescale will progress be delivered by this action and is it clear that the action will be completed within the third cycle of reporting?

3.7 In accordance with the IP Guidelines, those Implementation Plans with acceptable actions but that include answers in category 2 (see 3.1 above) would also be returned to Parties / jurisdictions with clear guidance on the way that the Review Group considered that the Implementation Plan should be improved. The Group agreed to provide its assessments to the Parties / jurisdictions using the agreed template, CNL40.2003.

4. Evaluation of the Implementation Plans

4.1 Implementation Plans are the key documents in the third reporting cycle. Their purpose, together with the Annual Progress Reports, is to provide a succinct, transparent, fair and balanced approach for reporting on the implementation of NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines by the Parties / jurisdictions. Implementation Plans are focussed around the three theme areas and should emphasise: the actions to be taken over the period of the Implementation Plan (2019 to 2024); clearly identifiable measurable outcomes and timescales; and appropriate monitoring to evaluate the effectiveness of the measures taken.

4.2 The Review Group agreed that their evaluation of each Implementation Plan would show whether each of the three key areas of assessment (see 3.1 above) had been

adequately addressed. Where any one of the areas was felt to have been inadequately addressed the Implementation Plan would be returned to the Party / jurisdiction together with clear guidance for its improvement.

- 4.3 The Review Group welcomed the high level of engagement of NASCO's Parties and jurisdictions with the third cycle of reporting, evidenced by the provision of 19 of the 21 Implementation Plans anticipated.

Interpretation of Assessments

- 4.4 A template for the preparation of Implementation Plans, CNL(18)50, had been agreed by the Council along with the IP Guidelines that were developed to assist Parties / jurisdictions with the development of their Plans. The Review Group noted that, in many cases, the IP Guidelines had not been followed, especially in relation to the provision of SMART actions. The Review Group considered that many of the actions lacked clear descriptions and were combined with the expected outcome in many instances. Additionally, in many instances, the actions were very long and difficult to interpret. In line with the IP Guidelines, the Review Group considered that SMART actions should be clear and concise.
- 4.5 In developing its guidance for each Party / jurisdiction when actions were not SMART, the Review Group felt it would be inappropriate to prescribe what it considered a clear action to be for each unclear action presented. Rather, the Review Group developed its guidance for each Party / jurisdiction to refer to each of the SMART descriptors that had not been addressed with the comment that these aspects should be addressed in the revised Implementation Plan in each case.
- 4.6 The Review Group emphasised that a score of '1' (satisfactory answers / information) for an answer simply meant that a satisfactory answer had been provided and did not indicate that the Party / jurisdiction was necessarily meeting NASCO guidelines or agreements. In many cases, the Review Group assessed a response to a question as being satisfactory provided that an action had been included in the Implementation Plan to address any major shortcoming. The Review Group noted that, in some cases, there were unsubstantiated comments provided, and it was not possible to confirm all the assertions made in the Implementation Plans given the limited amount of time available and the size of the task before it.
- 4.7 The IP Guidelines state that the Review Group should provide examples of good practice within the Implementation Plans. In its assessment of each Plan, the Review Group noted responses to questions showing good practice. These components of the Review Group's evaluations were included in the initial review. Individual reviews were developed for the Plans from each Party / jurisdiction, comprising text indicating the overall opinion of the Review Group together with the Group's response to each of the questions, threats and challenges and actions submitted in the individual Implementation Plans. These assessments were not made available publicly at this stage.

Timeliness of Reporting

- 4.8 The Council had requested that Implementation Plans be submitted by 1 February. Fifteen plans were submitted by this deadline, a significant improvement on the second round of reporting when only seven plans had been submitted on time. However, the Secretariat determined, in its initial review, that six of these were either draft versions, incomplete or in the incorrect template and referred them back to the relevant Party for correction. Consequently, in these instances, acceptable / finalised Implementation

Plans were received after the deadline.

Non-reporting

- 4.9 The Implementation Plan from the United States was not available for review by the Review Group when it met, beginning on 26 February. Prior to that meeting, the U.S. federal government commissioner to NASCO had advised the Council via email to the Secretary that the United States would be delayed in submitting its Implementation Plan due to the partial shutdown of the U.S. government that affected the operation of the National Marine Fisheries Service for an extended period in late 2018 and early 2019. In its communication, the United States noted its intention to deliver its Plan by May 1, 2019, to allow its evaluation by the Review Group during its second review of the Plans, to be conducted by correspondence as per the IP Guidelines.
- 4.10 The Implementation Plan from the United States was submitted to the NASCO Secretariat on 29 April. Given the changes proposed to the Implementation Plan schedule the Review Group agreed to review it on 13 May.
- 4.11 In total, the Review Group evaluated 20 Plans as follows:

Party / jurisdiction	Document number
Canada	IP(09)17
Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)	
<i>Faroe Islands*</i>	IP(09)23
<i>Greenland*</i>	IP(09)21
European Union	
<i>Denmark</i>	IP(09)09
<i>Finland</i>	IP(09)12
<i>France*</i>	IP(09)16
<i>Germany</i>	IP(09)11
<i>Ireland*</i>	IP(09)15
<i>Portugal*</i>	IP(09)06
<i>Spain – Asturias*</i>	IP(09)20
<i>Spain – Bizkaia</i>	
<i>Spain – Cantabria*</i>	IP(09)22
<i>Spain – Galicia*</i>	IP(09)19
<i>Spain – Navarra</i>	IP(09)14
<i>Sweden</i>	IP(09)07
<i>UK – England and Wales</i>	IP(09)13
<i>UK – Northern Ireland*</i>	IP(09)08
<i>UK – Scotland</i>	IP(09)10
Norway*	IP(09)18
Russian Federation	IP(09)05
United States of America*	IP(09)25

* *IPs submitted after the 1 February deadline*

5. Development of Feedback to the Parties / jurisdictions

- 5.1 The Review Group’s initial assessments of the 19 plans were sent to Parties / jurisdictions with clear guidance, where necessary, on how the Group felt they could be improved. After the first round of review one Implementation Plan was considered

to be acceptable, that of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) – Greenland.

6. Arrangements for Presenting the Group’s Report to the Council

- 6.1 The Review Group agreed that the Chair would present its report to the Council during the Special Session at the Thirty-Sixth (2019) Annual Meeting.

7. Report of the Meeting

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

8. Other Business

- 8.1 The level of assessment required, for each of the Implementation Plans that were submitted, was considerably more work than anticipated. In particular, developing clear and consistent guidance for the Parties / jurisdictions was challenging as many Implementation Plans only loosely followed the IP Guidelines. The Review Group was unable to complete the first round of review of all of the Implementation Plans over the three days in London originally envisaged for the task.

- 8.2 The Secretary wrote to the Heads of the NASCO Parties after the February meeting to explain that the reporting back to the Parties / jurisdictions after the first round of review would, by necessity, be delayed and to set out the reasons for the delay. A revised schedule for the review of Implementation Plans under the third reporting cycle was proposed. The first revised deadline requested, for return of the Implementation Plans requiring modification to Parties / jurisdictions with clear guidance on the Review Group’s recommendations for improvements, was 30 April 2019.

- 8.3 The Secretary agreed to liaise with the Heads of the NASCO Parties in advance of the Thirty-Sixth (2019) Annual Meeting to seek agreement on the revised schedule proposed by the Review Group and to determine what reviews should be presented in the Special Session, bearing in mind the need to balance the understanding of Parties / jurisdictions as to when their reviews would be made public with the requirement for transparency of review and reporting.

9. Close of the Meeting

- 9.1 The Chair thanked the Members of the Review Group for their contribution to the meeting and wished them a safe journey home.

*Draft Opening Remarks by NGOs at the 3rd Cycle
Implementation Plan Review Group Meeting*

Chair, Secretary and Review Group Members, it is once again a pleasure for the NGOs to serve on this important Review Group at the start of the third Implementation Plan reporting cycle. Following a conference call last week, in which NGOs from many of the Parties and Jurisdictions took part, Steve Sutton and I have been asked to give a short opening statement to the Review Group meeting.

As you are all no doubt well aware, the Implementation Plan process introduced back in 2007 is a means of assessing fairness and balance between binding NASCO regulatory measures applying to the fisheries at Faroes and Greenland and the ‘soft law’ measures applying to States of origin, but which nonetheless the Convention requires be taken into account in establishing those regulatory measures. The Council has recognised that it wishes to have a strengthened Implementation Plan process, with greater emphasis on salmon farming and the achievement of the international goals for sea lice and containment. The NGOs believe that these considerations need to be our major focus. Furthermore, the external performance review of NASCO’s work in 2012 commended the ‘Next Steps’ process but highlighted the, ‘*Apparent imbalance and disconnect between the Convention-based decisions and the ‘soft law’ measures that have been adopted in the context of the ‘Next Steps’ process, including in terms of their operation and effect*’. It is fair to say, therefore, that the work of this Review Group will be closely scrutinised externally including during the next external performance review scheduled for 2021.

The Council’s Guidelines for our evaluations state that, ‘*In the light of the need to move toward more measurable actions to demonstrate progress towards the attainment of NASCO goals, a ‘SMART’ approach must be taken in the third reporting cycle.*’ For the NGOs, the main change and the key to the success of this third reporting cycle is that actions must be **Ambitious**. Those Guidelines also state that, ‘*Articulating clearly the criteria upon which the Implementation Plans will be evaluated is key to the success of the third reporting cycle*’. The NGOs believe we should spend some time at the start of this meeting considering very carefully how we interpret this most important of criteria – that will help us with the review process and in justifying our evaluations to the Parties/jurisdictions, should that be required.

The Secretary’s guidance to the Review Group notes that defining ‘Ambitious’ will be challenging, and the NGOs agree, but we consider that this new criterion of Ambitious is absolutely essential to improving commitment to NASCO agreements and in ensuring meaningful new measures to protect wild salmon are introduced in the next five years. We believe it must mean more than the action has guaranteed funding in place. SMART actions need to be linked to contributing to achievement of NASCO (and NASCO/ISFA - aquaculture) goals – e.g. no net loss of habitat and no fisheries on stocks below CLs. In particular, given that there is to be greater focus on addressing impacts of salmon farming, and achievement of the international goals for sea lice and containment, the NGOs believe that this requires ambitious actions designed to achieve both zero escapes and no increase in sea lice loads or lice induced mortality of wild salmon attributable to the farms. So, an Implementation Plan that only contained actions related to research on sea lice or genetic impacts of escapees could not be seen as Ambitious, nor could one that was neither clear nor transparent, nor one that comes across as being defensive. With this in mind, it is notable that the regulation of sea lice and containment in the Faroe Islands, which has no wild salmon stocks of its own, is more robust

than in many countries that do have wild salmon, and which NASCO agreements are intended to protect. The measures adopted in the Faroe Islands have already been commended by the Review Group in past years and the NGOs believe these should be a baseline for us to work from. Anything less stringent would fail to achieve the fairness and balance sought by the Next Steps process, and would lack ambition. The NGOs would expect that States of (Wild Salmon) Origin with salmon farming should be aiming much higher.

Finally, both the Review Group and the Parties/jurisdictions have a very Ambitious schedule to work to, once we complete this week's meeting, not least because revised Implementation Plans will need to be re-evaluated by email in May, immediately prior to the Annual Meeting. We will need to consider how that work will be undertaken, given that the NGOs feel that most actions in the Implementation Plans are currently far from SMART, and there will be other commitments in the build-up to the Annual Meeting.

So, we have a considerable challenge and very important task ahead, not least because of the alarmingly low, in some areas critically low, abundance of wild salmon stocks around the North Atlantic. This process will need to be fair but robust and critical, and focused more on progress towards the international goals for salmon farming if it is to fulfil the Council's mandate and be acceptable not only to the NGOs, but particularly when the work of NASCO is reviewed externally in two years' time. Our prism must be that proposed actions are SMART, in particular Ambitious, and that they are targeted at the conservation and restoration of the wild Atlantic salmon. There is much room for improved commitment to the international goals. This Review Group has a very good record of developing unanimously agreed evaluations and that gives them strength – the NGOs seek similar consensus in the work ahead if possible. We look forward to contributing to the fair but robust evaluation of the documents before us this week.

Paul Knight and Steve Sutton
Co-Chairs – NASCO NGOs
February 2019

List of Participants

Cathal Gallagher	Inland Fisheries Ireland
Paddy Gargan	Inland Fisheries Ireland
Emma Hatfield	NASCO Secretary
Paul Knight	Salmon and Trout Conservation UK
Sarah Robinson	NASCO Assistant Secretary
Rory Saunders	NOAA, National Marine Fisheries Service, USA (Review Group Chair)
Steve Sutton	Atlantic Salmon Federation, Canada
Lawrence Talks	Environment Agency

IP(19)04

***Meeting of the
Implementation Plan / Annual Progress Report Review Group***

***Oak Room, Hotel London Kensington,
61 Gloucester Road, London SW7 4RE***

26, 27 & 28 February 2019

Agenda

1. Opening of the Meeting
2. Adoption of the Agenda
3. Review of the Terms of Reference and Consideration of Working Methods
4. Evaluation of the Implementation Plans
5. Development of Feedback to the Parties / jurisdictions
6. Arrangements for Presenting the Group's Report to the Council
7. Report of the Meeting
8. Other Business
9. Close of the Meeting

Secretary
London
26 February 2019

Note: *The work to conduct the initial evaluations of the 20 Implementation Plans was conducted via three conference calls on 15 and 22 March and 5 April, in a further face-to-face meeting on 9 April and a final conference call on 13 May, in addition to the three day meeting from 26 – 28 February 2019.*

Annex 4***Evaluation of 2019 Implementation Plans***

Under NASCO's third reporting cycle the Review Group is asked to evaluate the Implementation Plans submitted by Parties / jurisdictions in three key areas of assessment, by:

- 1. identifying whether the answers by each Party / jurisdiction to the questions posed in the Implementation Plan template are satisfactory;*
- 2. identifying clearly that the threats and challenges to the management of wild Atlantic salmon identified under each theme are related to NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines; and*
- 3. assessing the description of each action to ensure that it adheres to the 'SMART' descriptors such that progress over time can be assessed objectively.*

This is described in detail in the 'Guidelines for the Preparation and Evaluation of NASCO Implementation Plans and for Reporting on Progress', CNL(18)49.

- 1. Answers to each question in the Implementation Plan template, CNL(18)50, are to be assessed as:*
 - 1. Satisfactory answers / information;*
 - 2. Unsatisfactory (including unclear or incomplete answers / information or clear omissions or inadequacies).*
- 2. NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines as they apply to the third cycle of reporting are listed throughout the Implementation Plan template, CNL(18)50.*
- 3. The Review Group will be required to assess the description of each action using the 'SMART' criteria laid out in the new Guidelines document, CNL(18)49, thereby assessing the quality of each of the actions, not just how clearly the actions are stated.*

Through this process it will be possible to determine whether the Implementation Plan provides a fair and equitable basis for assessing the progress that the Party / jurisdiction will make in implementing NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.

Where Implementation Plans are not deemed to be satisfactory by the Review Group, in any or all of the three areas described above, the Implementation Plan will be returned to the Party / jurisdiction with clear guidance on the way the Review Group considers that the Implementation Plan should be improved. The tables below, one for each of the three main areas to be assessed, provide a template for evaluation in each case.

Party:

Jurisdiction/Region:

Assessment area 1. Are the questions posed in the Implementation Plan template answered satisfactorily?

#	Question in IP Template	Initial Assessment (1 or 2)	Draft feedback on any improvements required (for answers assessed as 2)
1. Introduction			
1.1	What are the objectives for the management of wild salmon?		
1.2	What reference points (e.g. conservation limits, management targets or other measures of abundance) are used to assess the status of stocks?		
1.3	What is the current status of stocks under the new classification system outlined in CNL(16)11?		
1.4	How is stock diversity (e.g. genetics, age composition, run-timing, etc.) taken into account in the management of salmon stocks?		
1.5	To provide a baseline for future comparison, what is the current and potential quantity of salmon habitat?		
1.6	What is the current extent of freshwater and marine salmonid aquaculture? <i>Append one or more maps showing the location of aquaculture facilities and aquaculture free zones in rivers and the sea.</i>		
1.7	Please describe the process used to consult NGOs and other stakeholders and industries in the development of this Implementation Plan.		

2. Management of Salmon Fisheries: <i>In this section please review the management approach to each of the fisheries in your jurisdiction (i.e. commercial, recreational and other fisheries) in line with the relevant NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. For Parties / jurisdictions that prosecute mixed-stock fisheries, there should be at least one action related to their management.</i>			
2.1	What are the objectives for the management of the fisheries for wild salmon?		
2.2	What is the decision-making process for the management of salmon fisheries, including predetermined decisions taken under different stock conditions (e.g. the stock level at which regulations are triggered)?		
2.3	(a) Are fisheries permitted to operate on salmon stocks that are below their reference point (e.g. Conservation Limits)? If so, (b) how many such fisheries are there and (c) what approach is taken to managing them that still promotes stock rebuilding?		
2.4	(a) Are there any mixed-stock salmon fisheries? If so, (b) how are these defined, (c) what was the mean catch in these fisheries in the last five years and (d) how are they managed to ensure that all the contributing stocks are meeting their conservation objectives?		

2.5	How are socio-economic factors taken into account in making decisions on management of salmon fisheries?		
2.6	What is the current level of unreported catch and what measures are being taken to reduce this?		
2.7	Has an assessment under the Six Tenets for Effective Management of an Atlantic Salmon Fishery been conducted? If so, (a) has the assessment been made available to the Secretariat and (b) what actions are planned to improve the monitoring and control of the fishery? (c) If the six tenets have not been applied, what is the timescale for doing so?		

3. Protection and Restoration of Salmon Habitat: <i>In this section please review the management approach to the protection and restoration of habitat in your jurisdiction in line with the relevant NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.</i>			
3.1	How are risks to productive capacity identified and options for restoring degraded or lost salmon habitat prioritised, taking into account the principle of 'no net loss' and the need for inventories to provide baseline data?		
3.2	How are socio-economic factors taken into account in making decisions on salmon habitat management?		
3.3	What management measures are planned to protect wild Atlantic salmon and its habitats from (a) climate change and (b) invasive aquatic species?		

4. Management of Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers and Transgenics <i>Council has requested that for Parties / jurisdictions with salmon farms, there should be a greater focus on actions to minimise impacts of salmon farming on wild salmonid stocks. Each Party / jurisdiction with salmon farming should therefore include at least one action relating to sea lice management and at least one action relating to containment, providing quantitative data in Annual Progress Reports to demonstrate progress towards the international goals agreed by NASCO and the International Salmon Farmers Association (ISFA):</i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% of farms to have effective sea lice management such that there is no increase in sea lice loads or lice-induced mortality of wild salmonids attributable to the farms; • 100% farmed fish to be retained in all production facilities. 			
<i>In this section please provide information on all types of aquaculture, introductions and transfers, and transgenics (including freshwater hatcheries, smolt-rearing etc.</i>			
4.1	(a) Is the current policy concerning the protection of wild salmonids consistent with the international goals on sea lice and containment agreed by NASCO and ISFA? (b) If the current policy is not consistent with these international goals, when will current policy be adapted to ensure consistency with the international goals and what management measures are planned to ensure achievement of these goals and in what timescale?		

4.2	(a) What quantifiable progress can be demonstrated towards the achievement of the international goals for 100% of farms to have effective sea lice management such that there is no increase in sea lice loads, or lice-induced mortality of wild salmonids attributable to sea lice? (b) How is this progress monitored, including monitoring of wild fish? (c) If progress cannot be demonstrated, what additional measures are proposed and in what timescale?		
4.3	(a) What quantifiable progress can be demonstrated towards the achievement of the international goals for achieving 100% containment in all (i) freshwater and (ii) marine aquaculture production facilities? (b) How is this progress monitored, including monitoring of wild fish (genetic introgression) and proportion of escaped farmed salmon in the spawning populations? (c) If progress cannot be demonstrated, what additional measures (e.g. use of sterile salmon in fish farming) are proposed and in what timescale?		
4.4	What adaptive management and / or scientific research is underway that could facilitate better achievement of NASCO's international goals for sea lice and containment such that the environmental impact on wild salmonids can be minimised?		
4.5	What is the approach for determining the location of aquaculture facilities in (a) freshwater and (b) marine environments to minimise the risks to wild salmonid stocks?		
4.6	What progress has been made to implement NASCO's guidance on introductions, transfers and stocking?		
4.7	Is there (a) a requirement to evaluate thoroughly risks and benefits before undertaking any stocking programme and (b) a presumption against stocking for purely socio-political / economic reasons?		
4.8	What is the policy / strategy on use of transgenic salmon?		
4.9	<i>For Members of the North-East Atlantic Commission only:</i> What measures are in place, or are planned, to implement the eleven recommendations contained in the 'Road Map' to enhance information exchange and co-operation on monitoring, research and measures to prevent the spread of <i>Gyrodactylus salaris</i> and eradicate it if introduced, including the development and testing of contingency plans?		

Assessment area 2. Are the threats and challenges to the management of wild Atlantic salmon identified under each theme related clearly to NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines?

2.8 Threats identified to wild salmon and challenges for management associated with their exploitation in fisheries, including bycatch of salmon in fisheries targeting other species	Initial Assessment (yes / no)	Draft feedback on any improvements required
Threat / challenge F1		
Threat / challenge F2		
Threat / challenge F3		
Threat / challenge F4		

Copy and paste lines to add in other challenges in the relevant Implementation Plan

3.4 Threats identified to wild salmon and challenges for management in relation to estuarine and freshwater habitat.	Initial Assessment (yes / no)	Draft feedback on any improvements required
Threat / challenge H1		
Threat / challenge H2		
Threat / challenge H3		
Threat / challenge H4		

Copy and paste lines to add in other challenges in the relevant Implementation Plan

4.10 Threats identified to wild salmon and challenges for management in relation to aquaculture, introductions and transfers, and transgenics.	Initial Assessment (yes / no)	Draft feedback on any improvements required
Threat / challenge A1		
Threat / challenge A2		
Threat / challenge A3		
Threat / challenge A4		

Copy and paste lines to add in other challenges in the relevant Implementation Plan

Assessment area 3. Does each action adhere to the ‘SMART’ descriptors laid out in the new Guidelines document, CNL(18)49?

As a reminder, the ‘SMART’ approach includes reporting on both quantitative and qualitative information. Quantitative information is expected wherever possible and should be presented to demonstrate progress made over the period of the plan towards NASCO’s goals. This should be clear and concise. Where a deviation must be made from a quantitative metric, the reason for the deviation should be explained.

2.9 What SMART actions are planned during the period covered by this Implementation Plan (2019 – 2024) to address each of the threats and challenges identified in section 2.8 to implement NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines and demonstrate progress towards achievement of its goals and objectives for the management of salmon fisheries?					
#	Action in IP Template	Is it ‘SMART’? (yes / no)	If ‘no’, which descriptor needs to be reflected more clearly in the action?	If the proposed monitoring is qualitative (as allowed in the Guidelines), is the reason and proposed non-quantitative alternative for monitoring progress acceptable?	If ‘no’, which aspect needs to be reflected more clearly in the action?
F1					
F2					
F3					
F4					

Copy and paste lines to add in other actions in the relevant Implementation Plan

3.5 What SMART actions are planned during the period covered by this Implementation Plan (2019 – 2024) to address each of the threats and challenges identified in section 3.4 to implement NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines and demonstrate progress towards achievement of its goals and objectives for the Protection, Restoration and Enhancement of Atlantic Salmon Habitat?					
#	Action in IP Template	Is it ‘SMART’? (yes / no)	If ‘no’, which descriptor needs to be reflected more clearly in the action?	If the proposed monitoring is qualitative (as allowed in the Guidelines), is the reason and proposed non-quantitative alternative for monitoring progress acceptable?	If ‘no’, which aspect needs to be reflected more clearly in the action?
H1					
H2					
H3					
H4					

Copy and paste lines to add in other actions in the relevant Implementation Plan

4.11 What SMART actions are planned during the period covered by this Implementation Plan (2019 – 2024) to address each of the threats and challenges identified in section 4.10 to implement NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines and demonstrate progress towards achievement of its goals and objectives for aquaculture, introductions and transfers, and transgenics?					
#	Action in IP Template	Is it ‘SMART’? (yes / no)	If ‘no’, which descriptor needs to be reflected more clearly in the action?	If the proposed monitoring is qualitative (as allowed in the Guidelines), is the reason and proposed non-quantitative alternative for monitoring progress acceptable?	If ‘no’, which aspect needs to be reflected more clearly in the action?
A1					
A2					
A3					
A4					

Copy and paste lines to add in other actions in the relevant Implementation Plan

Mandatory action check	Is such a mandatory action required for this Party / jurisdiction? (yes / no)	Is such an action contained in the Implementation Plan (yes / no)
For Parties / jurisdictions that prosecute mixed-stock fisheries, there should be at least one action related to their management.		
Each Party / jurisdiction with salmon farming should include at least one action relating to sea lice management.		
Each Party / jurisdiction with salmon farming should include at least one action relating to containment.		