



CNL(14)14

Report on Progress in Implementing the Measures contained in the 'Action Plan for taking forward the recommendations of the External Performance Review and the review of the 'Next Steps' for NASCO'

In 2013 the Council adopted an 'Action Plan for taking forward the recommendations of the External Performance Review and the review of the 'Next Steps' for NASCO (CNL(13)38). The following tables present a progress report on each of the recommended actions which we have updated for 2014.

Section 1 contains recommendations which had been implemented or planned at the time the Action Plan was developed in 2013 but for which there was a need to monitor progress and evaluate outcomes.

Section 2 contains recommendations for which further action was required for their implementation. For ease of reference we have numbered the nine decisions in Action Plan.

Section 3 contains actions to strengthen NASCO's work on the management of salmon fisheries.

Secretary
Edinburgh
29 May 2014

Section 1: Recommendations of the External Performance Review Panel (EPR) and ‘Next Steps’ Review Group (NS) that have been implemented or are planned and for which there may be a need to monitor progress and evaluate outcomes

| | Recommendation | Actions taken |
|-------|---|--|
| | NASCO’s ‘Next Steps’ Process | |
| EPR1 | The ‘Next Steps’ process has succeeded in undertaking a comprehensive and critical review of the work of the Organization to date and in enhancing efforts on the current areas of focus of the Organization. This progress should continue, based on the Strategic Approach, which has provided a comprehensive framework for the work to be undertaken and for improvements to be made in the implementation of NASCO Agreements. | <p><i>The Council has agreed to proceed with a new cycle of IPs covering the period 2013 -2018 and Annual Progress Reports (APRs). The ‘Next Steps’ review process proposed only minor changes to the Strategic Approach. The EPR considered that the Strategic Approach had provided a comprehensive framework for the work of NASCO and it will be used in the next cycle of reporting.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: New IPs for the period 2013 - 2018 and the first APRs have been submitted by the Parties/jurisdictions and evaluated by a Review Group. There was a Special Session at the 2013 Annual Meeting to allow for the presentation of the Group’s evaluations of the IPs. Following the 2013 Annual Meeting, Parties/jurisdictions were given a further opportunity to clarify any unclear/incomplete answers or information in their Plans, even where these were assessed as satisfactory by the Review Group. Most Parties took advantage of this opportunity. A further Special Session will be held at the 2014 Annual Meeting to allow for presentation and discussion of the evaluation of new IPs received since the 2013 Annual Meeting and of the first APRs.</p> |
| EPR 2 | In the next reporting cycle, the Parties should continue their efforts to implement the decisions and to address the issues identified in the Strategic Approach. It will be important for the second cycle to address areas identified in the first cycle of the ‘Next Steps’ process for additional action. Consideration should be given to convening an FAR special session on this topic. Progress on the socio-economic aspects of Atlantic salmon and initiatives for endangered populations is also encouraged. | <p><i>The IP template adopted in 2012, CNL(12)42, indicates that jurisdictions should take into account the specific issues on which action was recommended in the first cycle of reporting. These issues were collated by the Secretariat and sent to jurisdictions with the request to develop new IPs. An initial assessment of the IPs will be undertaken to ensure the information requested in this template has been provided and where there are gaps the IPs will be returned to the jurisdiction for further drafting. The IPs will then be evaluated by a Review Group. The findings of the evaluation will be considered at the 2013 Annual Meeting. A Special Session on socio-economics is to be held during the 2014 Annual Meeting. The IP template seeks information on social and economic aspects and on how threatened and endangered stocks are identified and of actions to address threats to them so these issues should be addressed in the new IPs. There will be a need to monitor progress and evaluate outcomes.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: New IPs for the period 2013 - 2018 and the first APRs have been submitted by the Parties/jurisdictions and evaluated by a Review Group. In undertaking the evaluation of the 2013 – 2018 IPs the Review Group drew on information arising from the first reporting cycle, including the FAR assessments. There was a Special Session at the 2013 Annual Meeting to allow for the presentation of the Group’s evaluations of the IPs. Following the 2013 Annual Meeting, Parties/jurisdictions were given a further opportunity to clarify any</p> |

| | | |
|-------|---|--|
| | | <p>unclear/incomplete answers or information in their Plans, even where these were assessed as satisfactory by the Review Group. Most Parties took advantage of this opportunity. A further Special Session will be held at the 2014 Annual Meeting to allow for presentation and discussion of the evaluation of new IPs received since the 2013 Annual Meeting and of the first APRs.</p> <p>On the recommendation of its Socio-Economics Sub-Group, the Council decided that the 2014 Theme-based Special Session will be on the topic of management of single and mixed stock fisheries, with particular focus on fisheries on stocks below their conservation limits, and that the presentations at this Special Session should include details on how socio-economic issues are included in management decisions including the interests of indigenous peoples. The Socio-Economics Sub-Group also recommended that further Special Sessions be planned in future on integrating socio-economic factors in decisions relating to habitat protection, restoration and enhancement and to aquaculture and related activities.</p> |
| EPR 3 | <p>In terms of reporting, the next cycle should focus on assessing the effectiveness of the measures taken by the Parties. The IPs should contain clearly described identifiable, measurable outcomes and timescales. The Parties are encouraged to prepare IPs and FARs in a timely fashion, including through the possibility of electronic filing.</p> | <p><i>The Guidelines for the Preparation and Evaluation of IPs and for Reporting on Progress, CNL(12)44, indicate that IPs should specify the actions to be taken, the timescales for these actions, the expected outcomes and the approach to monitoring and enforcement so that progress can be subject to critical evaluation. The IP template, CNL(12)42, has been structured to ensure that, for each action, information is provided on the expected outcome and timescale and guidance has been provided on what constitutes an action and a measurable outcome. An initial assessment of the IPs will be undertaken to ensure the information requested in this template has been provided and where there are gaps the IPs will be returned to the jurisdiction for further drafting. The IPs will then be evaluated by a Review Group. The findings of the evaluation will be considered at the 2013 Annual Meeting. In the next cycle of reporting, FARs are to be replaced by APRs that will be reviewed. Timetables for submission of IPs and APRs have been developed. The APRs will be requested in early January each year and the Secretariat will send out reminders in early March, one month before the deadline for submission (1 April). Both the IP and APR templates will be available electronically. There will be a need to monitor progress and evaluate outcomes.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: New IPs for the period 2013 - 2018 and the first APRs have been submitted by the Parties/jurisdictions and evaluated by a Review Group. There was a Special Session at the 2013 Annual Meeting to allow for the presentation of the Group's evaluations of the IPs. The Review Group indicated that there were still some issues of timeliness regarding the submission of the IPs; three jurisdictions have not yet submitted an IP. Timeliness of reporting through APRs was generally good but two jurisdictions have not yet submitted their APRs. Following the 2013 Annual Meeting, Parties/jurisdictions were given a further opportunity to clarify any unclear/incomplete answers or information in their Plans, even where these were assessed as satisfactory by the Review Group. Most Parties took advantage of this opportunity. The Review Group had concluded that, overall, compared to the first cycle of reporting, the new IPs were clearer, better focused and more succinct.</p> |
| EPR 4 | <p>In the long-term, the 'Next Steps' process should consider cross-cutting issues, such as climate change. It should also consider conducting a review of the functions and role of the</p> | <p><i>The Council has agreed that Theme-based Special Sessions could be helpful to NASCO and procedures for planning and organising these Special Sessions agreed (see CNL(12)12 for details). A number of priority topics have been identified including management of mixed-stock fisheries (MSFs), managing salmon under a changing climate and fish passage at hydro-electric facilities. It has been agreed that there will be a Special Session on socio-economics at the 2014 Annual Meeting and a focus on MSFs in NEAC in 2013. Information on climate change impacts on</i></p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | Council including the possibility of vesting it with binding decision-making authority. | <p><i>salmon was presented at the ‘Salmon Summit’ and should be taken into account in developing future research needs. ICES has been requested to report on any significant advances in understanding of the biology of Atlantic salmon that is pertinent to NASCO, including information on the potential implications of climate change for salmon management.</i></p> <p><i>The actions relating to modernizing and strengthening the work of NASCO are detailed in sections 2 and 3 below.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: On the recommendation of its Socio-Economics Sub-Group, the Council decided that the 2014 Theme-based Special Session will be on the topic of management of single and mixed stock fisheries, with particular focus on fisheries on stocks below their conservation limits, and that the presentations at this Special Session should include details on how socio-economic issues are included in management decisions including the interests of indigenous peoples. The Socio-Economics Sub-Group also recommended that further Special Sessions be planned in future on integrating socio-economic factors in decisions relating to habitat protection, restoration and enhancement and to aquaculture and related activities.</p> |
| Convention for the Conservation of Salmon in the North Atlantic Ocean | | |
| EPR24 | The institutional structure should be reviewed and amended as appropriate to include subsidiary bodies and a Secretariat, as well as rules for appointment of a Secretary and the duties of the Secretary. Authority and procedures for the establishment of <i>ad hoc</i> bodies should be provided. | <p><i>Article 12 of the Convention states that the Council shall appoint a Secretary and describes the functions of the Secretary. Rule 28 of the Council’s Rules of Procedure states that the Council may establish such other subsidiary bodies as it deems necessary and shall determine their composition and terms of reference.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: A procedure for the appointment of a Secretary was agreed by the Parties and used in 2013.</p> |
| EPR27 | It is recommended that, as appropriate, consideration be given to adoption of rules relating to the establishment of NASCO subsidiary and <i>ad hoc</i> bodies. | <p><i>Rule 28 of the Council’s Rules of Procedure states that the Council may establish such other subsidiary bodies as it deems necessary and shall determine their composition and terms of reference.</i></p> |
| EPR32 | The description of the functions of the Secretary in article 12 should be reviewed, expanded and modernized to reflect actual practice. This can be elaborated in rules of procedure. | <p><i>Article 12.2 states that the functions of the Secretary include performing such functions as follow from other provisions of the Convention or as the Council may determine. This provides the flexibility for the Council to determine the functions of the Secretary adaptively in response to the work of the Organization.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: The functions of the Secretary were detailed in the job description used in advertising the post in 2013.</p> |
| EPR33 | The regulatory and other measures reflecting the scientific advice should continue to be set and, in this regard, efforts to develop a risk framework for the Faroese fishery are encouraged | <p><i>Multi-annual regulatory measures or decisions were agreed for both the West Greenland and Faroese fisheries in 2012. The development of a risk framework is underway for the Faroese fishery.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: The multi-annual measures agreed in 2012 apply to the fisheries at West Greenland in 2012, 2013 and 2014 and at the Faroe Islands in 2013, 2014 and 2015. The Framework of Indicators was run in both the West</p> |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | Greenland and North-East Atlantic Commissions in 2013 and 2014 to determine if reassessment of the catch advice was required. In 2013, ICES advised on progress made with developing the Risk Framework for the Faroese salmon fishery, including the implications of selecting different numbers of management units, the limitations for defining management units smaller than the current NEAC stock complexes, the implications of applying probabilities of achieving conservation limits to separate management units versus the use of simultaneous probabilities and the choice of risk levels for achieving management objectives. Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) advised the Commission that additional time was needed for domestic consultations before being able to further consider a Risk Framework for the Faroese salmon fishery. This issue is on the 2014 agenda for the North-East Atlantic Commission. |
| EPR 36 | Obligations for Parties to provide information should be reviewed and updated, consistent with the recommendations of the 'Next Steps' Review Group and the Working Group on Future Reporting. The type of information required by the Organization to meet the challenges identified in the 'Next Steps' process should be prioritized and identified, and information requirements concerning outcomes of actions taken to implement NASCO programmes or decisions should be required. | <p><i>In 2012, the Council adopted all of the recommendations of the Working Group on Future Reporting, CNL(12)12 and templates for both IPs and APRs were agreed that specify the information sought, including details of monitoring programmes and expected outcomes of actions developed to address threats. The IP template, CNL(12)42, seeks information on the three main 'focus areas' of management of fisheries, habitat protection and restoration, and aquaculture and related activities (including G. salaris and transgenics). Information is sought on how socio-economic factors are included under management decisions and on how threatened and endangered stocks are identified.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: New IPs have been submitted and reviewed and the first APRs under these Plans were reviewed in 2014 (see CNL(14)12). These APRs provide an update on progress on each action in the IP for each jurisdiction. The Review Group has provided a table summarising for each jurisdiction whether each action has not started, is ongoing or completed. This table will be updated annually. There will be a Special Session at the 2014 Annual Meeting to present and discuss the Review Group's findings.</p> |
| Conservation and Management | | |
| EPR 41 | NASCO should ensure that the precautionary approach is used to the same extent in managing all impacts of human activity on the full life-cycle of salmon in rivers, estuaries, coastal areas and the open ocean. | <p><i>NASCO's agreements developed under the Precautionary Approach relate to management of fisheries, habitat protection and restoration and aquaculture and related activities. Guidelines both on incorporating socio-economic factors in decisions under the Precautionary Approach and on stock rebuilding programmes have also been developed. The IP template, CNL(12)42, requests that jurisdictions take account of the specific actions identified in the first reporting cycle to ensure consistency with these agreements (see EPR 2 and EPR43). There will be a need to monitor progress and evaluate outcomes.</i></p> <p><i>By-catch of salmon in pelagic fisheries for other species is referred to in the Agreement on the Adoption of a Precautionary Approach (see EPR10 below).</i></p> <p>2014 Update: In undertaking the evaluation of the IPs the Review Group drew on information arising from the first reporting cycle, including the FAR assessments.</p> <p>The IASRB has established a Telemetry Sub-Group to develop and document a 'roadmap' outlining a large scale</p> |

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| | | <p>international collaborative telemetry project to ultimately provide information on migration paths and quantitative estimates of mortality during phases of the marine life-cycle of salmon. The Sub-Group will report its findings to the IASRB during the 2014 Annual Meeting, SAG(14)4.</p> <p>In 2013, ICES was asked to provide recommendations on how a targeted study of pelagic bycatch in relevant areas might be carried out with an assessment of the need for such a study considering the current understanding of pelagic bycatch impacts on Atlantic salmon populations. The advice from ICES is contained in document CNL(14)8. In summary, ICES advises that the latest information highlights ongoing uncertainty on the salmon bycatch question, but new screening programmes, considered by ICES to provide the most reliable data, suggest relatively low levels of bycatch in the mackerel catches ICES noted the markedly higher salmon bycatch rates recorded in the IESSNS surveys, but it is unclear how representative these might be of the bycatch in the commercial fishery given differences in the design and operation of the gears used. In any event, the capture rates remain low relative to the estimates of total NEAC PFA (< 2%). Given that estimates of the bycatch of salmon in the total pelagic fisheries are highly uncertain, ICES considers it would be informative to increase efforts to obtain reliable estimates of the bycatch of salmon and made a number of recommendations as to how this might be achieved.</p> |
| EPR 42 | <p>NASCO should ensure that the WSSD-JPOI commitment to maintain or restore stocks to levels that can produce the maximum sustainable yield with the aim of achieving these goals for depleted stocks on an urgent basis, where possible not later than 2015, is taken into account, including in the context of the 'Next Steps' process.</p> | <p><i>NASCO's Agreement on Adoption of a Precautionary Approach, CNL(98)46, states that stocks should be maintained above conservation limits (CLs) by the use of management targets (MTs) and that stock rebuilding programmes should be undertaken for stocks that are below these CLs. ICES advises that conservation limits should be set at a level that will achieve long-term maximum sustainable yield. Progress towards establishment and attainment of these CLs and MTs will be evaluated in the next cycle of IPs and APRs. The IP template, CNL(12)42, seeks information on stock status relative to reference points (conservation limits, management targets or other measures of abundance) so as to provide a baseline for future comparison. The IP template also seeks information on any fisheries permitted to operate on stocks that are below their reference point and the approach to managing them to promote stock rebuilding. A major factor influencing salmon abundance is mortality at sea and this is constraining the ability to achieve stock rebuilding goals.</i></p> <p><i>Currently, the stated management objectives for Atlantic salmon stocks in the US and the Scotia-Fundy Region of Canada are a 25% increase in returns of 2SW salmon from the average returns in 1992-1996. This rebuilding objective was established in light of the extremely depleted state of these endangered populations. However, selection of this management objective is inconsistent with NASCO's Agreement on the Adoption of the Precautionary Approach, Action Plan for the Application of the Precautionary Approach, NASCO Guidelines for the Management of Salmon Fisheries, and scientific advice from ICES. The North American Commission has, therefore, agreed to review these management objectives.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: The IPs, and the APRs on actions under these Plans, contain information on stock status relevant to reference points.</p> <p>A Theme-based Special Session, on the topic of single and mixed stock fisheries, with particular focus on stocks below their conservation limits, will be held at the 2014 Annual Meeting. The objectives of this session are to allow for an exchange of information on:</p> |

| | | |
|--------|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress in establishing conservation limits, or alternative reference points, and the approaches being used to manage fisheries in their absence; • How management measures are used to ensure the protection of the weakest contributing stocks in mixed-stock fisheries; • How socio-economic considerations, including the interests of indigenous people, are weighed against conservation needs and, where fishing is permitted on stocks below their CLs, the approaches being used to ensure that exploitation is limited to a level that permits stock rebuilding within a stated timeframe. <p>An overview of the information contained in the IPs has been prepared by the Steering Committee, CNL(14)43.</p> <p>At the 2013 Annual Meeting, the US tabled a paper NAC(13)4, describing new management objectives. ICES was asked to describe the implications of these new objectives for the provision of catch advice for the West Greenland fishery. ICES has advised (see CNL914)8) that the proposed modification of the US management objective would have had a negligible impact on the catch advice for the 2012–2014 fishing years.</p> |
| EPR 43 | <p>Noting that NASCO has, in the SALSEA Programme, addressed the problem of estimating sea mortality, it is important to cover the sea areas stretching from estuaries to the high seas, the phase of the life cycle where the salmon leaves natal waters, to the same extent as other phases of the life cycle.</p> | <p><i>The SALSEA Programme was a comprehensive programme involving freshwater, estuarine, in-shore and high seas elements, although the marine surveys were focused on post-smolts and on improving understanding of distribution and migration at sea. A Sub-Group of the SAG has met and provided recommendations to the IASRB for future research for consideration during the 2013 Annual Meeting.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: At its 2013 Annual Meeting in the light of the recommendations from the Sub-Group on Future Research, the IASRB decided that one priority should be to analyse the remaining samples and data arising from the SALSEA programme and recognised that it would be important to first clarify what remaining samples are available, how their analysis could benefit salmon management and how much the analyses would cost. The SAG Chairman will develop this information and report to the SAG at its 2014 meeting. In light of the recommendations that a particular focus of future research should be studies to partition marine mortality, the IASRB established a Telemetry Sub-Group to develop and document a ‘roadmap’ outlining a large scale international collaborative telemetry project to ultimately provide information on migration paths and quantitative estimates of mortality during phases of the marine life-cycle of salmon (see SAG(14)4).</p> |
| EPR 46 | <p>Through the ‘Next Steps’ process, NASCO has addressed some of the ambiguities or inconsistencies in its instruments relating to fisheries management. In future reporting, information should be provided by the Parties on the interplay between stock conservation needs and incorporation of social and economic factors in decision-making, for both single and</p> | <p><i>The IP template, CNL(12)42, requests that jurisdictions identify any fisheries permitted to operate on salmon stocks that are below their reference point and describe the approach taken to managing them that still promotes stock rebuilding. Jurisdictions are also requested to describe how socio-economic factors are taken into account in making decisions on fisheries management. There will be a need to monitor progress and evaluate outcomes.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: The IPs prepared using the template CNL(12)42 have been submitted and reviewed, as have the first APRs under these Plans. No clear omissions or inadequacies were identified in any of the IPs in relation to management of salmon fisheries although the Review Group noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • many of the responses provided information on the organizations that are involved in the decision-making |

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| | <p>mixed-stock fisheries. In particular, clear indications should be given of how decisions were taken to permit exploitation of stocks known to be below their reference points, where information on stock status was lacking, and the consequences of these decisions for stock rebuilding.</p> | <p>process but not on how decisions are taken in response to different stock conditions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> fisheries are permitted to operate on stocks that are below their reference point in several jurisdictions, but the number of fisheries involved and the management measures applying to these fisheries to promote stock rebuilding were not always clearly described. <p>The objectives of the 2014 Theme-based Special Session are to allow for an exchange of information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress in establishing conservation limits, or alternative reference points, and the approaches being used to manage fisheries in their absence; How management measures are used to ensure the protection of the weakest contributing stocks in mixed-stock fisheries; How socio-economic considerations, including the interests of indigenous people, are weighed against conservation needs and, where fishing is permitted on stocks below their CLs, the approaches being used to ensure that exploitation is limited to a level that permits stock rebuilding within a stated timeframe. |
| EPR 47 | <p>The Parties are encouraged to report on issues relating to the management of salmon fisheries in a prompt and timely fashion.</p> | <p><i>The IP Guidelines, CNL(12)44, specify the timetable for submission of IPs and APRs. Reminders will be issued. There will be a need to monitor compliance with these timelines.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: The Review Group indicated that there were still some issues of timeliness regarding the submission of the IPs; three jurisdictions have not yet submitted an IP. Timeliness of reporting through APRs was generally good but two jurisdictions have not yet submitted their APRs.</p> |
| EPR 48 | <p>As recommended by the ‘Next Steps’ Review Group, there is a need for further progress to be made in the management of salmon fisheries as part of the next cycle of the ‘Next Steps’ process.</p> | <p><i>The IP template, CNL(12)42, seeks information on the main threats and management challenges relating to fisheries and the actions to address each threat, including actions on the specific issues identified in the first reporting cycle. There will be a need to monitor progress and evaluate outcomes.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: No clear omissions or inadequacies were identified in any of the IPs in relation to management of salmon fisheries (but see EPR46 above). The APRs submitted in 2014 include updates on progress on each of the actions in the IPs, and have been evaluated by the Review Group. There will be a Special Session at the 2014 Annual Meeting to discuss the Group’s findings. The Review Group has developed a table showing the status of each action (not started, ongoing or completed) for each jurisdiction and this will be updated annually.</p> |
| EPR 49 | <p>The Parties are encouraged to report on issues relating to the protection and restoration of salmon habitat in a timely fashion.</p> | <p><i>The IP Guidelines, CNL(12)44, specify the timetable for submission of IPs and APRs. Reminders will be issued. There will be a need to monitor compliance with these timelines.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: The Review Group indicated that there were still some issues of timeliness regarding the submission of the IPs; three jurisdictions have not yet submitted an IP. Timeliness of reporting through APRs was generally good but two jurisdictions have not yet submitted their APRs.</p> |
| EPR 50 | <p>As recommended by the ‘Next Steps’ Review Group, there is a need for further progress to be made in the protection and preservation of salmon</p> | <p><i>The IP template, CNL(12)42, seeks information on the main threats and management challenges relating to habitat protection and restoration, and the actions to address each threat, including actions on the specific issues identified in the first reporting cycle. There will be a need to monitor progress and evaluate outcomes.</i></p> |

| | | |
|---------------|---|--|
| | <p>habitat as part of the next cycle of the 'Next Steps' process.</p> | <p>2014 Update: The IPs for the period 2013 - 2018 were submitted and reviewed prior to the 2013 Annual Meeting. No clear omissions or inadequacies were identified in any of the IPs in relation to habitat protection and restoration. The APRs submitted in 2014 include updates on progress on each of the actions in the IPs, and have been evaluated by the Review Group. There will be a Special Session at the 2014 Annual Meeting to discuss the Group's findings. The Review Group has developed a table showing the status of each action (not started, ongoing or completed) for each jurisdiction and this will be updated annually.</p> |
| <p>EPR 51</p> | <p>If there is to be a balance between measures aimed at ending mixed-stock fisheries in the areas beyond fisheries jurisdiction and measures ending mixed-stock fisheries within fisheries jurisdiction, NASCO should aim at managing mixed-stock fisheries in the North Atlantic to protect the weakest of the contributing stocks.</p> | <p><i>The NASCO Convention does not permit salmon fishing beyond areas of fisheries jurisdiction and no activity by vessels from non-NASCO Parties has been detected in international waters since the early 1990s (see EPR6). Under the IP template, CNL(12)42, jurisdictions are requested to describe how MSFs are defined, indicate the mean catch in these fisheries over the last 5 years and describe how they are managed to ensure that all contributing stocks are meeting their conservation objectives. There will be a need to monitor progress and evaluate outcomes.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: The IPs prepared using the template CNL(12)42 have been submitted and reviewed and were discussed at the 2013 Annual Meeting. The Review Group noted <i>inter alia</i> that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most IPs clearly indicated whether or not a Party/jurisdiction had mixed-stock fisheries and how these are defined (most used the NASCO definition but one Party/jurisdiction indicated that it considers mixed-stock fisheries to be in-river fisheries that exploit salmon from more than one tributary within the river system). Where Parties/jurisdictions have such fisheries, the IPs generally provided information on catches but clear descriptions of how the fisheries are managed to ensure that all the contributing stocks are meeting their conservation objectives were often lacking. <p>An item was included on the North-East Atlantic Commission's agenda in 2013 on the management of mixed-stock fisheries. Items on mixed-stock fisheries will be included on the Commission agendas for their 2015 meetings.</p> <p>One of the objectives of the Theme-based Special Session to be held at the 2014 Annual Meeting is to allow for an exchange of information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How management measures are used to ensure the protection of the weakest contributing stocks in mixed-stock fisheries; <p>With regard to fishing for salmon beyond areas of fisheries jurisdiction by non-NASCO Parties, there have been no sightings since the early 1990s but see section 2 below concerning IUU fishing (cooperation on surveillance with NAFO and NEAFC).</p> |
| <p>EPR 52</p> | <p>Additional progress is needed towards achieving the international goals for sea lice and containment.</p> | <p><i>The IP template, CNL(12)42, seeks information on the main threats and management challenges relating to aquaculture and related activities, and the actions to address each threat, including actions on the specific issues identified in the first reporting cycle. There will be a need to monitor progress and evaluate outcomes.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: The Review Group has reported that five IPs contained clear omissions or inadequacies in the responses to either or both questions 4.2 and 4.3 concerning demonstration of progress towards the international goals for sea lice and containment. The APRs submitted in 2014 include updates on progress on each of the actions</p> |

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| | | in the IPs, and have been evaluated by the Review Group. For those IPs with clear omissions or inadequacies in the responses, the Review Group has asked the Parties/jurisdictions concerned to indicate how progress towards the international goals will be monitored. There will be a Special Session at the 2014 Annual Meeting to discuss the Group's findings and for the Parties/jurisdictions to respond to the Group's questions. |
| EPR 53 | As recommended by the FAR Review Group, there is a need for further progress to address the impacts of aquaculture, introductions and transfers and transgenics as part of the next cycle of the 'Next Steps' process. | <p><i>The IP template, CNL(12)42, seeks information on the main threats and management challenges relating to the impacts of aquaculture, introductions and transfers and transgenics, and the actions to address each threat (consistent with the Williamsburg Resolution and the BMP Guidance), including actions on the specific issues identified in the first reporting cycle. There will be a need to monitor progress and evaluate outcomes.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: The Review Group has reported that five IPs contained clear omissions or inadequacies in the responses to either or both questions 4.2 and 4.3 concerning demonstration of progress towards the international goals for sea lice and containment. The APRs submitted in 2014 include updates on progress on each of the actions in the IPs, and have been evaluated by the Review Group. Questions have been asked to those Parties/jurisdictions as to how progress towards the international goals will be monitored. There will be a Special Session at the 2014 Annual Meeting to discuss the Group's findings and for the Parties/jurisdictions to respond to these Group's questions. The Review Group has developed a table showing the status of each action (not started, ongoing or completed) for each jurisdiction and this will be updated annually.</p> |
| EPR 54 | The Parties are encouraged to report on issues relating to aquaculture, introductions and transfers and transgenics in a full and timely fashion. | <p><i>The IP Guidelines, CNL(12)44, specify the timetable for submission of IPs and APRs. Reminders will be issued. There will be a need to monitor compliance with these timelines.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: The Review Group indicated that there were still some issues of timeliness regarding the submission of the IPs; three jurisdictions have not yet submitted an IP. Timeliness of reporting through APRs was generally good but two jurisdictions have not yet submitted their APRs.</p> |
| EPR 57 | It is recommended that further efforts be made to address the issue of <i>Gyrodactylus salaris</i> in the context of the NASCO 'Next Steps' process. | <p><i>The IP template, CNL(12)42, seeks information on the main threats and management challenges relating to <i>G. salaris</i> and the actions to address each threat, including actions on the specific issues identified in the first reporting cycle. There will be a need to monitor progress and evaluate outcomes.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: The Review Group has reported that three IPs contained clear omissions or inadequacies in the responses to question 4.6 in that no information had been provided on the measures in place to prevent the introduction of <i>G. salaris</i>. The APRs submitted in 2014 include updates on progress on each of the actions in the IPs, and have been evaluated by the Review Group. Questions have been asked to those Parties/jurisdictions on the measures in place to prevent the introduction of <i>G. salaris</i>. There will be a Special Session at the 2014 Annual Meeting to discuss the Group's findings and for the Parties/jurisdictions to respond to these Group's questions. The Review Group has developed a table showing the status of each action (not started, ongoing or completed) for each jurisdiction and this will be updated annually.</p> |
| EPR 58 | Further exchange of information among the jurisdictions through the development of IPs and FARs, as | <i>The Council has agreed that the next cycle of IPs and APRs should commence in 2013 and that Theme-based Special Sessions will be held on a range of topics. The first Theme-based Special Session will be on mixed-stock fisheries.</i> |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | appropriate, should be welcomed. | 2014 Update: The IPs for the period 2013 – 2018 were submitted and reviewed prior to the 2013 Annual Meeting. The APRs submitted in 2014 include updates on each of the actions contained within the IPs, and have also been evaluated by the Review Group. There will be a Special Session at the 2014 Annual Meeting to discuss the Group’s findings. FARs have been replaced by APRs but, additionally, a Theme-based Special Session will be held in 2014 to allow for detailed exchange on the topic of the management of salmon fisheries. The Review Group has highlighted that no IPs have been received for three jurisdictions and no APRs have been received for two jurisdictions. |
| Compliance and Enforcement | | |
| EPR 59 | The ‘Next Steps’ process has been an effective mechanism to improve compliance and enforcement in NASCO, in large part due to the expanding and evolving role of the Council. The Organization is encouraged to continue these efforts to further improve compliance and enforcement and promote the conservation, restoration, enhancement and rational management of salmon stocks. | <i>The IP template CNL(12)42, seeks details of the expected outcome, the approach for monitoring effectiveness and enforcement. Progress will be reported through the APRs for each specified action. The new reporting cycle has greater focus on enforcement than the first cycle. There will be a need to monitor progress and evaluate outcomes.</i> 2014 Update: The first APRs on the 2013 – 2018 IPs were submitted in 2014, and evaluated by the Review Group. The Review Group noted that it was intended that progress on each action would be reported under ‘Monitoring/Enforcement Results’ but in some cases only the approach to monitoring was described. The Review Group, therefore, recommended that the Secretariat be asked to modify the template to read ‘Progress on action to date’ rather than ‘Monitoring/Enforcement Results’. |
| EPR 61 | The Parties are encouraged to continue to report on these matters in the next cycle of the ‘Next Steps’ process. Implementation plans should include reporting on estimates of unreported catches and measures taken to reduce such catches. Timely reporting is essential so that all relevant information is available during assessments. | <i>The IP template, CNL(12)42, seeks information on the current level of unreported catch and the measures being taken to reduce this. The APR template, CNL(12)43, seeks details of the estimated unreported catch from in-river, estuarine and coastal fisheries. A schedule for reporting has been agreed and reminders will be issued to the Parties. There will be a need to monitor compliance with these timelines, progress and evaluate outcomes.</i> 2014 Update: The Review Group indicated that there were still some issues of timeliness regarding the submission of the IPs; three jurisdictions have not yet submitted an IP. Timeliness of reporting through APRs was generally good but two jurisdictions have not yet submitted their APRs. Estimates of unreported catch are contained in document CNL(14)12. The Review Group has highlighted that not all Parties/jurisdictions have provided an estimate of unreported catch. |
| International Cooperation | | |
| EPR 69 | The NASCO website should show active NGOs, or explain why an NGO is referred to as ‘suspended’. | <i>The website has been amended in accordance with this recommendation.</i> |
| EPR 73 | Iceland should be encouraged to re- | <i>In accordance with this recommendation a letter was sent to the Icelandic Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 15 May</i> |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---|
| | accede to the Convention. | <p><i>2012 inviting Iceland to re-accede to the Convention. The Council has agreed that the President and Secretary should keep Iceland informed of NASCO's work. The Parties are also encouraged to raise the issue bilaterally.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: Mr Arni Isaksson, former Head of Delegation to NASCO, has now retired. The Secretary has met his replacement and has briefed him on NASCO matters and provided relevant documentation on the work of NASCO.</p> |
| EPR 74 | Dialogue with St. Pierre and Miquelon should be increased in order to agree upon targets and a method for making decisions on their salmon fishery and also to improve data collection. | <p><i>A letter was sent to the French Secrétariat Général de la Mer by the President in 2010 encouraging France (in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon) to accede to the Convention. Welcome improvements have been made to the sampling programme of the St Pierre and Miquelon salmon fishery including genetic analyses. In accordance with this recommendation and as agreed by the Council a follow-up letter will be sent by the President. The Parties are encouraged to raise the issue bilaterally.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: A representative of St Pierre and Miquelon participated in the 2013 Annual Meeting and also at the 2014 intersessional Meeting of the West Greenland Commission. At its 2013 Annual Meeting the representative of France (in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon) advised the Council that the question of acceding to the Convention would be discussed again but it is likely that, given that there is no option to have status as a Cooperating Non-Member State, France (in respect of St. Pierre and Miquelon) would wish to retain observer status. Representatives of France (in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon) will attend the 2014 Annual Meeting.</p> |
| | | <p><i>NASCO should continue to cooperate with EIFAAC and OSPAR on issues of common interest.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: An MoU between NASCO and OSPAR came into effect on 5 August 2013 and is available on the NASCO website. Both EIFAAC and OSPAR have been invited to attend the 2014 NASCO Annual Meeting.</p> |
| 'Strategic Approach' | | |
| NS1 | While the five key issues relating to management of salmon fisheries remain valid, the Group recognised the need for further progress to address the additional actions highlighted by the FAR Review Group. The 2009 fisheries management guidelines should assist jurisdictions in making further progress in implementing NASCO's agreements and with future reporting. | <p><i>The IP template, CNL(12)42, seeks information on the main threats and management challenges relating to fisheries and the actions to address each threat, including actions on the specific issues identified in the first reporting cycle. These issues were collated by the Secretariat and sent to jurisdictions with the request to develop new IPs. There will be a need to monitor progress and evaluate outcomes.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: The IPs for the period 2013 - 2018 were submitted and reviewed prior to the 2013 Annual Meeting. No clear omissions or inadequacies were identified in any of the IPs in relation to management of salmon fisheries (but see EPR46 above). The APRs submitted in 2014 include updates on progress on each of the actions in the IPs, and have been evaluated by the Review Group. There will be a Special Session at the 2014 Annual Meeting to discuss the Group's findings. The Review Group has developed a table showing the status of each action (not started, ongoing or completed) for each jurisdiction and this will be updated annually.</p> |
| NS2 | NASCO could provide a useful forum for exchange of information on how different jurisdictions are incorporating social and economic factors in | <p><i>A Special Session on socio-economics is planned for 2014. The Council has agreed that this should include case studies, consideration of the usefulness of NASCO's socio-economic guidelines and NASCO's future work on this topic. The IP template, CNL(12)42, also seeks information relating to social and economic aspects and how these are incorporated in management decisions.</i></p> |

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| | <p>managing their salmon resource. Proposals for a Special Session are being developed by a Sub-Group of the Socio-Economics Working Group. It would be valuable to consider not only case studies on how social and economic factors are included in decisions relating to each of the three focus areas but to have discussions on the value of NASCO's social and economic guidelines and what NASCO's future role on this topic might be.</p> | <p>2014 Update: In 2013, the Socio-Economics Sub-Group had recommended that rather than a general focus on socio-economic issues, the Council should focus the 2014 Special Session only on how socio-economic factors are integrated into decisions relating to the management of salmon fisheries, both single and mixed-stock fisheries, and particularly in situations where fisheries are permitted on stocks below their conservation limits. The Socio-Economics Sub-Group had further recommended that further Special Sessions on integrating socio-economic factors in decisions relating to habitat protection, restoration and enhancement and to aquaculture and related activities be planned in future. The Council decided to change the structure of its 2014 Annual Meeting, on a trial basis, in order to improve the opportunities for exchange of information during the meeting.</p> |
| NS4 | <p>NASCO's Habitat Plan of Action is vague and most habitat issues are a matter for the jurisdictions. The 2010 habitat guidelines may assist jurisdictions in making further progress in implementing NASCO's agreements and with future reporting.</p> | <p><i>The IP template, CNL(12)42, seeks information on the main threats and management challenges relating to habitat protection and restoration, and the actions to address each threat, including actions on the specific issues identified in the first reporting cycle. These issues were collated by the Secretariat and sent to jurisdictions with the request to develop new IPs. There will be a need to monitor progress and evaluate outcomes.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: The IPs were reviewed prior to the 2013 Annual Meeting. No clear omissions or inadequacies were identified in any of the IPs in relation to habitat protection and restoration. The APRs submitted in 2014 include updates on progress on each of the actions in the IPs, and have been evaluated by the Review Group. There will be a Special Session at the 2014 Annual Meeting to discuss the Group's findings and for the Parties/jurisdictions to respond to the Group's questions.</p> |
| NS5 | <p>The 2009 BMP Guidance on sea lice and containment may assist jurisdictions in making further progress in implementing NASCO's agreements and with future reporting but there might also be improved guidance on other aspects of reporting e.g. in relation to transgenic salmon. Key issue 7 ('Consider the consequences of aquaculture of Atlantic salmon in countries that are not parties to NASCO') may not be required if the Strategic Approach is revised in future.</p> | <p><i>The IP template, CNL(12)42, seeks information on the main threats and management challenges relating to aquaculture and related activities, and the actions to address each threat, including actions on the specific issues identified in the first reporting cycle. These issues were collated by the Secretariat and sent to jurisdictions with the request to develop new IPs. The IP template seeks specific information on the policy/strategy in the case of transgenic salmon. There will be a need to monitor progress and evaluate outcomes. The EPR considered that the Strategic Approach had provided a comprehensive framework for the work of NASCO and it will be used in the next cycle of reporting.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: The IPs were reviewed prior to the 2013 Annual Meeting. The Review Group has reported that five IPs contained clear omissions or inadequacies in the responses to either or both questions 4.2 and 4.3 concerning demonstration of progress towards the international goals for sea lice and containment. The APRs submitted in 2014 include updates on progress on each of the actions in the IPs, and have been evaluated by the Review Group. Questions have been asked to those Parties/jurisdictions as to how progress towards the international goals will be monitored. There will be a Special Session at the 2014 Annual Meeting to discuss the Group's findings and for the Parties/jurisdictions to respond to the Group's questions.</p> |

| | | |
|---------------------------------|--|---|
| NS6 | <p>Given the risks posed by the spread of <i>G. salaris</i>, further exchange of information among the jurisdictions is important and future reporting under Implementation Plans may be the most appropriate way to facilitate this exchange. It was recognised that <i>G. salaris</i> is a specific issue that was highlighted in the Strategic Approach, but in the event that the Strategic Approach is revised in the future, the goal and key issue relating to <i>G. salaris</i> could be incorporated in Challenge 5 (Aquaculture, introductions and transfers and transgenics).</p> | <p><i>The IP template, CNL(12)42, seeks information on measures in place to prevent the spread of G. salaris. The EPR considered that the Strategic Approach had provided a comprehensive framework for the work of NASCO and it will be used in the next cycle of reporting.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: The IPs were reviewed prior to the 2013 Annual Meeting. The Review Group has reported that three IPs contained clear omissions or inadequacies in the responses to question 4.6 in that no information had been provided on the measures in place to prevent the introduction of <i>G. salaris</i>. The APRs submitted in 2014 include updates on progress on each of the actions in the IPs, and have been evaluated by the Review Group. Questions have been asked to those Parties/jurisdictions on the measures in place to prevent the introduction of <i>G. salaris</i>. There will be a Special Session at the 2014 Annual Meeting to discuss the Group’s findings and for the Parties/jurisdictions to respond to the Group’s questions.</p> |
| Reporting and evaluation | | |
| NS8 | <p>The second round of reporting under Implementation Plans should be streamlined so as to reduce the reporting burden, avoid duplication and focus the reports and reviews on information and analysis to further NASCO’s objectives of conserving, restoring, enhancing and rationally managing salmon stocks in the North Atlantic. It would assist the streamlining of future reporting if templates were developed to facilitate the development of consistent plans and reports and the possibility of electronic reporting should be considered</p> | <p><i>Templates for both IPs (CNL(12)42) and APRs (CNL(12)43) have been developed. The IP template has been made available electronically for completion.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: New IPs and the first APRs developed using these templates have been submitted by the Parties/jurisdictions and evaluated. The Review Group had concluded that, overall, compared to the first cycle of reporting, the new IPs were clearer, better focused and more succinct. There will be a Special Session at the 2014 Annual Meeting to present the Group’s findings. The Review Group has proposed some revisions to the APR template to clarify the information that is being sought in future reporting.</p> |
| NS9 | <p>The second round of reporting under Implementation Plans should place</p> | <p><i>The IP template, CNL(12)42, seeks details of the actions to be taken, the timescales for these actions, the expected outcomes and the approach to monitoring and enforcement so that progress can be evaluated. An initial assessment</i></p> |

| | | |
|------|--|--|
| | greater emphasis on monitoring and evaluation of activities and describe clearly identifiable measurable outcomes and timescales. | <p><i>will be undertaken to ensure such information is presented and where there are gaps the IPs will be returned to the jurisdiction for further drafting. They will then be evaluated by a Review Group. There will be a need to monitor progress and evaluate outcomes.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: Following discussion of the evaluation of the new IPs at the 2013 Annual Meeting, Parties/jurisdictions were given a further opportunity to clarify any unclear/incomplete answers or information in their Plans. Most Parties took advantage of this opportunity. The first APRs under these IPs were submitted in 2014 and have been evaluated by a Review Group. These APRs will be used to monitor progress and evaluate outcomes in an on-going process. The Review Group has developed a table showing the status of each action (not started, ongoing or completed) for each jurisdiction and this will be updated annually.</p> |
| NS10 | In developing updated Implementation Plans it is envisaged that jurisdictions will use their existing plans as a starting point and involvement of NGOs and other stakeholders is encouraged. | <p><i>The IP Guidelines, CNL(12)44, state that IPs should draw on information contained in the first IPs and be prepared in consultation with other NGOs and other relevant stakeholders and industries. There will be a need to monitor progress and evaluate outcomes.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: The new IPs were submitted and evaluated in 2013. Two representatives of the NGOs served on the Review Group together with four representatives from the Parties.</p> |
| NS11 | The findings from the first round of reviews should be taken into account in developing updated Implementation Plans. | <p><i>The IP template, CNL(12)42, requests that jurisdictions take into account the specific issues on which action was recommended in the first cycle of reporting. These issues were collated by the Secretariat and sent to jurisdictions with the request to develop new IPs. There will be a need to monitor progress and evaluate outcomes.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: In undertaking the evaluation of the 2013 – 2018 IPs the Review Group drew on information arising from the first reporting cycle, including the FAR assessments.</p> |
| NS12 | Updated Implementation Plans should be subjected to a critical review since these plans will set the stage for activities and reporting for a five year period. The Group recommends that any plan that is not sufficiently specific should be returned to the jurisdiction for further drafting | <p><i>The IP Guidelines, CNL(12)44, state that there will be an initial assessment of IPs and where IPs do not provide answers to all questions, list threats and provide actions to address threats they will be returned for further drafting. Similarly, after a full evaluation, IPs that are unsatisfactory will be returned for further drafting. There will be a need to monitor progress and evaluate outcomes.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: Following discussion of the findings of the evaluation of the new IPs at the 2013 Annual Meeting, CNL(13)12, Parties/jurisdictions were given a further opportunity to clarify any unclear/incomplete answers or information in their Plans. Most Parties took advantage of this opportunity even when their IP was considered to be satisfactory. Details of the seven IPs that are still considered to contain clear omissions or inadequacies are given in the Review Group's report, CNL(14)11.</p> |
| NS13 | Each year the jurisdictions should provide a report identifying the status of actions within their plan as well as available data on monitoring the effectiveness of those actions. A review of the Annual Reports should | <p><i>A template for APRs, CNL(12)43, has been developed that seeks a progress report on each action, the results of monitoring and enforcement and whether the objective has been achieved. These APRs will be reviewed in order to ensure that jurisdictions have provided a clear account of progress in implementing and evaluating the actions in their IPs (see CNL(12)44). There will be a need to monitor progress and evaluate outcomes.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: The APRs have been reviewed by the Review Group, and where the Group felt that information was lacking, questions have been sent to the Party/jurisdiction concerned. Each Party/jurisdiction will have the</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | be conducted to assess if the commitments in the plan have been fulfilled and whether progress has been made towards achievement of the stated objectives. | opportunity to respond to these questions at a Special Session to be held during the 2014 Annual Meeting. The Review Group has developed a table showing the status of each action (not started, ongoing or completed) for each jurisdiction and this will be updated annually. |
| NS14 | There should be a new cycle of Focus Area Reports but developed around specific themes e.g. during the year when habitat protection and restoration is considered the theme might be an exchange of information on fish passage issues. Reports may be solicited from jurisdictions and could be presented during the Special Session | <p><i>The Council has agreed that FARs will be replaced by Theme-based Special Sessions and procedures have been agreed for planning and organising these sessions. Priority themes have been agreed (See CNL(12)12). The first theme-based Special Session will be on mixed-stock fisheries.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: In addition to the development of APRs detailing the progress made on each action in the IP, the Council has agreed to hold a full day Theme-based Special Session at the 2014 Annual Meeting on the management of single and mixed stock fisheries, with particular focus on fisheries on stocks below their conservation limits. A Steering Committee, comprising three representatives from the Parties and one representative from NASCO's accredited NGOs, has developed the Programme for the session including an invited speaker and solicited presentations from the Parties/jurisdictions, CNL(14)13. A report of the session will be prepared by the Steering Committee after the Annual Meeting. The session is intended to allow for a thorough exchange of information.</p> |
| Additional areas to be addressed in meeting NASCO's challenges | | |
| NS15 | Climate change poses real challenges for salmon management that may require management approaches to be more flexible and adaptive to changes that may be difficult to predict. The Council might, in the first instance, consider holding a Special Session on this topic in the future to allow for information exchange | <p><i>The Council has agreed that theme-based Special Sessions could be helpful to NASCO and procedures for planning and organising these Special Sessions agreed (see CNL(12)12 for details). A number of priority topics have been identified including management of mixed-stock fisheries (MSFs), managing salmon under a changing climate and fish passage at hydro-electric facilities. It has been agreed that there will be a Special Session on socio-economics at the 2014 Annual Meeting and a focus on MSFs in NEAC in 2013. Information on climate change impacts on salmon was presented at the 'Salmon Summit' and should be taken into account in developing future research needs. ICES has been requested to report on any significant advances in understanding of the biology of Atlantic salmon that is pertinent to NASCO, including information on the potential implications of climate change for salmon management.</i></p> <p>2014 Update: Presentations at the 2014 Theme-based Special Session should include details on how socio-economic issues are included in management decisions. The Council will need to agree on a topic for the next Theme-based Special Session to be held in 2015 or 2016. The ICES advice developed in response to the request made in 2013 is contained in document CNL(14)8.</p> |
| NS16 | The President and Secretary should engage in discussions with the former Head of Delegation for Iceland to keep him informed of the work of NASCO | <p><i>A letter was sent to the Icelandic Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 15 May 2012 inviting Iceland to re-accede to the Convention. Efforts will continue to be made to keep Iceland informed of NASCO's work (see EPR 73).</i></p> <p>2014 Update: Mr Arni Isaksson, former Head of delegation to NASCO, has now retired. The Secretary has met his replacement and has briefed him on NASCO matters and provided relevant documentation on the work of NASCO.</p> |

**Section 2: Recommendations of the External Performance Review Panel (EPR) and ‘Next Steps’ Review Group (NS)
that require further action for their implementation**

2.1 IUU Fishing by non-NASCO Parties (This refers to recommendations contained within EPR6 – 8, EPR63, EPR 64 and EP72)

Decision: *A problem of fishing for salmon by vessels registered to non-NASCO Parties occurred in the North-East Atlantic in the late 1980s and early 1990s. NASCO took diplomatic action to address the problem and there have been no sightings of vessels registered to non-NASCO Parties fishing for salmon in international waters in the North-East Atlantic since the early 1990s. However, it is recognised that airborne surveillance of this area is limited, particularly during winter months. The Secretariat should continue to liaise with the Parties and the coastguard authorities. It should also seek cooperation from NEAFC and NAFO to use their MCS to identify any activity by vessels in their areas of competence that may be fishing for salmon in international waters and to compile information in accordance with the Council’s Resolution on Fishing for Salmon on the High Seas, CNL(92)54. The Parties should coordinate with their delegations to NAFO and NEAFC, as appropriate, on this issue. In the event that there is evidence of such activity, it will be drawn to the Council’s attention so that appropriate measures can be considered.*

2014 Update: The Secretariat has continued to liaise with the coastguard authorities in Norway and Iceland concerning information from airborne surveillance flights. During July, August and September 2013, the Norwegian coastguard carried out eight surveillance flights over the area of international waters north of the Faroe Islands in the Northern Norwegian Sea. No fishing for salmon was observed in 2013 as has been the case since the early 1990s. No information has been provided by the Icelandic coastguard, but in 2012/13 it did not undertake any flights over this area of international waters. In the 1990s when fishing by non-NASCO Parties was known to have occurred, information was also obtained from ports and from fishery protection vessel patrols but no such information has been received since then.

The Secretariat has contacted NAFO and NEAFC to seek cooperation in using their MCS to identify any activity by vessels that may be fishing for salmon in international waters. The NAFO Secretariat has advised that NAFO is willing to assist NASCO with regard to fishing for salmon in international waters and indicated that most of the surveillance in the NAFO Regulatory Area is conducted by Canada. The NAFO Secretariat will advise whether the Parties or NAFO will respond. There will be an opportunity to discuss this further with the NAFO and NEAFC Secretariats at the 2014 Regional Secretariats Network (RSN) meeting.

2.2 IUU Fishing – NASCO Parties (This refers to recommendations contained within EPR60 and EPR62)

Decision: *In response to requests from NASCO, ICES has advised that over recent years efforts have been made to reduce the level of unreported catch in a number of countries through improved reporting procedures, carcass tagging and logbook schemes. Consistent with the 1993 Minimum Standard for Catch Statistics, CNL(93)51, jurisdictions should continue to take measures to reduce the level of unreported catches. The IP template, CNL(12)42, seeks information on the current level of unreported catch and the measures being taken to reduce this. The APR template, CNL(12)43, seeks details of the estimated unreported catch from in-river, estuarine and coastal fisheries. There will be a need to monitor progress and evaluate outcomes. A Special Session was held on this topic in 2007 to review approaches to estimating and minimise such catches. The need for the development of guidelines on approaches to minimising unreported catches and for a Special Session on this topic could be considered in the light of the information provided in the next reporting cycle. ICES has reviewed the methods used to calculate unreported catches and has provided suggestions for how estimates of unreported catch should be included in regional, national and international assessments. Best practice guidelines have not, however, been developed by the Council and in the first instance, the Secretariat should review FAO’s IUU IPOA with regard to any guidance the IPOA may include on best practice in minimising unreported catches and report back to the Council.*

2014 Update: All Parties/jurisdictions are requested to report annually to NASCO on the level of unreported catch (and information is also provided to ICES). NASCO’s

2012 External Performance Review had concluded that timely reporting on estimates of unreported catches and measures taken to reduce such catches is essential. Last year, in its report to the Council (CNL(13)12), the Implementation Plan Review Group had indicated that most, but not all Parties/jurisdictions had provided an estimate of the level of unreported catch in their Implementation Plan. Most Parties/jurisdictions also described a range of measures being taken to reduce unreported catches and these include:

- carcass tagging;
- logbooks;
- ban on the sale of rod caught salmon;
- measures to increase awareness among fishermen of the need to report catches (including issuing reminders, campaigns in the media and deposits on catch reports);
- targeted enforcement activity to reduce illegal fishing;
- a requirement to report any bycatch in fisheries for other species and use of observers on vessels to document any bycatch of salmon.

For 2013, the estimated unreported catch was 295t down from 398t in 2012 (no estimate was available for the Russian Federation and not all EU Member States provided an estimate) (see CNL914)12). An estimate of unreported catch for 2013 is also included in the ICES ACOM report of 306t down from 404t in 2012. ICES has again noted that over recent years efforts have been made to reduce the level of unreported catch in a number of countries (e.g. through improved reporting procedures and the introduction of carcass tagging and logbook schemes). Nonetheless, the estimate of unreported catch in 2013 equates to approximately 20% of the reported catch and not all Parties/jurisdictions have provided an estimate.

NASCO's Guidelines for the Management of Salmon Fisheries, CNL(09)43), provide some general guidance in relation to unreported catches including that estimates of the level of unreported catches and other mortalities associated with the fishery should be collected for all salmon fisheries; information should be sought on the by-catch of salmon in fisheries for other species and efforts made to identify their river of origin; and managers should be able to enforce the measures that are in place to regulate fishing activity and to minimise the level of unreported catches.

The International Plan of Action (IPOA) to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) Fishing is a voluntary instrument that was approved by the FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI) in 2001. It was developed because COFI was concerned about an apparent increase in IUU fishing including fishing vessels flying 'flags of convenience'. It contains an Introduction and sections on the Nature and Scope of IUU Fishing and the IPOA; Objectives and Principles; Implementation of Measures to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate IUU Fishing (sub-divided into All State Responsibilities, Flag State Responsibilities, Coastal State Measures, Port State Measures, Internationally Agreed Market-Related Measures, Research, and Regional Fisheries Management Organizations); Special Requirements of Developing Countries; Reporting; and the Role of FAO. The objective of the IPOA is to prevent, deter and eliminate IUU fishing by providing all States with comprehensive and transparent measures by which to act, including through appropriate regional fisheries management organizations. There are certainly elements in the IPOA that could be supportive of NASCO's initiatives with regard to IUU fishing but many of these relate to IUU fishing by non-NASCO Parties (see 2.1 above) and there have been no sightings of such activity since the early 1990s. The IPOA could, however, be helpful if such activity occurs in future. For example, the IUU IPOA indicates that: States should discourage their nationals from flagging fishing vessels under the jurisdiction of a State that does not meet its flag State responsibilities; States should ratify, accept or accede to *inter alia* the 1995 UN Fish Stocks Agreement and the 1993 FAO Compliance Agreement; States should avoid flagging vessels with a history on non-compliance and should deter vessels from reflagging for the purpose of non-compliance with conservation and management measures; States should require vessels seeking permission to enter their ports to provide reasonable advanced notice of their entry, a copy of their authorisation to fish and information including quantities of fish onboard; and where a port State has clear evidence that a vessel that has been granted access to its ports has engaged in IUU fishing, landings or transshipment should not be allowed and it should report the matter to the flag State of the vessel.

There are also some elements that appear consistent with NASCO's initiatives to reduce IUU fishing for salmon by NASCO Parties such as recommendations that States should undertake comprehensive and effective monitoring, control and surveillance of fishing and that they should ensure compliance with and enforcement of policies and measures related to IUU fishing adopted by relevant regional fisheries management organizations. However, the IPOA does not contain best practice guidance on minimising unreported catches in salmon fisheries and appropriate measures may differ among Parties. It may, therefore, be more appropriate to share experience of measures to minimise unreported catches through the IPs/APRs (including holding a further Special Session on this topic which might result in development of guidance).

2.3 Ecosystem Approach (This refers to the recommendation contained within EPR9)

Decision: *ICES has advised that the current salmon fisheries in both the NEAC and NAC areas probably have no or only minor influence on the marine ecosystem. Furthermore, the Plan of Action for Habitat Protection and Restoration requires that each jurisdiction should prepare a comprehensive salmon habitat protection and restoration plan in order to identify risks to productive capacity. Progress in this regard is being assessed through IPs and APRs. Given that the issue of EAF is broad, the Secretariat should review these Technical Guidelines and report to the Council on any implications for NASCO.*

2014 Update: The External Performance Review Panel had recognised that an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF) is being operationalized by NASCO as it has addressed challenges related to management of salmon fisheries, habitat protection and restoration and aquaculture and related activities. The panel had noted that some other RFMOs are developing EAF management plans and it suggested that NASCO might consider whether such plans are needed. The FAO Technical Guidelines on the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries indicate that the information to be provided in an EAF management plan includes: the area of operation of the fishery; the various stakeholders; the gear and vessel types; the history, management and socio-economic importance of the fishery; monitoring data; the distribution area of the most important commercial species in the catch; relevant information on life-history; and any management procedures already in place with descriptions and a performance evaluation. In addition, the potential direct and indirect effects of the fishery on species and habitats should also be described including the critical habitats that may be affected, the species composition of both retained and non-retained by-catch, the likely amounts of discards, the potential amount of litter produced, the impact of fishing on life-history traits, and the major biological interactions in which the harvested species participate and the potential effects of fisheries on these interactions.

NASCO Parties/jurisdictions have all developed, or are developing, Implementation Plans that describe:

- the current status of stocks relative to the reference points and a description of how threatened and endangered stocks are identified;
- the objectives for the management of the fisheries for wild salmon;
- the decision-making process for fisheries management, including predetermined decisions taken under different stock conditions;
- the number of fisheries that are permitted to operate on salmon stocks that are below their reference point and how these are managed to promote stock rebuilding?
- how socio-economic factors are taken into account in making decisions on fisheries management;
- the current level of unreported catch and the measures being taken to reduce this;
- the main threats to wild salmon and challenges for management in relation to fisheries;
- the actions planned to address each of the above threats and challenges.

Additionally, ICES has again advised (CNL(14)8) that the current salmon fisheries probably have no or only minor influence on the marine ecosystem.

It would appear, therefore, that although not termed EAF management plans, NASCO Parties/jurisdictions have provided much of the information that would be included in such plans. The Secretariat will liaise with FAO and other RFMOs on this issue.

2.4 Rivers database (This refers to recommendations contained within EPR40 and NS7)

Decision: *All jurisdictions have contributed to the database and the information is available on the NASCO website. This information has already been used in research projects and is a valuable PR tool. The Council will convene a Working Group, to work by correspondence or at the Annual Meeting, to develop recommendations for revisions to the stock categories that are used in the database that better reflect status of stocks relative to attainment of conservation limits. The Parties would then be*

requested to update the stock category information held in the database and provide information on threats to those stocks. With the available information, the NASCO Secretariat should be requested to prepare an overview of the status of stocks around the North Atlantic and the threats to them using the information contained in the rivers database. The EPR considered that the Strategic Approach had provided a comprehensive framework for the work of NASCO and it will be used in the next cycle of reporting.

2014 Update: The 2013 request for scientific advice from ICES (CNL(13)10) included a request to provide a review of the stock status categories currently used by the jurisdictions of NASCO, including within their IPs, and to advise on common approaches that may be applicable throughout the NASCO area. ICES has advised that the database is an important source of information on Atlantic salmon stocks and rivers but notes that the stock categories used in the database do not reflect the use of conservation limits (CLs) and management targets (MTs) in making management decisions, the approach agreed by NASCO.

ICES reports that the NASCO categories ‘maintained’, ‘not present but potential’, and ‘restored’ are descriptive and do not appear to have a close parallel with the other species or river stock classifications generally in use. They clearly relate to special categories for stocks which have been or might be subject to special intervention, possibly including stocking. The NASCO categories ‘Threatened with loss’ and ‘Not threatened with loss’, while relating more directly to stock status, were also difficult to align directly with categories based on attainment of stock indicators because the terminology is imprecise and interpretation of these categories tends to encompass several categories in other systems. NASCO has recommended the development of CLs for all stocks. However, these have not yet been developed by some jurisdictions, where alternative stock abundance indicators may be used in management. ICES recognises that the implementation of any standardized classification scheme may also be difficult but considered that it might be possible to develop a classification more closely reflecting the generally applied categories used for describing stock status and providing management advice (i.e. CLs). A preliminary and tentative example was provided. However, it was recognised that approaches would need to be developed to enable compliance with the classification criteria to be averaged over time periods and thus avoid the need for assessment and updating of the Rivers Database on an annual basis. In addition, some degree of expert judgement would also be required for stocks that do not currently have CLs. The Council may wish to decide on the next steps with regard to the classification system used in the rivers database.

2.5 ICES Advice (This refers to recommendations contained within EPR44 – 45)

Decision: *EPR 44 relates to an issue concerning the forecasts of stock abundance and the EPR has noted that in 2011 the ICES Review Group recommended that environmental indices should be included in the model used by the ICES WGNAS. This matter should be considered by NASCO’s SSC to determine if a request should be made to ICES in relation to this issue. For EPR45, it is assumed that the ICES WGNAS will have acted on the issues and recommendations it raised in 2011.*

2014 Update: The Council might wish to refer this matter to the Committee at its 2014 Annual Meeting.

2.6 Research on Salmon at Sea (including bycatch) (This refers to recommendations contained within EPR10, EPR55-56 and NS3)

Decision: *The annual request to ICES seeks information on bycatch in new and existing fisheries. ICES has advised that the current salmon fisheries in both the NEAC and NAC areas probably have no or only minor influence on the marine ecosystem. For the WGC area ICES has indicated that there is no information on by-catch of other species in the salmon fishery that is practiced with nearshore surface gillnets. This fishery has been restricted to an internal-use fishery (~20 tonnes) since 1998 by NASCO agreements. The need for a by-catch strategy in NASCO might be considered if the ICES advice on this issue changed. If that was the case, the Secretariat could be requested to prepare a review of the International Guidelines on Bycatch/Discards. NASCO’s Guidelines for the Management of Salmon Fisheries, CNL(09)43, indicate that information should be sought on the by-catch of salmon in fisheries for other species and efforts made to identify their river of origin. Such information should be reported to NASCO. Concern was raised about bycatch of salmon in pelagic fisheries (e.g. for herring and mackerel) in the NEAC area. In the light of the new information and tools developed through the SALSEA Programme, the Council recommends that jurisdictions undertake further studies to assess by-catch in pelagic fisheries such as those recently undertaken by Russia, Iceland and the Faroe Islands. Further liaison with the pelagic RAC is also encouraged. The Secretariat might also liaise with NAFO and NEAFC regarding availability of information on by-catch of salmon obtained through their observer programmes. The Board’s role is to promote collaboration and cooperation on research into the causes of mortality of salmon at sea and the opportunities to counteract it. It has agreed to review its working methods in 2013; its TORs*

require that it maintain an inventory of research relating to mortality of salmon at sea. This includes information on long-term monitoring programmes in freshwater. It will be a matter for the Council to decide if it wishes to have a broader inventory of research relating to other aspects of NASCO's work. The Parties considered that Theme-based Special Sessions might allow for a further exchange on research priorities and needs. A Sub-Group of the SAG has met and provided recommendations to the IASRB for future research for consideration during the 2013 Annual Meeting.

2014 Update: In 2013, ICES was asked to provide recommendations on how a targeted study of pelagic bycatch in relevant areas might be carried out with an assessment of the need for such a study considering the current understanding of pelagic bycatch impacts on Atlantic salmon populations in 2014. The advice from ICES is contained in document CNL(14)8. In summary, ICES advises that the latest information highlights ongoing uncertainty on the salmon bycatch question, but new screening programmes, considered by ICES to provide the most reliable data, suggest relatively low levels of bycatch in the mackerel catches. ICES noted the markedly higher salmon bycatch rates recorded in the IESSNS surveys, but cautions that it is unclear how representative these might be of the bycatch in the commercial fishery given differences in the design and operation of the gears used. In any event, the capture rates remain low relative to the estimates of total NEAC PFA (< 2%). Given that estimates of the bycatch of salmon in the pelagic fisheries are highly uncertain, ICES considers it would be informative to increase efforts to obtain reliable estimates of the bycatch of salmon and made a number of recommendations as to how this might be achieved. These include, collating all available information on post-smolt and salmon marine distribution; collating information of possible interceptive pelagic fisheries in areas frequented by Atlantic salmon (in cooperation with scientists working on pelagic fish assessments); reviewing pelagic fisheries and investigating ways to intercalibrate survey trawls with commercial trawls; and carrying out comprehensive catch screening on commercial vessels fishing in areas with known high densities of salmon post-smolts or adults (this would require significant resources, coordination and funding). The Council may wish to consider if further action is needed.

The Secretariat has contacted NAFO and NEAFC about possible availability of information on by-catch of salmon obtained through their observer programmes. NAFO has responded indicating a willingness to assist but highlighting that the NAFO regulated species are mainly groundfish stocks. Some NAFO Parties report catches of salmon through STATLANT but NAFO indicates that it is not clear what fishery these come from and this issue will be raised at the upcoming NAFO Scientific Council meeting.

The IASRB agreed to focus on the partitioning of marine mortality of salmon and, through its Scientific Advisory Group, has established a Telemetry Sub-Group to develop and document a roadmap outlining a large scale international collaborative telemetry project to ultimately provide information on migration paths and quantitative estimates of mortality during phases of the marine life-cycle of salmon. The report of this Sub-Group will be presented to the SAG and the Board at the 2014 Annual Meeting (see document SAG(14)4). The Board's response to the Sub-Group's recommendations will be presented to the Council, CNL(14)9.

The Secretariat has been advised by Professor Ken Whelan that the Atlantic Salmon Trust (AST) attended the 2012 and 2013 General Assembly of the Pelagic Regional Advisory Council and gave presentations at each event, including details of the work of the IASRB. The Trust has recently joined the Pelagic RAC in an observer capacity and was advised that an application from the IASRB to join the Pelagic RAC would be welcomed, as the experience and expertise of the various salmon interest groups would be of benefit to the Pelagic RAC's work, possibly through involvement of scientists and managers on its Working Groups. The AST has advised that there was great interest within the Pelagic RAC in the research carried out under SALSEA and the potential development by the IASRB of an international tracking programme. The Pelagic RAC suggested that the IASRB could seek a briefing on pelagic surveys currently underway which could be of direct relevance to its work on salmon at sea. It was noted that the pelagic scientists may benefit from a technical workshop convened between salmon and pelagic scientists to update the pelagic scientists on the stock discrimination techniques developed under SALSEA. ICES has advised that if efforts are to be made to obtain reliable estimates of the bycatch of salmon (see above) there will be a need for close cooperation between WGNAS scientists and those working on pelagic fish assessments.

2.7 Public relations *(This refers to recommendations contained within EPR68 and EPR70 – 71)*

Decision: *The IPs and APRs in the second cycle of reporting will be made available on the NASCO website. NASCO has 34 accredited NGOs which now participate in most of the meetings and improvements have been made to the website. Stakeholder consultation meetings are a tool to be considered when a specific need for seeking broad input is identified. The Council has agreed that its initial priorities in Public Relations are its websites and the Salmon Rivers database. The work to enhance the website is on-going and should continue. The Council believes that NASCO should be the source of information on salmon stock status around the North Atlantic and has agreed to develop a State of the Salmon report using the updated stock categories in the rivers database (see above). The Council should keep its PR approach under review and consider if further actions are needed.*

2014 Update: Since last year, further improvements have been made to the NASCO and IASRB websites. The new IPs and first APRs have been made available on the website together with the outcome of their evaluation. NASCO has supported the production of a film entitled ‘Atlantic salmon: Lost at Sea’ and served on the Steering Committee and contributed to a Discussion Forum on the Atlantic salmon held by the Royal Society of Edinburgh in November 2013. Further details of NASCO’s activities relating to PR are contained in document CNL(14)6.

The 2013 request for scientific advice from ICES (CNL(13)10) included a request to provide a review of the stock status categories currently used by the jurisdictions of NASCO, including within their IPs, and to advise on common approaches that may be applicable throughout the NASCO area (see 2.4 above).

2.8 Future role for NASCO on aquaculture *(This refers to recommendations contained within NS17)*

Decision: *Aquaculture remains a focus area for NASCO in terms of concerns over impacts on wild Atlantic salmon. In general, NASCO has established the goal to minimise adverse impacts to wild stocks from aquaculture activities. However, it is for the Parties and jurisdictions to identify and implement appropriate measures to meet this goal. Progress will be tracked as Implementation Plans and Annual Reports are submitted. Some more specific measures are contained in the NAC Protocols, appended to the Williamsburg Resolution.*

2014 Update: At the 2013 Annual Meeting, the Council agreed that an item should be retained on the Council’s agenda entitled ‘Liaison with the Salmon Farming Industry’, during which a representative of the International Salmon Farmers’ Association (ISFA) could be invited to participate in an exchange of information on issues concerning impacts of aquaculture on wild salmon. The regular meetings of the Liaison Group would not be continued, but, if a specific need arose, consideration could be given to convening a joint *ad hoc* group. A representative of ISFA will attend the 2014 Annual Meeting.

The Review Group has reported that five IPs contained clear omissions or inadequacies in the responses to either or both questions 4.2 and 4.3 concerning demonstration of progress towards the international goals for sea lice and containment. The 2014 APRs include updates on progress on actions relating to aquaculture, introductions and transfers and transgenics and have been evaluated by the APR Review Group. Questions have been asked to those Parties/jurisdictions whose IPs contained clear omissions or inadequacies in the responses to either or both questions 4.2 and 4.3 as to how progress towards the international goals will be monitored. The Group’s report will be presented in a Special Session at the Annual Meeting, when jurisdictions will answer any questions raised by the Group in relation to the APRs. The Review Group has developed a table showing the status (not started, ongoing or completed) of each action for each jurisdiction and this will be updated annually.

2.9 Meeting schedule and structure *(This refers to recommendations contained within NS18)*

Decision: *The Parties are invited to submit proposals for changes to the structure, frequency and location of NASCO meetings to the Secretariat who will prepare a paper, based on these submissions, for consideration by the Council at its 2013 Annual Meeting. The intention is to explore options for changes to the structure, frequency and location of NASCO meetings with a view to ensuring the most effective use of the time available and expertise present. The Parties may choose to communicate with each other during the development of these papers and Canada committed to circulate its draft to the other Parties.*

2014 Update: Prior to NASCO's 2013 Annual Meeting, papers were received from Canada, Norway, the Russian Federation and the US and collated by the Secretariat (see document CNL(13)16). No suggestions were made regarding the location of NASCO meetings. The Council decided not to change the frequency (i.e. annual) of its meetings or the policy on the location of its Annual Meeting, but agreed to change its structure on a trial basis for 2014 using the papers from Norway and the US as a basis to improve the opportunities for exchange of information during the meeting. The Agendas for the 2014 Annual Meeting have been adapted in accordance with the proposals from Norway and the US and a full-day Theme-based Special Session will be held on the topic of management of single and mixed stock fisheries, with particular focus on fisheries on stocks below their conservation limits. A Programme for this session has been developed by the Steering Committee which comprised representatives of NASCO's Parties and its accredited NGOs.

Section 3: Strengthening the work of NASCO

Following a comprehensive discussion among the Parties in relation to the options for strengthening the work of NASCO (see FVN(13)12) it was agreed that in addition to the actions in sections 1 and 2, the priority area for special focus is in the area of fisheries management. The Parties renewed their commitment to the following actions:

| Recommendation | Action taken |
|---|---|
| <p>3.1 During the 2013 Council meeting, critically review the new 5-year Implementation Plans which include the following sections:</p> <p>(a) information on reference points used to assess the status of stocks;</p> <p>(b) the decision-making process for fisheries management, including predetermined decisions taken under different stock conditions (e.g. the stock level at which fisheries are closed);</p> <p>(c) identification of whether fisheries are permitted to operate on salmon stocks that are below their reference point and, if so, how many fisheries there are and what approach is taken to managing them that still promotes stock rebuilding; and</p> <p>(d) identification of any mixed-stock salmon fisheries and an explanation of how they are managed to ensure that all the contributing stocks are meeting their conservation objectives.</p> | <p>2014 Update: <i>The IPs were evaluated by a Review Group whose findings were presented at a Special Session during the 2013 Annual Meeting. The Council asked the Parties to take the opportunity to revise their IPs, including those considered by the Review Group to be satisfactory, so as to clarify any unclear/incomplete answers. Most Parties took advantage of this opportunity. Since 2013, new IPs have been received from EU – Spain (Asturias, Cantabria and Galicia).</i></p> <p><i>The Review Group had noted inter alia that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>river-specific conservation limits have been established by some Parties/jurisdictions for all or most of their rivers. Progress is being made in most other Parties/jurisdictions towards development of these conservation limits and in the meantime juvenile abundance data and/or catch statistics are being used as temporary reference points by some jurisdictions;</i> • <i>many of the responses provided information on the organizations that are involved in the decision-making process but not on how decisions are taken in response to different stock conditions;</i> • <i>that fisheries are permitted to operate on stocks that are below their reference point in several jurisdictions, but the number of fisheries involved and the management measures applying to these fisheries to promote stock rebuilding were not always clearly described;</i> • <i>most IPs clearly indicated whether or not a Party/jurisdiction had mixed-stock fisheries and how these are defined. Where Parties/jurisdictions have such fisheries, the IPs generally provided information on catches but clear descriptions of how the fisheries are managed to ensure that all the contributing stocks are meeting their conservation objectives were often lacking.</i> <p><i>During the 2014 Annual Meeting, there will be a Theme-based Special Session on the topic of management of single and mixed stock fisheries, with particular focus on fisheries on stocks below their</i></p> |

| | |
|-----|---|
| | <p><i>conservation limits. The objectives of this session are to allow for an exchange of information on:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Progress in establishing conservation limits, or alternative reference points, and the approaches being used to manage fisheries in their absence;</i> • <i>How management measures are used to ensure the protection of the weakest contributing stocks in mixed-stock fisheries;</i> • <i>How socio-economic considerations, including the interests of indigenous people, are weighed against conservation needs and, where fishing is permitted on stocks below their CLs, the approaches being used to ensure that exploitation is limited to a level that permits stock rebuilding within a stated timeframe.</i> |
| 3.2 | <p>During each annual Council meeting, critically review the annual progress reports from each Party, paying particular attention to progress against actions relating to the management of salmon fisheries.</p> <p>2014 Update: <i>A Special Session is to be held at the 2014 Annual Meeting to allow for presentation and discussion of the evaluations of the APRs under the IPs. During this Special Session, Parties will be given the opportunity to respond to any questions the APR Review Group may raise in connection with their APRs and there will be an opportunity for all delegates to raise questions.</i></p> |
| 3.3 | <p>Ensure there are agenda items in each of the Commissions to allow for a focus on mixed-stock fisheries</p> <p>2014 Update: <i>For the 2013 Annual Meeting, a new item was included on the North-East Atlantic Commission's Agenda specifically focused on management of mixed-stock fisheries. At the 2014 Annual Meeting, there is to be a one-day Theme-based Special Session on the topic of management of single and mixed stock fisheries, with particular focus on fisheries on stocks below their conservation limits. The intention is to facilitate a greater exchange of information and the objectives of the session are detailed in 3.1 above. As such, no agenda items on mixed-stock fisheries have been included on the Commission agendas for 2014 because of the Theme-based Special Session but such items will be included on the 2015 agendas for all three Commissions.</i></p> |
| 3.4 | <p>Focus the first Council new theme-based Special Session on mixed-stock fisheries.</p> <p>2014 Update: <i>See point 3.1 above</i></p> |
| | <p>In addition, the Parties agreed to explore opportunities to strengthen their commitment to implement the NASCO Guidelines on Management of Salmon Fisheries <i>inter alia</i> by the use of a Protocol or Resolution.</p> <p>2014 Update: <i>The Secretariat has not been advised of any new Protocols or Resolutions that are being developed by Parties.</i></p> |