



Agenda item 4.2
For adoption

Council

CNL(13)7

Report on the Activities of the North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization in 2012

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Council**
- 3. North American Commission**
- 4. North-East Atlantic Commission**
- 5. West Greenland Commission**
- 6. Finance and Administration Matters**

Note: This Report is not intended for publication but is submitted to the Council under Article 5, paragraph 6 of the Convention which requires the submission of an annual report to the Parties. The report is a summary of the activities of the Organization in 2012, focusing on the actions taken. Full details of the work of the Organization are contained in the reports of the Twenty-Ninth Annual Meetings of the Council and Commissions and in the report of the Finance and Administration Committee.

CNL(13)7

Report on the Activities of the North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization in 2012

1. Introduction

- 1.1 For the first time since 2003, NASCO returned to Edinburgh for its Annual Meeting in 2012.

2. Council

- 2.1 The Twenty-Ninth Annual Meeting of the Council was held during the period 5 - 8 June 2012, under the Presidency of Ms Mary Colligan (US). Representatives of all the Parties, and observers from France (in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon) and the Ukraine, four inter-government organizations and eighteen accredited non-government organizations participated in the meeting.

(a) Report of the External Performance Review Panel and Progress with the 'Next Steps for NASCO' Process

Report of the External Performance Review Panel

- 2.2 The Report of the External Performance Review Panel was presented by a member of the Review Panel, Mr Kjartan Hoydal, during a Special Session of the Council. There was an extensive discussion of the report and the Council welcomed the Panel's findings and its' endorsement of NASCO's work, including the changes introduced under the 'Next Steps' process and the Panel's support to move forward with this in a second cycle of Implementation Plans.

- 2.3 The completion of the first cycle of reporting and review under the 'Next Steps' process and receipt of the External Performance Review had provided the Council with an opportunity to revisit its vision for the future of NASCO. As an initial step, the Council decided that the Parties would coordinate, over the course of the year, including an inter-sessional meeting of the Parties to:

(a) *Discuss priority objectives and action areas for NASCO and recommendations for how the Organization can best position itself to fulfil these objectives;*

(b) *Review and evaluate the recommendations of the External Performance Review Panel that have not already been acted upon by the Council, including those that relate to the Convention (recommendations 1 and 7 - 35 of the section entitled 'Convention for the Conservation of Salmon in the North Atlantic Ocean');*

(c) *Consider other recommendations from the 'Next Steps' process that have not yet been implemented, as well as any other relevant information concerning the improvement of the functioning and operation of NASCO and any input submitted from Parties and stakeholders;*

(d) Develop a recommended Plan of Action, including prioritised recommendations, for consideration by the Council on potential actions, to be discussed by the Council at its 2013 Annual Meeting.

- 2.4 The NGOs reiterated the role of the accredited NGOs to NASCO as principal stakeholders and their willingness to work with the Parties to take this process forward. Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) encouraged the other Parties to take this opportunity to correct the imbalance in the Convention noted by the Review Panel and previously highlighted by Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland). The US indicated that this is an important initiative and understands that there will be a special inter-sessional meeting of the Heads of Delegations who, given the issues, will need to be supported by appropriate technical expertise. The President indicated that she would consult Heads of Delegations after the meeting with regard to participation in the inter-sessional meeting.

Report of the Working Group on Future Reporting under Implementation Plans and Evaluation of these Reports

- 2.5 At the 2011 Annual Meeting, the ‘Next Steps for NASCO’ Review Group had proposed some streamlining in reporting under the Implementation Plans and that greater emphasis should be placed on the activities and actions each jurisdiction plans to take over a period of five years and on the monitoring and evaluation of activities with clearly described, identifiable, measurable outcomes and timescales. The Review Group had further recommended that, in future, Focus Area Reports should be developed around specific themes, which would be reviewed. The Council had, therefore, established a Working Group to develop a framework for future reporting and evaluation to report back to the 2012 Annual Meeting.
- 2.6 The report of the Working Group on Future Reporting under Implementation Plans and Evaluation of these Reports was presented. The Working Group considered that Implementation Plans are the key documents and the success of the next cycle of reporting will depend on these plans specifying clearly the actions each jurisdiction plans to take over a five year period, the expected outcomes and the approach to monitoring, including enforcement. The Group recommended that these plans should be reviewed and that Annual Progress Reports would identify the status of actions within the Implementation Plans, with evaluation to assess if the commitments in the plans have been fulfilled and whether progress is being made towards achievement of the objectives. The Group had developed templates to assist jurisdictions in developing their Implementation Plans and Annual Progress Reports together with new guidance on the format and content of the plans and reports and for their evaluation. The Group also recommended a new cycle of Special Session Reports to replace Focus Area Reports, developed around specific themes in order to encourage an exchange of information and in-depth consideration of approaches being used to address a particular threat to salmon stocks or challenge to management.
- 2.7 The Council welcomed the recommendations for streamlining future reporting developed by the Working Group and adopted the templates for Implementation Plans and Annual Progress Reports. The Council also adopted the guidance on the format

and content of plans and reports and on their evaluation, including a schedule for their submission, review and distribution.

Progress in implementing a Public Relations Strategy

- 2.8 A report was made on progress with further development of the NASCO and IASRB websites, including the completion of the rivers database, which had been made available to the public on the website. The Council agreed to capitalise on a Public Relations opportunity by contributing funds to a film project entitled ‘Atlantic Salmon – Lost at Sea!’ The funding had been obtained through budget savings in 2013 as well as expected contributions from the US and EU-UK (Scotland). The funding will support filming in Greenland, highlighting the sampling programme and will be a positive action to raise the profile of NASCO.

(b) The NASCO/ICES ‘Salmon Summit’

- 2.9 In 2011, an international symposium, or ‘Salmon Summit’, entitled ‘Salmon at Sea: Scientific Advances and their Implications for Management’ was convened by NASCO and ICES in La Rochelle, France. This ‘Salmon Summit’ was attended by 128 managers and scientists from around the North Atlantic, the North Pacific and Baltic regions. There are two reports of the meeting. A number of the scientific papers will be published, following peer review, in the ICES Journal of Marine Science. A second report, by the Convenors and the Guest Editor of the ICES Journal of Marine Science, focussing on the management implications of the research, was distributed at the Annual Meeting. The Council recognised that the unique commitment of scientific collaboration among the Parties was a valuable concept of the SALSEA Programme and that such collaboration should remain a standing commitment of NASCO Parties in the future.

(c) Annual Reports on Progress in Implementing NASCO’s Agreements

- 2.10 A summary of the Annual Reports on Implementation Plans was presented. The Council agreed that the Parties should be requested to provide information on both the reported numbers of salmon escaping from farms and the estimated numbers that are unreported in their annual returns under the Implementation Plans in 2013. The Council decided to revisit this issue in 2013 in the light of the information provided. It was noted that the statistics on escapes are only part of the picture and that data on the incidence of escaped farmed salmon in fisheries and rivers are also important.

(d) Liaison with the North Atlantic Salmon Farming Industry

- 2.11 At the 2011 Annual Meeting, the future of the Liaison Group had been discussed. ISFA had indicated that it would prefer to engage directly with the Parties through a seat at the NASCO Annual Meeting, consistent with that afforded to the NGOs. The Council had decided that in the light of the ongoing ‘Next Steps’ process and the External Performance Review, the issue would be considered at its 2012 Annual Meeting. The President noted that it would not be possible to respond to the industry at the 2012 Annual Meeting and that the priority for engagement over the next twelve months would be in the development of Implementation Plans. The Council

encouraged each jurisdiction to engage with the industry in the development of its Implementation Plan.

(e) New or Emerging Opportunities for, or Threats to, Salmon Conservation and Management

2.12 Information was provided in the ACOM report from ICES and in the Annual Reports by the Parties on their Implementation Plans. The NGOs referred to the growing concern among NGOs across Europe at the increase in hydro-electric installations and the impact these may have on salmon.

(f) Incorporating Social and Economic Factors in Salmon Management

2.13 At the 2011 Annual Meeting, the Socio-Economic Sub-Group presented a proposal for a Special Session on socio-economics to be held at the 2012 Annual Meeting. The objective of this Special Session would be to provide an opportunity for a more detailed exchange of information on how jurisdictions are incorporating socio-economic factors in decisions relating to: management of salmon fisheries; habitat protection and restoration; and aquaculture and related activities. It would also allow for feedback from the Parties on the usefulness of the NASCO Guidelines and for consideration of NASCO's future role on this topic. Following the meeting, it was decided that, due to time constraints at the 2012 Annual Meeting, the Special Session should be postponed to 2013. The Council had asked the Sub-Group to proceed and develop the programme. The Council had suggested that the Sub-Group might wish to consult EIFAAC with a view to its involvement in the Special Session.

2.14 At the 2012 Annual Meeting, the Council recognised that it will again have a heavy schedule of work at the 2013 Annual Meeting and asked that the Secretariat look at the schedule of meetings to see if this Special Session could be accommodated. The Sub-Group was asked to develop its recommendations for the Special Session well in advance of the 2013 Annual Meeting.

(g) The International Atlantic Salmon Research Board (IASRB)

2.15 The report of the meeting of the Board was presented.

(h) Management and Sampling of the St Pierre and Miquelon Salmon Fishery

2.16 A report was tabled containing information on management of the fishery and details of catches, the number of licenses issued and the sampling programme in 2011. France (in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon) had reiterated that it wishes to retain its observer status and to develop scientific cooperation with NASCO, given that salmon fishing is a traditional, seasonal activity for the inhabitants of the islands. Canada requested that France (in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon) become an active member of NASCO so as to further enhance the cooperation. The Council decided that, in the light of the External Performance Review, the Secretary should write to the French authorities inviting France (in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon) to become a member of NASCO. A similar letter had already been sent to Iceland.

2.17 France (in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon) indicated that while the fishery is an interception fishery, it is small and catches are low compared to elsewhere in the North Atlantic and it is important for socio-economic reasons. The NGOs noted that while catches are low in the St Pierre and Miquelon fishery, they include harvests of salmon from endangered stocks. France (in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon) indicated that following ICES advice, it intended to collaborate more closely, particularly with Canada, to improve the quality of genetic analysis in future by using a genetic baseline enriched with North American profiles. The US supported the statements by Canada and the NGOs and welcomed the commitment from France (in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon) with regard to the sampling programme.

(i) Scientific Research Fishing in the Convention Area

2.18 There were no applications to conduct scientific research fishing in the Convention area during 2012.

(j) Other Business

2.19 The scientific advice from ICES was presented. The Council adopted a request for scientific advice to be presented in 2013. The NGOs requested representation on the Standing Scientific Committee. The Council decided not to change the composition of the SSC but agreed that NGO input would be sought in future through the Committee's consultation process.

2.20 The Council agreed a schedule for the recruitment of a new Secretary from 1 January 2014 and agreed to finalise the recruitment procedure through correspondence among Heads of Delegations. The President, on behalf of the Council, thanked Dr Windsor for his exceptional work for the Organization and wished him a long and happy retirement. The Secretary made a valedictory statement.

2.21 The Council re-elected Ms Mary Colligan (US) as President and Mr Steinar Hermansen (Norway) as Vice-President.

2.22 The Council received a report from each of the three regional Commissions on its activities (see sections 3, 4 and 5 below).

2.23 The Council adopted the report of the Finance and Administration Committee (see section 6 below).

2.24 The Council adopted a report to the Parties on the Activities of the Organization in 2011.

2.25 The winner of the Tag Return Incentive Scheme Grand Prize was Mr Andreas Mårtenson, Sweden.

2.26 The Council accepted an invitation to hold its Thirtieth Annual Meeting in Ireland during 4 – 7 June 2013.

3. North American Commission

3.1 The Twenty-Ninth Annual Meeting of the North American Commission was held in Edinburgh, Scotland during the period 5 - 8 June 2012 under the Chairmanship of Mr Stephen Gephard (US).

(a) Review of the 2011 Fishery and ACOM Report from ICES

3.2 The Commission reviewed the 2011 fishery and considered the scientific advice from ICES. The Commission agreed a request to ICES for scientific advice to be presented in 2013.

3.3 The NGOs asked that unreported catch information provided by ICES be broken down by river, estuarine and coastal catches and for continued collaboration on how unreported catches are calculated. Canada responded that the focus is on educating the public and stakeholders on the impacts of these unreported catches. The NGOs also asked that the Parties consider having an NGO representative on the Standing Scientific Committee. This issue was referred to the Council.

(b) The St. Pierre and Miquelon Salmon Fishery

3.4 The Commission noted that a report had been tabled and presented in the Council on the management of the fishery and the sampling programme by France (in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon). Canada thanked France (in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon) for its continued assistance and partnership in sampling. The US highlighted a willingness to cooperate with France (in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon) in implementing its sampling programme and expressed its concern over the interception of endangered and threatened stocks by France (in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon). The NGOs also expressed concern regarding the fishery, particularly as it exploits stocks listed as endangered in both the US and Canada.

3.5 Canada and the US encouraged France (in respect of St. Pierre and Miquelon) to accede to the NASCO Convention. France (in respect of St. Pierre and Miquelon) thanked the Parties for their comments and stated that France (in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon) intends to remain an observer to NASCO and that, following ICES advice, it intended to collaborate more closely, particularly with Canada, to improve the quality of genetic analysis to come, by using a baseline enriched with North American profiles. France (in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon) also stated that the harvest in the fishery is small, but significant for a number of people.

3.6 The Commission decided that, in the light of the External Performance Review, the NASCO President should be asked to write to France (in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon) requesting that it accede to the NASCO Convention.

(c) Salmonid Introductions and Transfers

3.7 The US provided details of an existing application to the Food and Drug Administration to sell genetically modified salmon raised in hatcheries outside of the United States. The Commission was advised that the proposal would not result in live genetically modified salmon within the US.

3.8 A report was tabled by Canada relating to salmonid introductions and transfers and it reiterated its intent to continue to live up to its obligations under the Williamsburg Resolution. The NGOs asked Canada if the information reported to the Commission on disease incidence is available to the public. Canada noted that reporting between countries through OIE requirements is done in real time. Public reports are available after a verification process. No reportable outbreaks were reported in the NAC region of Canada in 2011. The NGOs requested that the date of escapes be indicated in the reporting to the Commission and Canada agreed to provide this information. The NGOs also suggested that ICES could be asked to compile information and provide full reports on aquaculture escapees annually and over time. The US agreed that such information would be useful and suggested that the idea be brought before the Council for consideration, as the need for that information applies throughout the North Atlantic, not just in the North American Commission area.

(d) Sampling in the Labrador Fishery

3.9 Canada provided an update on the sampling of the Labrador fishery in 2011 as well as an overview of the salmon fishery in Labrador.

3.10 Canada tabled a paper describing the Labrador Inuit Food, Social and Ceremonial Fishery, including the tag allocation process.

3.11 The NGOs asked Canada to comment on estuarine fisheries as mixed-stock fisheries, as these fisheries may catch salmon from more than one Labrador river stock, some of which may not be meeting conservation requirements. Canada responded that there was a possibility of localised mixing of some stocks in estuaries, but the genetic work being undertaken may provide more details. The results will be available in the fall of 2012 and will be shared with stakeholders. Canada clarified that effort controls are used, i.e. each user group receives a specific number of tags (Nunatsiavut Government – 8,400 tags; Innu Nation – 1,500 tags; Nunatukavut – 6,000 tags).

(e) Other Business

3.12 The winner of the North American Commission prize in the Tag Return Incentive Scheme was Mr Noe Thibodeau, New Brunswick, Canada.

3.13 The Commission re-elected Mr Stephen Gephard (US) as Chairman and elected Mr Serge Tremblay (Canada) as Vice-Chairman.

3.14 The US tabled a paper on Management Objectives, with the suggestion that NAC Parties meet inter-sessionally before the next NASCO meeting to discuss the current management objectives for Atlantic salmon stocks in the United States and the Scotia-Fundy Region of Canada. Canada agreed to distribute the document internally and to discuss inter-sessionally with the United States. The NGOs asked to be involved in the process. The US indicated that it would be open to stakeholder involvement in that effort.

3.15 Canada tabled a paper on activities related to the status of Atlantic salmon in the context of the Species at Risk Act. The US thanked Canada for the report and

indicated that including samples from the southern Newfoundland populations in the genetics baseline will be even more important in light of the threatened status of these stocks.

4. North-East Atlantic Commission

4.1 The Twenty-Ninth Annual Meeting of the North-East Atlantic Commission was held in Edinburgh, Scotland during the period 5 – 8 June 2012, under the Chairmanship of Mr Raoul Bierach (Norway).

(a) Review of the 2011 Fishery and Scientific Advice from ICES

4.2 The Commission considered the scientific advice from ICES and agreed a request to ICES for scientific advice to be presented in 2013.

4.3 In response to a question from the NGOs concerning an increase in coastal netting, the European Union advised the Commission that the increase in netting in Sweden was due to one fisherman using a new fishing method that is not regulated and that had resulted in a catch of about 2,000 salmon in 2011. The Swedish authorities were exploring options to prevent the use of this fishing method in the future. In England and Wales, the increase was due to increased abundance of salmon, as confirmed from counters in rivers, and catch per unit effort. The operation of the fishery was considered to be justified because all stocks contributing to the fishery are stable or increasing.

4.4 The NGOs commented that there had also been an increase in abundance of salmon at West Greenland but no increase in that fishery had been permitted, so the increased catch in England and Wales does not seem to be in accordance with NASCO's goal of increasing fairness and balance in the management of distant-water and homewater fisheries. The EU responded that in the case of the mixed-stock fishery in England and Wales, all of the contributing stocks were stable or increasing and that is not the case for the stocks being fished at West Greenland.

4.5 Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) commented that no decision had been taken by NASCO concerning a sharing agreement for the salmon fishery at Faroes but there had been discussions within the Commission. In response to a question from Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), ICES indicated that much effort had been put into developing forecast models at the country level and that this should be possible in the near future. The EU noted that advice is presently provided at the stock complex level and that the extent to which advice can be provided at a finer scale would depend on data availability and questioned if the way forward would be for ICES to explore the implications of using different numbers of management units in terms of data availability and risk levels. ICES indicated that managers would need to consider the implications of providing advice on the basis of finer-scale units as the more stocks that are considered the harder it is to achieve conservation limits in all stocks.

(b) Progress with development of a Risk Framework for the Faroese Fishery

- 4.6 The Chair noted that ICES had indicated that feedback was sought from managers on the seasons that would apply to a fishery at Faroes (January to December or October to May), the choice of management units, the specification of management objectives and a sharing agreement. Previous discussions on these issues had been held both at the 2011 Annual Meeting and inter-sessionally. ICES had been requested to further develop the risk framework and progress reports had been provided in both 2011 and 2012. ICES advised the Commission that following work over the past year, the same elements used to provide advice for the West Greenland fishery are now available in relation to the fishery at Faroes.
- 4.7 Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) indicated that there would need to be internal discussions, including consultations with stakeholders, before agreeing on a risk framework. The Russian Federation asked if deadlines could be set but Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) indicated that it could not commit to a deadline at this stage. However, the momentum from the Annual Meeting would be used to commence this process and the Commission could then return to this issue at the next Annual Meeting. The Chairman noted that a problem could arise if there was a harvestable surplus and no mechanism had been agreed for setting a quota and indicated that it was, therefore, important to make progress on this issue. Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) referred to mixed-stock fisheries in other parts of the Commission area and indicated that it wished to see progress from States of origin with regard to these fisheries.

(c) Regulatory Measures

- 4.8 The Commission adopted the Framework of Indicators (FWI) developed by ICES for the Faroese salmon fishery, as a way to identify if there had been any significant change in the previously provided multi-annual management advice. The FWI could, therefore, be used in support of a multi-annual measure or decision. The Commission agreed to adopt the same procedure as that used in the West Greenland Commission in order to apply the FWI, i.e. a small group comprising one representative from each member of the Commission would be established to work by correspondence to coordinate the data collection and application of the FWI. The Secretary will contact the Parties to seek nominations for the Group and report the Group's findings to the Parties and ICES in January each year when the FWI is used.
- 4.9 The Commission adopted a decision concerning fishing of salmon in Faroese waters in 2013, 2014 and 2015.
- 4.10 Norway informed the Commission that in accordance with the procedure agreed in 2009, the Russian Federation and the EU had been consulted with regard to the salmon fisheries in Finnmark in 2012. There had also been constructive discussions during the 2012 Annual Meeting.
- 4.11 The Russian Federation indicated that the results of earlier tagging experiments and recent genetic projects indicate that quite a large number of salmon of Russian origin are harvested in the interceptory mixed-stock coastal fisheries in Northern Norway. This fishery cannot avoid harvesting salmon from rivers where the stocks are most at

risk and this is a concern for the Russian Federation. The position of the Russian Federation is that this mixed-stock fishery should be phased out. In 2011, in order to provide a better scientific basis for the future development of a sustainable, long-term and knowledge-based management regime for salmon stocks in the Barents region of Norway, Russia and Finland, a new ENPI Cross-Border Cooperation (CBC) project entitled 'Kolarctic salmon' was launched. The project is a joint venture between management, research and salmon fishing organizations and salmon fishermen in the participating countries. The project will run from 2011 to 2013 and the results will provide a better basis for the decision-making process to regulate the coastal fisheries in both Norway and Russia.

- 4.12 Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) urged Norway to start a process to end the coastal fishery in the same way that the Faroe Islands had done in its waters. In response to a suggestion from Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland), the Commission agreed that there should be an agenda item at the 2013 Annual Meeting to allow for a focus on the management of mixed-stock fisheries on the basis of information contained in the Implementation Plans.
- 4.13 The NGOs asked the representatives of Norway and the European Union when management measures might be introduced for the coastal fishery and the fishery in the Tana River. Norway indicated that management measures are in place, having been introduced in 2008 and again in 2010, and have significantly reduced the coastal mixed-stock fishery in Finnmark. The European Union advised that it is difficult to predict but is pleased that the process has commenced again.

(d) Risk of Transmission of *Gyrodactylus salaris* in the Commission Area

- 4.14 The Commission was advised that of the 48 rivers infected with *G. salaris* in Norway, 20 have been declared free from the parasite after successful rotenone treatment and a further 3 have been treated and are being monitored for a five year period to assess the success of the treatment. Norway advised the Commission that there are 10 infected rivers and 3 infected lakes in the Vefsna region of northern Norway. It is planned to treat all 10 infected rivers in this region twice; the first treatment was conducted in 2011 and the second treatment will take place in 2012. The lakes will be treated once.
- 4.15 Norway indicated that in 2011 a new attempt was made to eliminate *G. salaris* by the use of acid aluminium in the River Lærdalselva. Another treatment was planned for 2012. While it has not yet been possible to eradicate *G. salaris* in an infected river using this method, there have been some significant developments concerning the use of acid aluminium in the last two years. In the river Driva, salmon can migrate 90km upstream. To reduce the distance to be treated with rotenone, a barrier will be constructed 30 km from the sea. If all the permits are granted and funding obtained, the barrier will be built during winter 2013/14. In the Rauma region, which contains 5 infected rivers, surveys and planning are being undertaken with the aim of conducting rotenone treatments in 2013 and 2014. The Norwegian programme to eradicate *G. salaris* cost £14 million in 2012.

(e) Other Business

- 4.16 The winner of the Commission's US\$1,500 prize in the Tag Return Incentive Scheme

was Mr B. Green, Wales, UK.

- 4.17 The Commission re-elected Mr Raoul Bierach (Norway) as Chairman and Dr Ciaran Byrne (European Union) as Vice-Chairman.

5. West Greenland Commission

- 5.1 The Twenty-Ninth Annual Meeting of the West Greenland Commission was held in Edinburgh, Scotland during the period 5 - 8 June 2012. In the absence of the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman, Mr George Lapointe (US) chaired the meeting.

(a) Review of the 2011 Fishery and Scientific Advice from ICES

- 5.2 The Commission reviewed the 2011 fishery at West Greenland and considered the scientific advice from ICES. The Commission adopted a request to ICES for scientific advice to be presented in 2013.

- 5.3 The US supported the recommendation from ICES that arrangements be made to enable sampling of the fishery in Nuuk where an important proportion of the salmon catch is landed annually and requested the assistance of the Greenlandic authorities in this regard. While in the last three years samples had been obtained through the enhanced sampling programme, this had now ended so it would be important to have other arrangements in place. The US indicated that it intends to make a proposal in the North American Commission for inter-sessional consultations with Canada to review the management objectives for the Scotia Fundy and US regions. At present, the rebuilding objective is to achieve a 25% increase in returns of 2SW salmon compared to the average returns in the period 1992 - 1996. If this objective is achieved it would still only represent approximately 10% of the conservation limits for US stocks which is not consistent with NASCO agreements. The External Performance Review Panel had also encouraged progress in relation to initiatives for endangered species. The US would, therefore, wish to work with Canada to review these objectives with a view to considering a sequential approach to moving these objectives towards those contained in NASCO's agreements.

- 5.4 Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) presented a report on the 2011 fishery. The US expressed appreciation for the consideration being given to amending the current regulation with a view to improving catch reporting so as to obtain a more comprehensive picture of the fishery. Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) indicated that while fishermen fishing only for private consumption do not require a licence, they are urged to report their catch to GLFK and there have been media campaigns to encourage this. Fishermen wishing to sell their catch and tourist fishermen require licences and are required to report their catch.

(b) Regulatory measures

- 5.5 The Commission considered a proposal from the Chairman for a regulatory measure for the calendar years 2012 – 2014. The US stated that it could accept the proposal from the Chair as it reflected the latest scientific advice from ICES and advised the Commission that the language in the draft was intended to reinforce the ICES recommendations regarding monitoring and catch statistics, but not to interfere with

internal management in Greenland. The US indicated that the report, including the information on licensing and reporting, was very helpful and requested that future reports also include progress in implementing a logbook programme and any other measures to improve monitoring of the fishery and improve catch statistics.

- 5.6 Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) indicated that the additional text that had been included in the proposal from the Chair compared to the previous agreement could not be accepted as it related to internal Greenlandic affairs.
- 5.7 The Commission considered another proposal for a multi-annual regulatory measure. This measure was adopted and applies to the calendar years 2012 – 2014. The Commission agreed that the same procedure as was used during the previous regulatory measure for applying the Framework of Indicators (FWI) would apply during the new regulatory measure. Under this arrangement a small group comprising one representative from each member of the Commission would work by correspondence to coordinate the data collection and application of the FWI.

(c) Sampling in the West Greenland Fishery

- 5.8 The West Greenland salmon fishery sampling programme provides valuable biological data to the ICES stock assessments that inform science-based management decisions for the West Greenland fishery. The Commission adopted a West Greenland Fishery Sampling Agreement for 2012.

(e) Other Business

- 5.9 The winner of the Commission's US\$1,500 prize in the Tag Return Incentive Scheme was Mr Jorgen Inûsugtoq, Greenland.
- 5.10 The Commission elected Mr George Lapointe (US) as Chairman and Mr Ted Potter (European Union) as Vice-Chairman.

6. Finance and Administration Matters

- 6.1 The Finance and Administration Committee met prior to and during the Twenty-Ninth Annual Meeting of the Council. In the absence of the Chair of the Committee, the Vice-Chairman, Mr Raoul Bierach (Norway) chaired the meeting.

(a) Relationship with ICES

- 6.2 The Committee noted that in recent years ICES has made considerable progress in addressing NASCO's concerns about the timeliness and quality of presentation of the advice. The Committee welcomed the progress made by ICES but asked the Secretary to liaise with ICES on the possibilities of receiving the advice earlier so as to allow longer for consultations prior to the NASCO Annual Meeting.
- 6.3 The Chairman noted that under the MoU with ICES, which is next subject to review in 2013, there could be significant cost savings if multi-annual measures were agreed in both Commissions. While this may not affect the budget, because of the possibility that the Framework of Indicators could require reassessment of the catch advice in

any year, if reassessment was not required any surplus could be used to rebuild the Organization's funds.

(b) Consideration of the 2013 Draft Budget, Schedule of Contributions and five-year Budgeting Plan

6.4 The Secretary referred to the very favourable assessment of NASCO's financial management in the External Performance Review. He indicated that there was some uncertainty in staff-related costs in the 2013 draft budget related to the appointment of a new Secretary and potential relocation costs.

6.5 The Committee asked that in future budget proposals, a more detailed breakdown of the planned expenditure should be shown within budget heads and that details of staff salaries should be provided to the Committee. It was noted that it is not possible to predict the precise demands that would be made on many of the budget heads up to one and a half years ahead.

6.6 The Committee recommended the inclusion of a sum of £5,000 in the budget as a contribution to allow filming at West Greenland as part of the film 'Atlantic salmon – lost at sea!' The Committee also recommended that in future there be no mailings by post of documents for NASCO meetings, all such distributions in future would be done electronically.

6.7 The Committee agreed to recommend to the Council the adoption of the 2013 draft budget and 2014 forecast budget. A five-year spending plan (2013 - 2017) was also provided for information.

(c) Audited Accounts

6.8 The Committee recommended to the Council the adoption of the 2011 audited accounts.

6.9 In 2011 the Secretary had been asked to obtain quotes for the 2012 audit from PWC, Ernst and Young, KPMG and Deloitte and Touche and report back to the Committee at the 2012 meeting. In addition to PWC, only Ernst and Young had submitted a quote. While this was £600 below that provided by PWC, it was recognised that there would be an additional workload on the Secretariat from this change and that there was no guarantee that the cost would not increase in future years.

6.10 The Committee considered the pros and cons of changing the NASCO Auditors and recommended that it is time for a change. The Secretary was asked to obtain quotes for a minimum of three years work from auditing firms. The Secretary would circulate the information received to the Committee and seek agreement on the appointment.

(d) Other business

6.11 The Committee elected Mr Raoul Bierach (Norway) as its Chairman and Mr Doug Twining (Canada) as its Vice-Chairman.

- 6.12 The Secretary indicated that the Council had previously authorised changes to be made to the Staff Fund Rules. Following consultations with NASCO's advisors some changes to the way in which the fund is managed had been made but they have no financial implications. The Committee recommended that the Council adopt the revised rules.
- 6.13 At the 2011 Annual Meeting the Council considered a proposal from OSPAR that an MoU be agreed between OSPAR and NASCO. Following consultations, a draft MoU had been developed. It was noted that a similar MoU had been agreed between OSPAR and NEAFC. The Secretary noted that the draft MoU provided for an exchange of information between NASCO and OSPAR and that this was important because, in the past, OSPAR had listed the Atlantic salmon as endangered without consultation. The Committee considered a new, simplified text and agreed to resolve this inter-sessionally.

Interim Secretary
Edinburgh
5 April 2013