



Agenda Item 6
For information

Council

CNL(18)12

***Report of the Meeting of the Future Reporting Working Group under
Implementation Plans and Evaluation of Reports***

CNL(18)12

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

Rydges Kensington Hotel, London, UK

5 - 6 December 2017

1. Opening of the Meeting

- 1.1 The Chair of the Working Group on Future Reporting under Implementation Plans and Evaluation of Reports (hereinafter referred to as 'the Working Group'), Mr Rory Saunders (United States), opened the meeting and welcomed participants to London. He noted that the members of the Implementation Plan / Annual Progress Reports (IP / APR) Review Group are part of the Working Group and that their collective knowledge would be of valuable input to the task at hand. Their experience provides useful insight into the issues that have arisen during the last Implementation Plan (IP) cycle, in addition to the suggestions that have been formally made by the IP / APR Review Group through its reports. He also welcomed the presence of fresh faces to bring some new perspectives into the process. He noted that the Working Group on Future Reporting's tasks are about advancing NASCO's shared goals of wild salmon conservation and not about any individual's Party's strategy or interest. He indicated that the process is intended to strengthen NASCO, and it provides the opportunity to realise NASCO's goals of openness, fairness, balance, transparency and efficiency. He noted that if the Working Group does its job well, it will strengthen trust among Parties including those with interests in prosecuting high-seas fisheries and the States of Origin.
- 1.2 The Chair invited the Working Group participants to give their perspectives on the tasks ahead of them and the importance of the Implementation Plans to salmon management. Paul Knight (NGO) noted that substantial advances in mixed-stock fisheries are apparent, although challenges still remain to be addressed in some jurisdictions. However, measuring progress towards achievement of NASCO and ISFA's goals related to aquaculture remains challenging.
- 1.3 A list of participants is contained in Annex 1.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

- 2.1 The Working Group adopted its Agenda, WGFR(17)04 (Annex 2).

3. Consideration of the Terms of Reference

- 3.1 The Working Group's Terms of Reference were adopted by the Council of NASCO at its Thirty-Fourth Annual Meeting and are as follows:
 - (a) review the Guidelines for the Preparation and Evaluation of NASCO Implementation Plans and for Reporting on Progress, CNL(12)44, and advise on any changes required to streamline and further improve reporting in the next

Implementation Plan cycle in order to ensure that reports are meaningful and that unnecessary burden is avoided;

- (b) review the templates for preparation of Implementation Plans and Annual Progress Reports, CNL(12)42 and CNL(12)43, and advise on any changes to streamline and further improve reporting in the next Implementation Plan cycle, including options for including reporting under the Six Tenets for Effective Management of an Atlantic Salmon Fishery;
 - (c) propose a schedule for the development and review of Implementation Plans and submission and review of Annual Progress Reports.
- 3.2 The Working Group considered its Terms of Reference and noted that the Council's intention was to continue with the Implementation Plan process with a third cycle of plans which would cover the period 2019-2024. The Working Group noted that the Council had requested that it streamline and further **improve** reporting in the next Implementation Plan cycle and provide options for reporting under the Six Tenets for Effective Management of an Atlantic Salmon Fishery (as described in Annex 3). The Working Group discussed these Terms of Reference and agreed that, with regard to the six tenets assessments, it would consider various options for incorporating these into Implementation Plans but that it would then make its preferred recommendation on this matter to the Council and include appropriate text in the new Implementation Plan template.
- 3.3 The Working Group noted that the purpose of developing Implementation Plans is to demonstrate, **in a clear and transparent way**, the actions that are being taken to implement NASCO agreements so as to ensure fairness and balance between the measures being taken through binding regulatory measures for the salmon fisheries conducted by the Faroe Islands and Greenland and the conservation measures being taken by other Parties / jurisdictions. The goal of achieving fairness and balance was a key element of the 'Next Steps' for NASCO process and is consistent with Article 9 of the NASCO Convention. In 2013, the Council had sought to improve the reporting process in the light of shortcomings identified in the first reporting cycle, rather than considering changes to the Convention, which was one of the recommendations of the External Performance Review Panel that evaluated the work of NASCO in 2012. While the second reporting cycle showed considerable improvements over that first cycle, the Working Group notes that the Council has highlighted the need for further improvements. The Working Group agrees and believes that there must be substantial improvements in the quality, transparency, completeness and timeliness of reporting in the third cycle.
- 3.4 The Working Group held one meeting in London on 5-6 December 2017 and then completed the work detailed in its Terms of Reference by correspondence.

4. Review of Previous Reporting and Evaluation Procedures and Consideration of the Recommendations for Changes Identified by the IP / APR Review Group

- 4.1 The Working Group noted that the current reporting process works well overall. Furthermore, solutions have been found to some of the early challenges with the Implementation Plan process. The Working Group also noted the steady increase in reporting rate by jurisdictions over the second five-year reporting cycle (2013-2018). The Working Group also noted that the advances in streamlining of reporting from the first to the second cycle of reporting was a significant and welcome change.

- 4.2 The Working Group noted a number of shortcomings in the second reporting cycle which had been highlighted by the IP / APR Review Group, including the following:
- the most common and most serious shortcoming continues to be a lack of quantitative data to demonstrate progress towards achieving NASCO goals, particularly relating to the protection of wild fish from the impacts of salmon farming – specifically lice management and containment;
 - the lack of clarity in the actions in Implementation Plans, which makes evaluation of progress difficult within Annual Progress Reports ;
 - not all Parties / jurisdictions have provided an Implementation Plan or a complete Implementation Plan, even though the second reporting cycle is almost completed;
 - some actions appeared to have little relevance to achieving NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines;
 - in some instances, there had been a lack of consultation with stakeholders and NGOs in the development of the 2013–2018 Implementation Plans;
 - there had been a failure to submit Annual Progress Reports according to the agreed deadline of 1 April by some jurisdictions, giving the IP / APR Review Group little or no time to conduct its evaluations;
 - there had been a failure to address issues identified in questions developed by the IP / APR Review Group in the first three years of the second reporting cycle;
 - there was unclear reporting through many Annual Progress Reports, some of which was too brief or, indeed, overly long but still unclear, and several were reliant on weblinks, references and other external sources of information which the IP / APR Review Group does not have time to assess; and
 - some actions have not yet commenced, even though the second reporting cycle is near completion.
- 4.3 The Working Group noted with concern that no Implementation Plan has yet been submitted by Portugal and the plan submitted by France is incomplete (it contains no actions relating to aquaculture, introductions and transfers). The Working Group also noted that while Spain (Bizkaia) had submitted a self-assessment using the Six Tenets for Effective Management of an Atlantic Salmon Fishery, it had not provided an Implementation Plan. The Atlantic salmon faces particular challenges in the southern regions of its range and it is very important that all jurisdictions participate fully in the third reporting cycle.
- 4.4 The Secretariat provided a background document, WGFR(17)03, which, among other things, summarised a number of options for possible improvements which should be considered in the third reporting cycle. These included the following:
- in the next round of Implementation Plans, it may be necessary to include specific topic areas on which Parties / jurisdictions would be expected to provide an action if they do not demonstrate that they are fully compliant with NASCO agreements and guidelines;
 - greater efforts should be made in the next round of Implementation Plans to ensure that all actions are clearly and concisely described. Implementation Plans which do not contain clear actions (i.e. SMART Actions – see 5.9 below) should not be accepted by the IP / APR Review Group and should be returned to the Party / jurisdiction for revision; and
 - there may be a need to include some standard questions in the template for the next round of Implementation Plans with a view to ensuring that such information is

provided by all Parties / jurisdictions (e.g. relating to sea lice levels and containment within marine salmon farms).

- 4.5 The Working Group discussed the challenges ahead in the third reporting cycle and highlighted the important issues that it thought should be developed, including:
- the new Implementation Plans and Annual Progress Reports have to be more measurable and a lot less vague - using a clear SMART objective approach - because if the Implementation Plans are vague then the reporting under the Annual Progress Reports will also be vague;
 - the guiding principles need to be clearer to make the process more transparent and informative;
 - reporting on mixed-stock fisheries has improved substantially through the second cycle of reporting and if the same achievement can be reached in aquaculture, highlighting the issues of sea lice and containment (see 4.6 and 4.7 below), it would be a significant achievement for NASCO;
 - the Guidelines for the Preparation and Evaluation of NASCO Implementation Plans and for Reporting on Progress (WGFR(17)06) – Annex 4, the Implementation Plan template (WGFR(17)07) - Annex 5 and the Annual Progress Reports template (WGFR(17)08) – Annex 6 - should guide Parties and jurisdictions to clear reporting;
 - links to websites make the reviewing of Annual Progress Reports difficult and should no longer be accepted.

Salmon farming

- 4.6 The Working Group noted that the IP / APR Review Group had recognised that providing quantitative data to demonstrate progress towards the international goals for sea lice and containment (questions 4.2 and 4.3 in the 2013-2018 IP template, respectively) appeared to be particularly challenging. The IP / APR Review Group had suggested that the Implementation Plans for all Parties / jurisdictions with salmon farming should present quantitative data in a transparent manner to demonstrate progress made over the period of the plan towards the international goals for sea lice and containment, rather than describing only the management measures in place. The IP / APR Review Group had recommended that where this information had not been provided, it should be reported through the Annual Progress Reports or, if that was not feasible, prior to the start of the next Implementation Plan cycle. To date, this has not been done by all jurisdictions.
- 4.7 In 2016, the Council had held a Theme-based Special Session (TBSS) entitled '*Addressing impacts of salmon farming on wild Atlantic salmon: Challenges to, and developments supporting, achievement of NASCO's international goals*'. In its report to the Council, CNL(16)60, the Steering Committee noted with great concern the confirmation by ICES of widespread introgression of farmed salmon genes into wild salmon populations in Norway, and that there could be a reduction in salmon returning to the river of up to 39% as a consequence of sea lice infestations, and that this could adversely affect achievement of protection / conservation requirements for affected wild salmon stocks. The Steering Committee concluded that there is now an urgent need for all Parties / jurisdictions to adopt stronger measures if their international responsibilities are to be met, which it believes is not currently the case. The Steering Committee had recognised that new approaches that could assist in addressing impacts are at various stages of development and implementation but there are undoubtedly substantial challenges to be addressed if the international goals for salmon farming are to be

achieved. The Working Group considers that actions designed to protect wild salmon from the impacts of escaped farmed salmon and sea lice emanating from salmon farms should form a major focus of the next cycle of Implementation Plans. To this end, Annual Progress Reports should include quantitative data to allow progress towards achieving international goals to be assessed.

5. Review of the Guidelines for the Preparation and Evaluation of NASCO Implementation Plans and Reporting on Progress, CNL(12)44, including recommendations to streamline and improve reporting

(a) Preparation of IPs including content and format and schedule for submission

5.1 While welcoming the improvements evident in the second reporting cycle, including more jurisdictions reporting in a timely fashion with clear actions and measurable outcomes, the Working Group agreed that clear shortcomings are still evident in reporting almost 15 years after the Implementation Plan process commenced. The IP / APR Review Group stated that the success of the third reporting cycle would only be achieved if there was genuine commitment from the jurisdictions to adopting policies that progressed towards achieving NASCO's goals, and specifically the protection and conservation of wild salmon.

5.2 The Chair asked the Working Group to consider what was missing from the current process as this offers the opportunity to refine the content of Implementation Plans in the third cycle of reporting. The Working Group discussed three areas that require particular consideration: (i) the potential inclusion of the six tenets for all of NASCO's Parties and jurisdictions; (ii) standard questions on attainment of NASCO and ISFA's goals for aquaculture (i.e. goals for sea lice and containment); and (iii) assessment of the current status of stocks under the new classification system outlined in CNL(16)11.

5.3 The Working Group noted that at its 2017 Annual Meeting, the Council had agreed that, rather than developing questions for response by the Parties/jurisdictions, in future it should provide details of its evaluation of progress on each action in a table at the end of its review, highlighting shortcomings and that the Parties / jurisdictions would be asked to address these shortcomings in their Annual Progress Reports for the following year. The Working Group considered that this would streamline future reporting on progress and clearly summarise the evaluations developed by the IP / APR Review Group.

5.4 The Working Group held extensive discussions on options for including the Six Tenets for Effective Management of an Atlantic Salmon Fishery into the next cycle of Implementation Plans. It noted that the Parties and jurisdictions in the West Greenland Commission have already applied the six tenets and two very different approaches had been used for the assessment of the Greenland fishery (detailed review by a Commission Working Group with subsequent development of a detailed plan to improve monitoring and control of the fishery) and those of the other Parties / jurisdictions (self-assessment). The Working Group saw little merit in requiring that this exercise be repeated again by those Parties / jurisdictions that have already completed an assessment, as recently as 2016, but that the focus in the next cycle should be on measures to address shortcomings in monitoring and control identified as a result of the assessment. The Working Group also felt that those Parties / jurisdictions that have not yet applied the six tenets should be requested to do so and advise when this will be done. Accordingly, a new question has

been included in section 2 of the Implementation Plan template (which relates to the management of salmon fisheries).

- 5.5 The Working Group noted that the ‘*Guidelines for the Preparation and Evaluation of NASCO Implementation Plans and for Reporting on Progress*’, CNL(12)44, which applied to the second reporting cycle, proposed that Implementation Plans should be assessed as:
1. Satisfactory answers / information;
 2. Unclear or incomplete answers / information; or
 3. Clear omissions or inadequacies in answers / information.

These Guidelines indicate that Implementation Plans that were in categories 2 and 3 were to be returned for modifications. However, some Implementation Plans still contained unclear or incomplete answers / information after revision and this lack of clarity subsequently affected the IP / APR Review Group’s ability to evaluate the progress made. For the third reporting cycle, the Working Group recommends that Implementation Plans be assessed as either satisfactory or unsatisfactory and that no Implementation Plan should be accepted unless it is satisfactory following evaluation by the IP / APR Review Group and the website should indicate which Implementation Plans are considered to be satisfactory.

- 5.6 The Working Group also had an extensive discussion around the lack of clear progress towards achieving NASCO’s goals for aquaculture highlighted in the IP / APR Review Group reports and discussed ways that reporting must be improved to show clear progress and transparency of management actions aimed at protecting wild fish. The Working Group noted that while it is for the Parties and jurisdictions to decide what actions to include in their respective Implementation Plans, the IP / APR Review Group had recommended some standard questions that should apply for all jurisdictions with fish farming. The Working Group discussed the Guidance on Best Management Practices to address impacts of sea lice and escaped farmed salmon on wild salmon stocks (SLG(09)5) that had previously been agreed by NASCO and the International Salmon Farmers’ Association. It contains clear points of action to be addressed that should be considered benchmarks for future reporting and used to inform actions in the new Implementation Plans. For example, actions to demonstrate progress toward NASCO and ISFA’s goals for sea lice should include:

- by 2024, ensure that risk-based, integrated pest management (IPM) programmes have been sufficient for jurisdictions to meet the NASCO goal of no increase in sea lice loads or lice-induced mortality of wild salmonids attributable to the farms. This is to protect the most vulnerable life-history stage of wild salmonids;
 - in this example, progress should be demonstrated by providing data each year to show progress towards the NASCO goal that specified annual lice load targets are being met by 2024;
- by 2024, ensure that 100% of all salmon farms implement single-year class stocking;
 - in this example progress should be demonstrated by specifying the proportion of farms implementing single-year class stocking each year leading up to 100% implementation by 2024.

Similarly, actions to demonstrate progress toward NASCO and ISFA’s goals for containment should include:

- verify compliance with a Code of Containment for all fish farms that will achieve NASCO and ISFA’s goal of 100% containment by 2024.

The Working Group agreed that actions in future Implementation Plans should be clearly and explicitly linked to the actions in the NASCO’s Guidance on Best Management Practices to address impacts of sea lice and escaped farmed salmon on wild salmon stocks (SLG(09)5) because they can provide specific and measurable actions for jurisdictions in terms of demonstrating progress toward attainment of NASCO and ISFA’s goals for sea lice and containment. **The Working Group considered this the greatest challenge to the success of the third round of reporting.**

5.7 The third element that the Working Group discussed was the assessment of the current status of stocks under the new classification system outlined in CNL(16)11. The Chair noted that the intention was to incorporate the new stock classification into the new Implementation Plans and that all the Parties and jurisdictions should update their entries in the NASCO Rivers Database using this new classification scheme by December 31, 2017.

(b) Evaluation of IPs, including composition of Review Group, criteria to be used for reviews, criteria for acceptability, schedule for the review, and arrangements for reporting on the review

5.8 The Working Group emphasised that articulating clearly the criteria upon which Implementation Plans and Annual Progress Reports would be evaluated are key to the success of the new reporting cycle.

5.9 The Working Group considered the criteria for acceptability of Implementation Plans in NASCO’s third cycle of reporting at length. Based on the IP / APR Review Group’s assessment of challenges in assessing progress (summarised in WGFR(17)03), the Working Group agreed that actions for each of the theme areas (fisheries, habitat, and aquaculture) must be “SMART,” that is:

- S – Specific – actions should be ambitious, clear and concise and planned to address the threats / challenges identified in the Implementation Plan in a timely fashion in order to improve implementation of NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines;
- M – Measurable – for each action there should be an expected outcome and a monitoring programme that will allow progress to be measured and reported through the Annual Progress Reports for evaluation by the IP / APR Review Group;
- A – Ambitious yet Achievable – actions and associated monitoring programmes should be ambitious in scope, given the current status of wild Atlantic salmon around the North Atlantic, and the Council’s recognition of the need to improve commitment to NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. It should be clearly stated that funding is in place, or is expected to be in place, to allow implementation of proposed actions / monitoring programmes during the five-year period covered by the Implementation Plan;
- R – Relevant - actions should address the threats / challenges identified in the Implementation Plan in a timely fashion, taking into account the provisions in NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines;

- T – Timely – in general, all actions in the Implementation Plan should achieve their expected outcome within the five-year period covered by the Implementation Plan. Where appropriate, actions may cover a period of less or more than the five-year period of the Implementation Plan. Where appropriate, milestones that are expected to be achievable within the five-year period covered by the Implementation Plan could be specified.

Furthermore, these SMART actions must relate clearly to the main threats and / or challenges identified in the Implementation Plans, which will facilitate the objective assessment of each jurisdiction’s progress towards achieving NASCO’s goals. The Working Group noted that the role of the IP / APR Review Group would be critical in this process as they must determine if actions can be measured over time. In summary, the IP / APR Review Group agreed:

- for jurisdictions that prosecute mixed-stock fisheries, there should be at least one action related to the management of that fishery;
- for jurisdictions with salmon farms, there should be at least one action related to NASCO and ISFA’s goal for sea lice and one action related to NASCO and ISFA’s goal for containment. Quantitative data should be presented in a transparent manner to demonstrate progress made over the period of the plan towards these goals, rather than continuing to describe only the management measures in place, as was often the case during the second reporting cycle;
- Implementation Plans should include actions contained within the first and second Implementation Plans where they are still relevant in addressing a threat or challenge identified in the third Implementation Plan – but with clear timelines towards achievement of targets;
- if an action is not “SMART” then it is impossible to assess progress objectively. In instances where jurisdictions propose actions that are not “SMART”, the IP / APR Review Group should return the Implementation Plan to the jurisdiction for modification with clear guidance on the way that the Implementation Plan should be improved;
- if an Implementation Plan is returned to the jurisdiction for modification, it does not mean that the whole Implementation Plan is rejected. However, the Working Group considers that theme areas should be addressed together, such that if any action is not “SMART”, then that action would require revision before an Annual Progress Report for that specific section is developed. This approach should ensure that reporting is more specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and timely;
- additionally, if the Working Group determines that there is a clear omission of explanatory information, the Implementation Plan will be returned for revision.

5.10 The Working Group discussed the schedule for the third cycle of reporting and proposes the following schedule for Implementation Plan development:

| Date / deadline | Responsibility | Action required |
|------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| 30 June 2018 | Secretary | Requests submission of Implementation Plans |
| 1 February 2019 | Parties / jurisdictions | <u>Deadline</u> for submission of Implementation Plans to Secretary |
| 7 February 2019 | Secretary | Distribute Implementation Plans to IP / APR Review Group |
| 26 - 28 February 2019 | IP / APR Review Group | Meets and develops its evaluation of the Implementation Plans |

| | | |
|---|-------------------------|---|
| 15 March 2019 | Secretary | Return Implementation Plans requiring modification to jurisdictions with clear guidance on the IP / APR Review Group's recommendations for improvements |
| 1 May 2019 | Parties / jurisdictions | <u>Deadline</u> for submission of final Implementation Plans |
| May 2019 | IP / APR Review Group | Review revised Implementation Plans by correspondence |
| 27 May 2019 | Secretary | Email IP / APR Review Group's assessments to NASCO Heads of Delegation |
| June 2019 | IP / APR Review Group | Present report to the Council in Special Session |
| Summer 2019 | Secretary | Upload accepted Implementation Plans to NASCO website |
| 1 November 2019 / 2020 / 2021 / 2022 / 2023 | Parties / jurisdictions | <u>Deadline</u> for submission of revised Implementation Plans to NASCO |

5.11 The Chair will report to Council in June 2018.

(c) Preparation of APRs including content and format and schedule for submission

5.12 The Working Group noted that the content and format of the Annual Progress Reports should mirror closely that of the Implementation Plans. The main purposes of the Annual Progress Reports remain: the provision of details on any changes to the management regime for protecting wild salmon and consequent changes to the Implementation Plan; reporting on actions that have been taken under the Implementation Plan in a previous year; significant change to the status of stocks, and a report on catches; and actions taken in accordance with the provisions of the Convention.

5.13 The Working Group reviewed the current format of the Annual Progress Report template and suggested revisions in document WGFR(17)08.

5.14 The Working Group discussed the potential timing of Annual Progress Report submission and evaluation and proposed the schedule for submission as follows:

| Date | Responsibility | Action required |
|----------------|-------------------------|---|
| 5 January | Secretariat | Send the template for Annual Progress Reports to each Party / jurisdiction |
| 1 March | Secretariat | Send reminders for completion of Annual Progress Reports |
| 1 April | Parties / jurisdictions | Deadline for submission of Annual Progress Reports to Secretariat |
| | Secretariat | Annual Progress Reports made available on the website |
| 1 May | IP / APR Review Group | Completion of review |
| Annual Meeting | Parties / jurisdictions | Respond to shortcomings identified by the IP / APR Review Group at the Annual Meeting of the Council and address these shortcomings in the APR for the following year |

(d) Evaluation of APRs including composition of Review Group, criteria to be used for reviews, criteria for acceptability, schedule for the review, and arrangements for reporting on the review

5.15 The Working Group discussed the composition of the IP / APR Review Group. The Working Group agreed that the current structure works well and proposes that the IP / APR Review Group should comprise:

- one representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland);
- three representatives of the other Parties (preferably one from North America and two from Europe);
- two representatives of the NGOs (preferably one from Europe and one from North America); and
- one scientific representative from the Standing Scientific Committee.

The Chair noted that currently only two representatives of other Parties are counted as IP / APR Review Group members and, given the likely increase in workload with more Implementation Plans than in the past, a third representative from the other Parties should be added.

6. Review of, and recommendations for changes to, the templates for the preparation of IPs, CNL(12)42, and APRs, CNL(12)43, including options for including reporting under the Six Tenets for Effective Management of an Atlantic Salmon Fishery

6.1 The Working Group developed and agreed (by correspondence) templates for the preparation of Implementation Plans and Annual Progress Reports. As described in section 5.4, the Working Group reviewed the contents of the six tenets against the Fisheries Management section of the current Implementation Plan template and noted that whilst tenet 2 seemed to be adequately represented in the current Implementation Plan template, tenets 1 and 3-6 were missing. The Working Group noted that if the Council wishes to incorporate all aspects of the six tenets assessment into the next round of Implementation Plan reporting then new sections addressing those issues would need to be included. Should the Council wish to pursue that option, the Working Group developed an Implementation Plan template that more fully develops an option for reporting under the six tenets process.

7. Any Other Business

7.1 The Working Group noted that consideration of Special Sessions was a Term of Reference in the last Working Group on Future Reporting. The Working Group recommends that Special Sessions should continue to be held to allow the evaluations of both the third cycle of Implementation Plans and Annual Progress Reports to be presented and considered by the Council. In recent years, theme-based special sessions have allowed for more detailed exchange on a particular topic within each of NASCO's focus areas (management of fisheries, habitat protection and restoration and aquaculture). These sessions had been planned by Steering Committees established with appropriate expertise from the Parties and NGOs and were charged with preparing a report of the session and highlighting management implications arising from the presentations and discussions. The Working Group considers that such sessions have been well received and well organised and reported and it supports their continuation although, because of

the symposium being held during the 2019 Annual Meeting, it may not be possible to schedule a further theme-based special session until the 2020 Annual Meeting.

8. Report of the Meeting

8.1 The Working Group agreed a report of its meeting by correspondence.

9. Close of Meeting

9.1 The Chair thanked participants for their contributions and closed the meeting.

List of Participants

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Helge Dyrendal | Norway |
| Paddy Gargan | EU |
| Hugo Hansen | Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) |
| Emma Hatfield | NASCO |
| Kate Johnson | Canada |
| Paul Knight | NGO Co-chair |
| Sergey Prusov | Russian Federation |
| Annette Rumboldt | Canada |
| Rory Saunders | USA (Chair) |
| Steve Sutton | NGO Co-chair |
| Lawrence Talks | EU |

WGFR(17)04

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

**Rydges Kensington Hotel, London, UK
5 & 6 December 2017**

Agenda

1. Opening of Meeting
2. Adoption of Agenda
3. Consideration of the Terms of Reference
4. Review of Previous Reporting and Evaluation Procedures and consideration of the recommendations for changes identified by the IP / APR Review Group
5. Review of the Guidelines for the Preparation and Evaluation of NASCO Implementation Plans and Reporting on Progress, CNL(12)44, including recommendations to streamline and improve reporting:
 - (a) Preparation of IPs including content and format and schedule for submission;
 - (b) Evaluation of IPs including composition of Review Group, criteria to be used for reviews, criteria for acceptability, schedule for the review, and arrangements for reporting on the review;
 - (c) Preparation of APRs including content and format and schedule for submission;
 - (d) Evaluation of APRs including composition of Review Group, criteria to be used for reviews, criteria for acceptability, schedule for the review, and arrangements for reporting on the review.
6. Review of, and recommendations for changes to, the templates for the preparation of IPs, CNL(12)42, and APRs, CNL(12)43, including options for including reporting under the Six Tenets for Effective Management of an Atlantic Salmon Fishery
7. Any Other Business
8. Report of the Meeting
9. Close of Meeting

Secretary
London
5 December 2017

Comparison of the Six Tenets for Effective Management of an Atlantic Salmon Fishery with the Implementation Plan template (CNL(12)42).

The Working Group on Future Reporting was asked by the Council of NASCO to consider inclusion of the Six Tenets for Effective Management of an Atlantic Salmon Fishery. To consider this request thoroughly, the Working Group compared the information requests in the existing Implementation Plan template with the matrix provided by the Six Tenets Working Group (WGCST(16)16). Following is a table that is intended to provide a visual summary of each of the six tenets including whether each tenet is captured in the existing Implementation Plan template (CNL(12)42). The table also summarises the recommendations to Council for further information request should Council wish to pursue the six tenets assessments further through the next round of Implementation Plans.

| Tenet Number | Description of Tenet | Criteria (also referred to as “basis for the assessment” in WGCST(16)16) | Is the criterion currently included in IP template (Y/N)? | If it is included, which section of the template (CNL(12)42)? | If not, what is the Review Group’s recommendation? |
|---------------------|---|--|---|---|--|
| 1 | Known pool of participants | A) Is a statutory license system and/or register in place? | No | | Add to section 2.7 of WGFR’s Option 1 IP template |
| | | B) Does that system define the entire pool of participants? | No | | Add to section 2.7 of WGFR’s Option 1 IP template |
| | | C) Is the entire pool of participants known prior to or during the season? | No | | Add to section 2.7 of WGFR’s Option 1 IP template |
| | | | | | |
| 2 | Effectively limiting catch and/or harvest | A) Are measures in place to effectively limit catch and/or harvest e.g. harvest restrictions (including quotas), effort restrictions (including gear restrictions, ceiling on the number of licences, seasonal closures) or a combination of both? | Yes | Section 2.2 | |
| | | B) Are measures consistent with NASCO’s Guidelines | Yes | Section 2.2 | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|----|---|--|
| | | for the Management of Salmon Fisheries, CNL(09)43? | | | |
| 3 | Accurate, effective and timely reporting | A) Is a mandatory system in place to ensure accurate, effective and timely reporting by all participants in the fishery? | No | | Add to section 2.8 of WGFR's Option 1 IP template |
| | | B) Are assessments conducted to confirm the accuracy of catch returns? | No | Though partially covered in Section 2.6 | Add to section 2.8 of WGFR's Option 1 IP template |
| | | C) Are the outputs from A and B above used to effectively limit catch and/or harvest in accordance with tenet 2? | No | | Add to section 2.8 of WGFR's Option 1 IP template |
| 4 | Effective communication of management rules | A) Are measures in place to effectively communicate with all participants in the fishery in a timely fashion? | No | | Add to section 2.9 of WGFR's Option 1 IP template |
| | | B) Does the communication process explain clearly to participants in the fishery the policies underpinning the management rules e.g. license obligations, sanctions, any in-season management adjustments and fishery closure information? | No | | Add to section 2.9 of WGFR's Option 1 IP template |
| 5 | Control and enforcement | A) Are control and enforcement measures in place and are these considered to be effective? | No | | Add to section 2.10 of WGFR's Option 1 IP template |
| | | B) Are adequate sanctions in place to deter violations? | No | | Add to section 2.10 of WGFR's Option 1 IP template |
| | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---|----|--|--|
| 6 | Scientific fishery sampling | A) Are scientific fishery sampling programmes in place to provide additional inputs to the scientific assessment process? | No | | Add to section 2.11 of WGFR's Option 1 IP template |
| | | B) Are results of these programmes used to inform the management of the fishery? | No | | Add to section 2.11 of WGFR's Option 1 IP template |

WGFR(17)06

DRAFT Guidelines for the Preparation and Evaluation of NASCO Implementation Plans and for Reporting on Progress**1. NASCO's Goals and Objectives**

NASCO and its Parties have agreed to adopt and apply a Precautionary Approach to the conservation, management and exploitation of salmon in order to protect the resource and preserve the environments in which it lives. To this end, NASCO has adopted a number of Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines that address the Organization's principal areas of concern for the management of salmon stocks. The threats and challenges to wild salmon vary widely across jurisdictions. However, there are three common theme areas and the overall goals for NASCO and its Parties in relation to these three theme areas are summarised below:

- ***Management of salmon fisheries:*** promote the diversity and abundance of salmon stocks and maintain all stocks above their conservation limits.
- ***Protection and restoration of Atlantic salmon habitat:*** maintain and, where possible, increase the current productive capacity of Atlantic salmon habitat.
- ***Management of aquaculture, introductions and transfers and transgenics:*** minimise the possible adverse impacts of aquaculture, introductions and transfers and transgenics on the wild stocks of Atlantic salmon, including working with industry stakeholders, where appropriate.

The principal Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines that relate to these three theme areas are as follows:

- NASCO Guidelines for the Management of Salmon Fisheries, CNL(09)43. This document guides NASCO Parties in the management of wild salmon;
- NASCO Guidelines for the Protection, Restoration and Enhancement of Atlantic Salmon Habitat, CNL(10)51. This document guides NASCO Parties in making further progress in implementing NASCO's agreements for the protection and restoration of salmon habitat;
- Resolution by the Parties to the Convention for the Conservation of Salmon in the North Atlantic Ocean to Minimise Impacts from Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers, and Transgenics on the Wild Salmon Stocks, CNL(06)48, the 'Williamsburg Resolution'. This agreement consolidated a series of previous agreements and added new elements related to mitigation and corrective measures, implementation, burden of proof, risk assessment, stocking Atlantic salmon, river classification and zoning to guide NASCO Parties and jurisdictions in these areas;
- Guidance on Best Management Practices to Address Impacts of Sea Lice and Escaped Farmed Salmon on Wild Salmon Stocks, SLG(09)5. This guidance document was agreed by NASCO and the International Salmon Farmers' Association in 2009. It is intended to supplement the Williamsburg Resolution and to assist the Parties and

jurisdictions in managing salmon aquaculture (in co-operation with their industries), and in developing NASCO Implementation Plans, among other things.

The purpose of Implementation Plans and Annual Progress Reports is to provide a simple and transparent approach for reporting on the implementation of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines by the Parties and jurisdictions.

This document describes the structure and content of the third cycle of Implementation Plans, the criteria that will be used for their acceptance and review, and the procedures for reporting and evaluating progress through the Annual Progress Reports.

2. Implementation Plans

The first Implementation Plans were developed in 2007 and the first cycle of reporting was completed in 2011. During this period, reports on the actions taken under the Implementation Plans were made through detailed Focus Area Reports (FAR), which were critically reviewed, and Annual Reports.

Following a comprehensive review of the strengths and weaknesses of the first reporting cycle, it was agreed that Implementation Plans would be the key document in the second reporting cycle. The Implementation Plans would be focused around the three main theme areas and would emphasise: the actions to be taken over a five-year period; clearly identifiable measurable outcomes and timescales; and appropriate monitoring to evaluate the effectiveness of the measures taken.

The second round of Implementation Plans were prepared using the agreed template, CNL(12)42 and were intended to build on the first reporting cycle. The Implementation Plans should have been presented in a clear and straight-forward manner, so that they would be easily understood by both managers and stakeholders. These Implementation Plans would normally: apply to all the stocks / fisheries managed within a jurisdiction; apply for a period of 5 years (2013-2018), and generally require no annual modification unless circumstances change significantly; be clear and concise; draw on information contained in the first Implementation Plans; be prepared in consultation with NGOs and other relevant stakeholders and industries; address the issues on which additional actions were recommended by the FAR Review Groups in the first reporting cycle; and 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 **actions** were intended to be the key element of the Implementation Plans. At that time, actions were specific tangible activities that a Party or jurisdiction intended to undertake during the five-year term of the Implementation Plan (i.e. during 2013-2018) to address threats and management challenges. In general, actions are implemented as part of a strategy or plan to achieve a desired goal or vision. A vision may be the elimination of escapes from aquaculture cages; an **action** may be to require containment management systems for all marine cages by 2015. Similarly, a vision may be to reduce exploitation in a mixed-stock fishery and an action may be to reduce the netting effort through a reduction in the open season.

3. Review of previous reporting and evaluation schemes

The Working Group on Future Reporting under Implementation Plans and Evaluation of Reports met in London on December 5 and 6, 2017 (CNL(18)12). The Working Group reviewed the previous reporting and evaluation procedures. The Working Group noted that the second cycle of reporting was markedly improved from the first round in terms of delivering openness and transparency. However, the Working Group also noted that further improvement is necessary to evaluate progress toward attainment of NASCO's goals in NASCO's three areas. The Working Group also concurred with suggestions by the Implementation Plan / Annual Progress Report Review Group toward improvements to be considered in the third cycle of reporting. These suggestions were as follows:

- many of the actions that were planned by Parties / jurisdictions had been vague or unclear making it difficult to assess progress. In other cases, actions had little bearing on NASCO agreements or guidelines, even when the Party / jurisdiction was not abiding by the terms of the agreements and guidelines. In the next round of IPs, it may be necessary to include specific topic areas on which Parties / jurisdictions would be expected to provide an action if they do not demonstrate that they are fully compliant with NASCO agreements and guidelines;
- greater efforts should be made in the next round of IPs to ensure that all actions are clearly and concisely described. IPs that do not contain clear actions should not be accepted by the Implementation Plan Review Group and will be returned to the Party / jurisdiction for revision; and
- there may be a need to include some standard questions in the template for the next round of IPs with a view to ensuring that such information is provided by all Parties / jurisdictions (e.g. relating to sea lice levels and containment within marine salmon farms).

Some of these issues are reflected in the following Guidelines for Developing NASCO Implementation Plans and Annual Progress Reports for the third cycle of reporting.

4. Guidelines for Developing NASCO Implementation Plans and Annual Progress Reports for the third cycle of reporting

4.1 Structure, Format, and Content of Implementation Plans

The Implementation Plans should be prepared using the agreed template, WGFR(17)07. It is important that Implementation Plans are presented in a clear and straight-forward manner so that they are easily understood by both managers and stakeholders. As with the previous cycle of reporting, it is anticipated that an Implementation Plan would normally:

- apply to all the stocks / fisheries managed within a jurisdiction;
- apply for a period of 5 years (2019-2024), and generally require no annual modification unless circumstances change significantly;
- be clear and concise;
- be prepared in consultation with NGOs and other relevant stakeholders and industries;
- include actions contained within the first and second Implementation Plans where they are still relevant in addressing a threat or challenge identified in the third Implementation Plan;

- 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. In light of the need to move toward more measurable actions to demonstrate progress toward attainment of NASCO’s goals, a “SMART” approach must be taken in the third cycle of reporting. “SMART” stands for:
 - S – Specific – actions should be ambitious, clear and concise and planned to address the threats / challenges identified in the Implementation Plan in a timely fashion in order to improve implementation of NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines;
 - M – Measurable – for each action there should be an expected outcome and a monitoring programme that will allow progress to be measured and reported through the Annual Progress Reports for evaluation by the Implementation Plan / Annual Progress Report Review Group;
 - A – Ambitious yet Achievable – actions and associated monitoring programmes should be ambitious in scope, given the current status of wild Atlantic salmon around the North Atlantic, and the Council’s recognition of the need to improve commitment to NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. It should be clearly stated that funding is in place, or is expected to be in place, to allow implementation of proposed actions / monitoring programmes during the five-year period covered by the Implementation Plan;
 - R – Relevant - actions should address the threats / challenges identified in the Implementation Plan in a timely fashion, taking into account the provisions in NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines;
 - T – Timely – in general, all actions in the Implementation Plan should achieve their expected outcome within the five-year period covered by the Implementation Plan (2019-2024). Where appropriate, actions may cover a period of less or more than the five-year period of the Implementation Plan. Where appropriate, milestones that are expected to be achievable within the five-year period covered by the Implementation Plan could be specified.

In short, actions in Implementation Plans need to be “SMART” to enable evaluation of progress toward the attainment of NASCO’s goals. A wide array of tools is available online to assist Parties in developing “SMART” actions.

When an action is taken by a Party or jurisdiction it should result in a change – this change is the measurable outcome that flows from that action. For example, if the expected outcome is a reduction in the number of escapees detected in 36 salmon rivers, the description of the action could be: ‘to reduce the number of escapees detected annually in 36 salmon rivers by 20% each year over the five-year reporting period (2019-2024) through improved containment management systems’.

4.2 *Review of Implementation Plans*

Implementation Plans will be subject to a critical evaluation by a Review Group appointed by the Council. The purpose of the evaluation will be to ensure that, as far as possible, the Implementation Plans provide a fair and equitable account of the actions that each jurisdiction plans to take to implement NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.

4.3 *Composition of the Review Group*

The Implementation Plan Review Group will comprise:

- one representative of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland);
- three representatives of the other Parties (preferably one from North America and two from Europe);
- two representatives of the NGOs (preferably one from Europe and one from North America); and
- one scientific representative from the Standing Scientific Committee.

The members of the Review Group will be appointed specifically to represent NASCO and not their Party or Organization. To provide continuity, they should normally be appointed to serve for a period of up to three years. The NASCO Secretariat will coordinate the Review Group's work but will not serve as reviewers. The Review Group will also review the Annual Progress Reports (see paragraph 5.2).

4.4 *Initial Assessment of Implementation Plans*

The aim of the initial assessment is to ensure that time is not wasted on a full critical review of Implementation Plans that clearly contain significant omissions. Following submission, and if time permits, the NASCO Secretariat will, therefore, check the Draft Implementation Plans for the following information:

1. provision of answers to all the questions except where these are indicated to be inappropriate for the jurisdiction;
2. provision of lists of threats to wild salmon and challenges for management related to the three theme areas;
3. provision of actions to address the main threats and challenges which include measurable outcome(s), monitoring that will be undertaken to assess the effectiveness of the action and the planned timescale for the action.

Where there are obvious gaps in the Draft Implementation Plans in any of the above areas they will be referred to the jurisdiction for correction. In cases of uncertainty, the Secretariat will refer to the Review Group.

4.5 *Critical Evaluation of Implementation Plans*

Once accepted the Implementation Plans will be examined by a Review Group that will evaluate the quality of the information contained in the above areas and determine whether it provides a fair and equitable basis for assessing the progress that the jurisdiction will make in implementing NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.

The key to assessing progress toward NASCO's goals objectively (through the reporting of annual progress, see section 5 below) is the development of "SMART" actions.

The Review Group will assess, therefore, whether or not actions in each theme area are "SMART" and if they are not they will be referred to the relevant jurisdiction. Furthermore, actions must focus on the main threats and challenges identified in the IPs.

Answers to each question will be assessed as:

1. Satisfactory answers / information, including measurable (SMART) objectives
2. Unsatisfactory (including unclear or incomplete answers / information or clear omissions or inadequacies).

Implementation Plans which include answers in category 2 above will be returned to jurisdictions for modification with clear guidance on the way that the Review Group considers that the Implementation Plan should be improved. These assessments will not be made public at this stage.

Re-submitted Implementation Plans will be re-assessed by the Review Group to determine whether the areas highlighted have been addressed or a satisfactory explanation of the original content has been provided.

If the IP does not pass the second round of review it can be re-submitted by 1 November. The Review Group will re-assess the IP by correspondence in November.

4.6 Reporting to the Annual Meeting

Where the Review Group considers that there are still clear omissions or inadequacies in the answers / information provided (category 2), these shortcomings will be listed in their report to the Council. The Review Group will present its evaluation of the Implementation Plans to the Annual Meeting of the Council, highlighting examples of good practice within the Plans. The President will lead the discussions with jurisdictions concerning any outstanding questions about their Implementation Plans and those jurisdictions will have an opportunity to revise their Implementation Plans after the Annual Meeting.

4.7 Schedules for Submission, Review and Distribution of Implementation Plans

In order for the review process to function effectively, the following schedule is proposed:

| Date / deadline | Responsibility | Action required |
|------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| 30 June 2018 | Secretary | Requests submission of Implementation Plans |
| 1 February 2019 | Parties / jurisdictions | <u>Deadline</u> for submission of Implementation Plans to Secretary |
| 7 February 2019 | Secretary | Distribute Implementation Plans to Review Group |
| 26 - 28 February 2019 | Review Group | Meets and develops its evaluation of the Implementation Plans |
| 15 March 2019 | Secretary | Return Implementation Plans requiring modification to jurisdictions with clear guidance on the Review Group's recommendations for improvements |
| 1 May 2019 | Parties / jurisdictions | <u>Deadline</u> for submission of revised Implementation Plans |
| May 2019 | Review Group | Review revised Implementation Plans by correspondence |

| | | |
|---|-------------------------|---|
| 27 May 2019 | Secretary | Email Review Group's assessments of revised Implementation Plans to NASCO Heads of Delegation |
| June 2019 | Review Group | Present report to the Council in Special Session |
| Summer 2019 | Secretary | Upload accepted Implementation Plans to NASCO website |
| 1 November 2019 / 2020 / 2021 / 2022 / 2023 | Parties / jurisdictions | <u>Deadline</u> for submission of revised Implementation Plans to NASCO |

5. Annual Progress Reports

The primary purposes of the Annual Progress Reports are to provide details of:

- any changes to the management regime for salmon and consequent changes to the Implementation Plan;
- actions that have been taken under the Implementation Plan in the previous year;
- significant changes to the status of stocks, and a report on catches; and
- actions taken in accordance with the provisions of the Convention.

5.1 *Structure, Format and Content of Annual Progress Reports (to begin in 2020 after IPs finalised)*

Each year the jurisdictions should prepare Annual Progress Reports using the agreed reporting template WGFR(17)08. These should provide information on progress against actions in their Implementation Plans relating to management of salmon fisheries, habitat protection and restoration and aquaculture and related activities, as well as available information on monitoring the effectiveness of those actions and their enforcement. In addition, details of any significant changes to the status of stocks and any changes to the Implementation Plan should be included in the report. Details of actions taken in accordance with the provisions of the Convention are also needed by the Council. To aid completion of the report, the Secretariat will incorporate the actions specified in the Implementation Plan in the template for each jurisdiction.

5.2 *Critical Review of Annual Progress Reports*

The Annual Progress Reports will be subject to a critical evaluation by a Review Group appointed by the Council. The purpose of the evaluation will be to ensure that jurisdictions have provided a clear account of progress in implementing and evaluating the actions detailed in their Implementation Plans, along with the information required under the Convention.

The Review Group will evaluate the Annual Progress Reports to assess the progress that has been made on each of the actions detailed in the Implementation Plan. Where there are shortcomings, the Review Group will highlight these for each action. Parties / jurisdictions will have the opportunity to respond to these at the Annual Meeting of the Council and these shortcomings should be addressed in the APRs for the following year.

5.3 Schedules for Submission, Review and Distribution of Annual Progress Reports

In order for the review process to function effectively within a limited time period, the following schedule is proposed:

| Date | Responsibility | Action required |
|----------------|-------------------------|--|
| 5 January | Secretariat | Send the template for Annual Progress Reports to each Party / jurisdiction |
| 1 March | Secretariat | Send reminders for completion of Annual Progress Reports |
| 1 April | Parties / jurisdictions | Deadline for submission of Annual Progress Reports to Secretariat |
| | Secretariat | Annual Progress Reports made available on the website |
| 1 May | Review Group | Completion of review |
| Annual Meeting | Parties / jurisdictions | Respond to shortcomings identified by the Review Group at the Annual Meeting of the Council and address these shortcomings in the APR for the following year |

Under this reporting cycle, Annual Progress Reports will be submitted in 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024 and 2025.

WGFR(17)07

DRAFT NASCO Implementation Plan for the period 2019-24

The main purpose of this Implementation Plan is to demonstrate what actions are being taken by the jurisdiction to implement NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.

In answering the questions in the Implementation Plan please refer to the Implementation Plan Guidelines document WGFR(17)06

Questions in the Implementation Plan are drawn from the following documents:

- *NASCO Guidelines for Management of Salmon Fisheries, CNL(09)43 (referred to as the 'Fisheries Guidelines');*
- *Minimum Standard for Catch Statistics, CNL(93)51 (referred to as the 'Minimum Standard');*
- *NASCO Guidelines for Protection, Restoration and Enhancement of Atlantic Salmon Habitat, CNL(10)51 (referred to as the 'Habitat Guidelines');*
- *Williamsburg Resolution, CNL(06)48; and*
- *Guidance on Best Management Practices to address impacts of sea lice and escaped farmed salmon on wild salmon stocks (SLG(09)5) (referred to as the 'BMP Guidance').*

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Party: | |
| Jurisdiction / Region: | |

| | | |
|--|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1. Introduction | | |
| 1.1 What are the objectives for the management of wild salmon? <i>(Max 200 words)</i> | | |
| <i>Give the core national objectives guiding the legislation for your jurisdiction</i> | | |
| 1.2 What reference points (e.g. conservation limits, management targets or other measures of abundance) are used to assess the status of stocks? <i>(Max 200 words)</i> <i>(Reference: Sections 2.4 and 2.5 of the Fisheries Guidelines)</i> | | |
| 1.3 What is the current status of stocks under the new classification system outlined in CNL(16)11? | | |
| Stock Classification Score | Salmon Classification Category | No. rivers |
| 0 | Not at Risk | |
| 1 | Low Risk | |
| 2 | Moderate Risk | |
| 3 | High Risk | |
| N/A | Artificially Sustained | |
| N/A | Lost | |
| N/A | Unknown | |
| Additional comments: | | |
| 1.4 How is stock diversity (e.g. genetics, age composition, run-timing, etc.) taken into account in the management of salmon stocks? <i>(Max 200 words)</i> | | |
| 1.5 To provide a baseline for future comparison, what is the current and potential quantity of salmon habitat? <i>(Max 200 words)</i> <i>(Reference: Section 3.1 of the Habitat Guidelines)</i> | | |
| 1.6 What is the current extent of freshwater and marine salmonid aquaculture? | | |
| Number of marine farms | | |
| Marine production (tonnes) | | |
| Number of freshwater facilities | | |
| Freshwater production (tonnes) | | |
| Append one or more maps showing the location of aquaculture facilities and aquaculture free zones in rivers and the sea. | | |
| 1.7 Please describe the process used to consult NGOs and other stakeholders and industries in the development of this Implementation Plan. <i>(Max 200 words)</i> | | |

| | |
|------------|--|
| 2. | Fisheries Management: <i>In this section please review the management approach to each of the fisheries in your jurisdiction (i.e. commercial, recreational and other fisheries)</i> |
| 2.1 | What are the objectives for the management of the fisheries for wild salmon? <i>(Max. 200 words)</i> |
| 2.2 | What is the decision-making process for fisheries management, including predetermined decisions taken under different stock conditions (e.g. the stock levels at which regulations are triggered)? <i>(Max. 200 words)</i> <i>(This can be answered by providing a flow diagram if this is available.)</i> <i>(Reference: Sections 2.1 and 2.7 of the Fisheries Guidelines)</i> |
| 2.3 | Are fisheries permitted to operate on salmon stocks that are below their reference point and, if so, how many such fisheries are there and what approach is taken to managing them that still promotes stock rebuilding? <i>(Max 200 words.)</i> <i>(Reference: Section 2.7 of the Fisheries Guidelines)</i> |
| 2.4 | Are there any mixed-stock salmon fisheries and, if so, (a) how are these defined, (b) what was the mean catch in these fisheries in the last five years and (c) how are they managed to ensure that all the contributing stocks are meeting their conservation objectives? <i>(Max. 300 words in total)</i> <i>(Reference: Section 2.8 of the Fisheries Guidelines)</i> |
| (a) | |
| (b) | |
| (c) | |
| 2.5 | How are socio-economic factors taken into account in making decisions on fisheries management? <i>(Max. 200 words)</i> <i>(Reference: Section 2.9 of the Fisheries Guidelines)</i> |
| 2.6 | What is the current level of unreported catch and what measures are being taken to reduce this? <i>(Max. 200 words)</i> <i>(Reference: Section 2.2 of the Fisheries Guidelines and the Minimum Standard)</i> |
| 2.7 | Has the assessment under the Six Tenets for Effective Management of an Atlantic Salmon Fishery been conducted? If so, (a) has the assessment been made available to the Secretariat and (b) what actions are planned to improve the monitoring and control of the fishery? If the six tenets have not been applied, what is the timescale for doing so? (c). <i>(Max. 200 words)</i> <i>Reference: Six Tenets for Effective Management of an Atlantic Salmon Fishery (WGCST(16)16)</i> |

| | |
|---|--|
| (a) | |
| (b) | |
| (c) | |
| 2.8 In light of challenges in attaining the goals set out in the NASCO Guidelines for the Management of Salmon Fisheries, identify the threats to wild salmon and challenges for management associated with their exploitation in fisheries. | |
| Threat / challenge F1 | |
| Threat / challenge F2 | |
| Threat / challenge F3 | |
| Threat / challenge F4 | |

Copy and paste lines to add further challenges which should be labelled F5, F6, etc.

| | | |
|--|---|-----------------|
| 2.9 What measurable (SMART) actions are planned to make progress in the achievement of solutions to each of the above threats and challenges in the five-year period to 2024? | | |
| Action F1: | Description of action: | |
| | Planned timescale (include milestones where appropriate): | |
| | Expected outcome: | |
| | Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement: | |
| | Funding secured for both action and monitoring programme? | Choose an item. |
| Action F2: | Description of action: | |
| | Planned timescale (include milestones where appropriate): | |
| | Expected outcome: | |
| | Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement: | |
| | Funding secured for both action and monitoring programme? | Choose an item. |
| Action F3: | Description of | |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | action: | |
| | Planned timescale (include milestones where appropriate): | |
| | Expected outcome: | |
| | Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement: | |
| | Funding secured for both action and monitoring programme? | Choose an item. |
| Action F4: | Description of action: | |
| | Planned timescale (include milestones where appropriate): | |
| | Expected outcome: | |
| | Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement: | |
| | Funding secured for both action and monitoring programme? | Choose an item. |

Copy and paste lines to add further actions which should be labelled F5, F6, etc.

| | |
|---|---|
| 3. Protection and Restoration of Salmon Habitat: | |
| 3.1 | How are risks to productive capacity identified and options for restoring degraded or lost salmon habitat prioritised, taking into account the principle of ‘no net loss’ and the need for inventories to provide baseline data? (Max. 200 words) (Reference: Section 3 of the Habitat Guidelines) |
| | |
| 3.2 | How are socio-economic factors taken into account in making decisions on salmon habitat management? (Max. 200 words) (Reference: Section 3.9 of the Habitats Guidelines) |
| | |
| 3.3 | In light of challenges in attaining the goals set out in the NASCO Guidelines for the Protection, Restoration and Enhancement of Atlantic Salmon Habitat, identify the main threats to wild salmon and challenges for management in relation to estuarine and freshwater habitat. |
| Threat / challenge H1 | |
| Threat / challenge H2 | |

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Threat / challenge H3 | |
| Threat / challenge H4 | |

Copy and paste lines to add further threats/challenges which should be labelled H5, H6, etc.

| 3.4 What measurable (SMART) actions are planned to make progress in the achievement of solutions to each of the above threats and challenges in the five-year period to 2024? | | |
|--|---|-----------------|
| Action H1: | Description of action: | |
| | Planned timescale (include milestones where appropriate): | |
| | Expected outcome: | |
| | Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement: | |
| | Funding secured for both action and monitoring programme? | Choose an item. |
| Action H2: | Description of action: | |
| | Planned timescale (include milestones where appropriate): | |
| | Expected outcome: | |
| | Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement: | |
| | Funding secured for both action and monitoring programme? | Choose an item. |
| Action H3: | Description of action: | |
| | Planned timescale (include milestones where appropriate): | |
| | Expected outcome: | |
| | Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement: | |
| | Funding secured for both action and monitoring | Choose an item. |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | programme? | |
| Action H4: | Description of action: | |
| | Planned timescale (include milestones where appropriate): | |
| | Expected outcome: | |
| | Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement: | |
| | Funding secured for both action and monitoring programme? | Choose an item. |

Copy and paste lines to add further actions which should be labelled H5, H6, etc

| | |
|--|--|
| 4. Management of Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers, and Transgenics: | |
| <i>In this section please review information on all types of aquaculture including freshwater hatcheries etc.</i> | |
| 4.1 | What is the approach for determining the location of aquaculture facilities in (a) freshwater and (b) marine environments to minimise the risks to wild salmon stocks? (Max. 200 words for each) |
| (a) | |
| (b) | |
| 4.2 | Please report measurable outcomes on the achievement of the international goal for 100% of farms to have effective sea lice management such that there is no increase in sea lice loads, or lice-induced mortality of wild salmonids attributable to sea lice emanating from salmon farms. (Max. 200 words) <i>(Reference: BMP Guidance)</i> |
| <i>The measures by which these goals may be achieved, and against which the RG will be measuring the effectiveness of the IP, are set out in the BMP Guidance SLG(09)5 (best management practice; reporting and tracking; factors facilitating implementation) as agreed by the Salmon Liaison Group (comprising NASCO and the International Salmon Farmers' Association (ISFA))</i> | |
| 4.3 | Please report measurable outcomes on the achievement of the international goals for achieving 100% containment in all (a) freshwater and (b) marine aquaculture production facilities. (Max. 200 words for each) <i>(Reference: BMP Guidance)</i> |
| (a) | |
| <i>The measures by which these goals may be achieved, and against which the RG will be measuring the effectiveness of the IP, are set out in the BMP Guidance SLG(09)5 (best management practice; reporting and tracking; factors facilitating implementation) as agreed by the Salmon Liaison Group (comprising NASCO and the International Salmon Farmers' Association (ISFA))</i> | |
| (b) | |
| <i>The measures by which these goals may be achieved, and against which the RG will be measuring the</i> | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>effectiveness of the IP, are set out in the BMP Guidance SLG(09)5 (best management practice; reporting and tracking; factors facilitating implementation) as agreed by the Salmon Liaison Group (comprising NASCO and the International Salmon Farmers' Association (ISFA))</i> | |
| 4.4 | What progress has been made to implement NASCO guidance on introductions, transfers and stocking? (Max. 200 words) (Reference: Articles 5 and 6 and Annex 4 of the Williamsburg Resolution) |
| | |
| 4.5 | What is the policy / strategy on use of transgenic salmon? (Max. 200 words) (Reference: Article 7 and Annex 5 of the Williamsburg Resolution) |
| | |
| 4.6 | What measures are in place to prevent the introduction or further spread of <i>Gyrodactylus salaris</i> and to eradicate it where introduced? (Max. 200 words) |
| | |
| 4.7 | In light of challenges in attaining the goals set out in the BMP Guidelines and taking into account the Williamsburg Resolution, identify the main threats to wild salmon and challenges for management in relation to aquaculture, introductions and transfers, and transgenics. |
| Threat / Challenge A1 | |
| Threat / challenge A2 | |
| Threat / challenge A3 | |
| Threat / challenge A4 | |

Copy and paste lines to add further threats/challenges which should be labelled A5, A6, etc.

| | | |
|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| 4.8 | What measurable (SMART) actions are planned to make progress in the achievement of solutions to each of the above threats and challenges in the five-year period to 2024? | |
| Action A1: | Description of action: | |
| | Planned timescale (include milestones where appropriate): | |
| | Expected outcome: | |
| | Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement: | |
| | Funding secured for both action and monitoring programme? | Choose an item. |
| Action A2: | Description of action: | |
| | Planned timescale (include milestones | |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | where appropriate: | |
| | Expected outcome: | |
| | Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement: | |
| | Funding secured for both action and monitoring programme? | Choose an item. |
| Action A3: | Description of action: | |
| | Planned timescale (include milestones where appropriate): | |
| | Expected outcome: | |
| | Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement: | |
| | Funding secured for both action and monitoring programme? | Choose an item. |
| Action A4: | Description of action: | |
| | Planned timescale (include milestones where appropriate): | |
| | Expected outcome: | |
| | Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement: | |
| | Funding secured for both action and monitoring programme? | Choose an item. |

Copy and paste lines to add further actions which should be labelled A5, A6, etc

WGFR(17)08

***DRAFT Annual Progress Report on Actions taken under the Implementation Plan
for the Calendar Year 2019***

The primary purposes of the Annual Progress Reports are to provide details of:

- any changes to the management regime for salmon and consequent changes to the Implementation Plan;
- actions that have been taken under the Implementation Plan in the previous year;
- significant changes to the status of stocks, and a report on catches; and
- actions taken in accordance with the provisions of the Convention

These reports will be reviewed by the Council. Please complete this form and return it to the Secretariat **no later than 1 April 2020**.

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Party: | |
| Jurisdiction / Region: | |

| |
|--|
| 1: Changes to the Implementation Plan |
| 1.1 Describe any proposed revisions to the Implementation Plan (<i>Where changes are proposed, the revised Implementation Plans should be submitted to the Secretariat by 1 December</i>) |
| 1.2 Describe any major new initiatives or achievements for salmon conservation and management that you wish to highlight. |

| | | | | |
|--|----------|-----------|---------|-------|
| 2: Stock status and catches. | | | | |
| 2.1 Provide a description of any new factors which may significantly affect the abundance of salmon stocks and, if there has been any significant change in stock status since the development of the Implementation Plan, provide a brief (200 word max) summary of these changes. | | | | |
| 2.2 Provide the following information on catches:(nominal catch equals reported quantity of salmon caught and retained in tonnes ‘round fresh weight’ (i.e. weight of whole, ungutted, unfrozen fish) or ‘round fresh weight equivalent’). | | | | |
| (a) provisional nominal catch (which may be subject to revision) for 2019 (tonnes) | In-river | Estuarine | Coastal | Total |
| | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| (b) confirmed nominal catch of salmon for 2018 (tonnes) | | | | |
| (c) estimated unreported catch for 2019 (tonnes) | | | | |
| (d) number and percentage of salmon caught and released in recreational fisheries in 2019. | | | | |

3: Implementation Plan Actions.

3.1 Provide an update on progress against actions relating to the Management of Salmon Fisheries (section 2.9 of the Implementation Plan) *Note: The reports under 'Progress on Action to Date' should provide a brief overview with a quantitative measure of progress made. While referring to additional material (e.g. via links to websites) may assist those seeking more detailed information, this will not be evaluated by the Review Group.*

| | | |
|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| Action F1: | Description of Action (as submitted in the IP): | |
| | Expected Outcome (as submitted in the IP): | |
| | Progress on Action to Date (Provide a brief overview with a quantitative measure of progress. Other material (e.g. website links) will not be evaluated.) | |
| | Current Status of Action | Choose an item. |
| | If 'Completed', has the Action achieved its objective? | |
| Action F2: | Description of Action (as submitted in the IP): | |
| | Expected Outcome (as submitted in the IP): | |
| | Progress on Action to Date (Provide a brief overview with a quantitative measure of progress. Other material (e.g. website links) will not be evaluated.) | |
| | Current Status of Action | Choose an item. |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| | If 'Completed', has the Action achieved its objective? | |
| Action F3: | Description of Action <i>(as submitted in the IP):</i> | |
| | Expected Outcome <i>(as submitted in the IP):</i> | |
| | Progress on Action to Date <i>(Provide a brief overview with a quantitative measure of progress. Other material (e.g. website links) will not be evaluated.)</i> | |
| | Current Status of Action | Choose an item. |
| | If 'Completed', has the Action achieved its objective? | |
| Action F4: | Description of Action <i>(as submitted in the IP):</i> | |
| | Expected Outcome <i>(as submitted in the IP):</i> | |
| | Progress on Action to Date <i>(Provide a brief overview with a quantitative measure of progress. Other material (e.g. website links) will not be evaluated.)</i> | |
| | Current Status of Action | Choose an item. |
| | If 'Completed', has the Action achieved its objective? | |

3.2 Provide an update on progress against actions relating to Habitat Protection and Restoration (section 3.4 of the Implementation Plan) *Note: The reports under 'Progress on Action to Date' should provide a brief overview with a quantitative measure of progress made. While referring to additional material (e.g. via links to websites) may assist those seeking more detailed information, this will not be evaluated by the Review Group.*

| | | |
|-------------------|--|--|
| Action H1: | Description of Action <i>(as submitted in the IP):</i> | |
| | Expected Outcome <i>(as submitted in the IP):</i> | |
| | Progress on Action to Date <i>(Provide a brief overview with a quantitative measure of progress. Other material (e.g.</i> | |

| | | |
|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | <i>website links) will not be evaluated.)</i> | |
| | Current Status of Action | Choose an item. |
| | If 'Completed', has the Action achieved its objective? | |
| Action H2: | Description of Action (as submitted in the IP): | |
| | Expected Outcome (as submitted in the IP): | |
| | Progress on Action to Date (Provide a brief overview with a quantitative measure of progress. Other material (e.g. website links) will not be evaluated.) | |
| | Current Status of Action | Choose an item. |
| | If 'Completed', has the Action achieved its objective? | |
| Action H3: | Description of Action (as submitted in the IP): | |
| | Expected Outcome (as submitted in the IP): | |
| | Progress on Action to Date (Provide a brief overview with a quantitative measure of progress. Other material (e.g. website links) will not be evaluated.) | |
| | Current Status of Action | Choose an item. |
| | If 'Completed', has the Action achieved its objective? | |
| Action H4: | Description of Action (as submitted in the IP): | |
| | Expected Outcome (as submitted in the IP): | |
| | Progress on Action to Date (Provide a brief overview with a quantitative measure of progress. Other material (e.g. website links) will not be evaluated.) | |
| | Current Status of Action | Choose an item. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | If 'Completed', has the Action achieved its objective? | |
|--|--|--|

3.3 Provide an update on progress against actions relating to Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers and Transgenics (section 4.8 of the Implementation Plan) *Note: The reports under 'Progress on Action to Date' should provide a brief overview with a quantitative measure of progress made. While referring to additional material (e.g. via links to websites) may assist those seeking more detailed information, this will not be evaluated by the Review Group.*

| | | |
|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| Action A1: | Description of Action (as submitted in the IP): | |
| | Expected Outcome (as submitted in the IP): | |
| | Progress on Action to Date (Provide a brief overview with a quantitative measure of progress. Other material (e.g. website links) will not be evaluated.) | |
| | Current Status of Action | Choose an item. |
| | If 'Completed', has the Action achieved its objective? | |
| Action A2: | Description of Action (as submitted in the IP): | |
| | Expected Outcome (as submitted in the IP): | |
| | Progress on Action to Date (Provide a brief overview with a quantitative measure of progress. Other material (e.g. website links) will not be evaluated.) | |
| | Current Status of Action | Choose an item. |
| | If 'Completed', has the Action achieved its objective? | |
| Action A3: | Description of Action (as submitted in the IP): | |
| | Expected Outcome (as submitted in the IP): | |
| | Progress on Action to Date (Provide a brief overview with a quantitative measure of progress.) | |

| | | |
|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| | <i>Other material (e.g. website links) will not be evaluated.)</i> | |
| | Current Status of Action | Choose an item. |
| | If 'Completed', has the Action achieved its objective? | |
| Action A4: | Description of Action (as submitted in the IP): | |
| | Expected Outcome (as submitted in the IP): | |
| | Progress on Action to Date (Provide a brief overview with a quantitative measure of progress. Other material (e.g. website links) will not be evaluated.) | |
| | Current Status of Action | Choose an item. |
| | If 'Completed', has the Action achieved its objective? | |

| | |
|--|---|
| 4: Additional information required under the Convention | |
| 4.1 | Details of any laws, regulations and programmes that have been adopted or repealed since the last notification. |
| 4.2 | Details of any new commitments concerning the adoption or maintenance in force for specified periods of time of conservation, restoration and other management measures. |
| 4.3 | Details of any new actions to prohibit fishing for salmon beyond 12 nautical miles. |
| 4.4 | Details of any new actions to invite the attention of States not Party to the Convention to matters relating to the activities of its vessels which could adversely affect salmon stocks subject to the Convention. |
| 4.5 | Details of any actions taken to implement regulatory measures under Article 13 of the Convention including imposition of adequate penalties for violations. |
| North American Commission Members only: | |
| 4.6 | Details of any new measures to minimise by-catches of salmon originating in the rivers of the other member. |

4.7 Details of any alteration to fishing patterns that result in the initiation of fishing or increase in catches of salmon originating in the rivers of another Party except with the consent of the latter.