



West Greenland Commission

WGC(13)3

Report on the Use of the Framework of Indicators in 2013

WGC(13)3

Report on the Use of the Framework of Indicators in 2013

1. At its 2012 Annual Meeting, the West Greenland Commission adopted a multi-annual regulatory measure, (WGC(12)12), for the fishing of salmon at West Greenland in 2012, 2013 and 2014. Under this measure, the catch at West Greenland in 2012 was restricted to the amount used for internal consumption in Greenland which in the past has been estimated to be 20 tonnes annually. There would be no commercial export of salmon. The regulatory measure would also apply to the fishery in 2013 and 2014 unless application of the Framework of Indicators (FWI) in those years showed that there has been a significant change in the indicators used and, therefore, that a full reassessment of the catch advice is required.
2. The Commission agreed that the procedure used during the previous Regulatory Measure that applied to the years 2009, 2010 and 2011, WGC(09)7, should again be used for applying the FWI under the new regulatory measure. Thus, each WGC Party was asked to nominate a representative to serve on the FWI Working Group in 2013. The representatives appointed were Gérald Chaput (Canada), Kristina Guldbaek (Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)), Ted Potter (European Union) and Rory Saunders (USA). Gérald Chaput served as the Group's Coordinator. The Group worked by correspondence to coordinate the data collection and apply the FWI. The Group's report is attached.
3. The Group concluded that the FWI did not show that there had been a significant change in the indicators used and, therefore, that a reassessment of the ICES management advice for the 2013 fishery at West Greenland was not required. This means that the multi-annual Regulatory Measure agreed in 2012 will continue to apply to the 2013 fishery and there will not, therefore, be a need for negotiations on a new measure at the Thirtieth Annual Meeting. It also means that, in accordance with the request for scientific advice adopted by the Council last year, ICES has been advised that it does not need to provide catch options or alternative management advice for either the NAC or WGC areas.
4. This arrangement again appeared to work well and within the timescale proposed by the Commission. We are grateful to the Group for its work. For the North-East Atlantic Commission, ICES has recommended a slight change to the future operation of the FWI. In the event of a closed fishery, it has been proposed that the indicators should only be used to signal an under-estimate of forecast abundance. The WGC may wish to consider if this proposed approach might also be relevant to running its FWI in the future.

Interim Secretary
Edinburgh
13 May 2013

NASCO - WEST GREENLAND COMMISSION

REPORT OF THE FRAMEWORK OF INDICATORS WORKING GROUP 2013

Introduction:

At its Annual Meeting in Edinburgh, the West Greenland Commission adopted a multi-annual regulatory measure for the West Greenland salmon fishery for the years 2012, 2013 and 2014 (WGC(12)12). This regulatory measure applied to the fishery in 2012 and it will be carried forward to 2013 and 2014 without further review unless application of the Framework of Indicators (FWI) shows that there has been a significant change in the indicators used and, therefore, that a full reassessment of the management advice is required.

The Commission agreed that the same procedure used in 2008, 2010 and 2011 should again be used in applying the FWI in 2013 under the current regulatory measure. Thus, a small group comprising one representative from each member of the Commission was appointed to work by correspondence to collect the data and apply the FWI (Annex 1 and 2). The Working Group comprised:

Gérald Chaput	Canada
Kristina Guldbaek	Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)
Ted Potter	European Union
Rory Saunders	USA

The Group was asked complete their tasks by January 31 2013 and to liaise with the NASCO who would present their findings to the Parties and to ICES.

Work of the Working Group:

Gérald Chaput agreed to act as coordinator of the FWI Working Group for 2013. Annex 3 summarizes the chronology of the work undertaken by the Group. A request for data to populate the FWI was circulated to representatives from each of the North American Commission 'management units' (Annex 4), and returns were sent to the coordinator. The coordinator then circulated the completed FWI worksheet for 2013 (Annex 5) and the draft report to the Working Group for their review and agreement (Annex 8).

Framework of Indicators Analysis – 2013:

The FWI worksheet includes data from five North American Commission 'management units': Newfoundland, Gulf, Quebec, Scotia-Fundy, and USA. Each Working Group member has reviewed the raw data and the FWI assessment spreadsheet and confirmed their agreement with the following summary of the findings for the return year 2012 (Annex 3).

There were some changes in the indicators in the current FWI from those in the FWI spreadsheet of 2011 (Annex 5). In Scotia-Fundy Region, two indicators were dropped in the current version (Baddeck large salmon, North River small salmon). As indicated in the note to data providers, ICES inadvertently included four indicators for this region which were not available because the series had already been discontinued (LaHave hatchery smolt survivals

to 1SW and 2SW, Liscomb Hatchery smolt 2SW survivals and East Sheet Harbour hatchery smolt 2SW survivals). The exclusion of these indicators does not alter the functioning of the FWI. In Gulf Region, Margaree River small salmon returns are not in the current indicator. For Quebec region, one indicator was dropped in the current FWI (Mitis large salmon returns) and nine new indicators were added. For Newfoundland, two indicators were dropped in the current FWI. Region specific comments, when provided, are tabulated in Annex 6.

The indicators for the return year 2012 are all consistently below the threshold values in USA, Scotia-Fundy and Gulf with mean indicator scores in each region of -0.93, -0.90, and -0.95, respectively, over a possible range of -1 to +1 (Annex 7). For the Quebec region, 14 of 17 indicators were below the threshold value, with a mean indicator score of -0.48 (Annex 7). The only region with a positive mean indicator score, identifying that the management objectives would have been met was Newfoundland, with a mean score of 0.22 (Annex 7). One of the four indicators for Newfoundland region was below the threshold (Annex 7).

The assessment indicates that the Management Objectives would not be met in four of the five areas in the framework and therefore that there was no significant change in the indicators.

Conclusions:

The overall conclusion of the FWI Working Group is that the FWI does not show that there has been a significant change in the indicators used and therefore a re-assessment of the ICES management advice for the 2013 fishery is not required.

**FWI Working Group
7 February 2013**

Annex 1. Initial communication from NASCO to Heads of West Greenland Commission regarding application of the Framework of Indicators

From: hq@nasco.int [mailto:hq@nasco.int]
Sent: November-12-12 12:24 PM
To: Heads of West Greenland Commission
Cc: Marco D'Ambrosio (marco.dambrosio@ec.europa.eu); Rory Saunders (rory.saunders@noaa.gov); Ted Potter (Cefas) (ted.potter@cefas.co.uk); Chaput, Gerald
Subject: Framework of Indicators - West Greenland Commission

To: Heads of West Greenland Commission
CC: Members of the 2011 FWI Group
From: Interim Secretary
RE: Framework of Indicators – West Greenland Commission

At the Annual Meeting of the West Greenland Commission in Edinburgh in June, a multi-annual regulatory measure was adopted for the West Greenland salmon fishery for the years 2012, 2013 and 2014, WGC(12)12. This measure will apply to the fishery in 2013 and 2014 unless application of the Framework of Indicators (FWI) shows that there has been a significant change in the indicators used and consequently that a re-assessment of the management advice is required. The FWI will, therefore, need to be applied in 2013.

When the FWI was run in previous years, a small Group comprising one representative of each member of the Commission worked by correspondence to collate the data and apply the FWI. This task needs to be completed by the end of January 2013 and the Secretariat will liaise with the Co-ordinator of the Group (this changed each year that the Group met) and present the findings to the Parties and to ICES.

The members of the Group, when it was last convened in 2011, were:

Gerald Chaput	Canada
Sonja Feldthaus	Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)
Ted Potter	EU - Coordinator
Rory Saunders	US

We will need to resolve the membership of the Group to apply the FWI for 2013 and I would be grateful, therefore, if you could advise me of the name of your representative by 3 December. Sonja Feldthaus is, of course, no longer involved in NASCO matters.

Best regards

Peter Hutchinson
Interim Secretary

WGC14.336

Annex 2. Notification of representation on the FWI Working Group

From: hq@nasco.int [mailto:hq@nasco.int]
Sent: December-21-12 11:36 AM
To: Framework of Indicators Working Group WGC
Subject: FWI Working Group - WGC

Dear All,

We have been advised that the representatives on the Framework of Indicators Working Group will be as follows:

Canada	Gérald Chaput
Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)	Kristina Guldbaek
European Union	Ted Potter
USA	Rory Saunders

I would ask that you appoint a Coordinator to liaise with the NASCO Secretariat and that the Group's findings be reported to us no later than 31 January 2013 so that I can advise the Parties to the West Greenland Commission and ICES. Ted Potter served as Coordinator when the Group last met in 2011.

Thank you for agreeing to contribute to the work of this Group.

Best regards

Peter Hutchinson
Interim Secretary

WGC14.346

Annex 3. Summary of requests and receipts of data for Indicator Framework

Date	Contact	Action
04-Apr-12	ICES-WGNAS	Finalized and updated FWI
27-Apr-12	ICES-ACOM	Reviewed and approved FWI
06-Jun-12	NASCO-WGC	FWI presented by ICES accepted by NASCO for the 2013 and 2014 advice years.
12-Nov-12	Secretariat	Request to Heads of WGC for nominations to the FWI Working Group
21-Dec-12	Secretariat	Confirmation of membership and responsibilities of FWI Working Group
02-Jan-13	FWI-CG	Agreement on Gérald Chaput as coordinator of FWI-WG for 2013
08-Jan-13	Chaput	Request for data inputs sent to Canadian and USA contacts
08-Jan-13	G. Veinott	Data submitted to coordinator for Newfoundland indicators
08-Jan-13	Saunders	Request for data submitted by Saunders for USA indicators
15-Jan-13	Oliver Cox	Data submitted to coordinator for USA indicators
17-Jan-13	Julien April	Data submitted to coordinator for Quebec indicators
22-Jan-13	Christine Hansen	Data submitted to coordinator for Scotia-Fundy indicators (Nova Scotia rivers)
23-Jan-13	Ross Jones	Data submitted to coordinator for Scotia-Fundy indicators (Bay of Fundy rivers)
25-Jan-13	Chaput	Data submitted to coordinator for Gulf indicators
26-Jan-13	Chaput	Completed FWI worksheet and prepared draft report.
26-Jan-13	Chaput	Draft report circulated to FWI-WG for approval including FWI input data, FWI worksheet and draft conclusions of assessment.
28-Jan-13	Potter	Confirmed agreement with assessment and report on behalf of EU
30-Jan-13	Saunders	Confirmed agreement with assessment and report on behalf of USA
7 Feb 13	Guldbaek	Confirmed agreement with assessment and report on behalf of Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)
7 Feb 13	Chaput	Agreed Report of FWI-Working Group sent to Peter Hutchinson, NASCO

Annex 4. Requests to provide indicator data to populate the framework spreadsheet.

From: Chaput, Gerald

Sent: January-08-13 3:20 PM

To: 'Melanie.Dionne@mrrnf.gouv.qc.ca'; Douglas, Scott; Jones, Ross (Science); Gibson, Jamie; Levy, Alex L; Veinott, Geoff; Rory Saunders - NOAA Federal

Subject: RE: Data to run the Framework of indicators for NASCO / données pour faire tourner le cadre d'indicateurs pour l'OCSAN

[Le message en français suit:](#)

Dear colleagues,

NASCO employs a Framework of Indicators (FWI) to indicate whether a full re-assessment of the multi-year catch advice for West Greenland may be required. This is based on returns and return rates of salmon to rivers in eastern North America. The framework was initially developed by ICES in 2007 and accepted by NASCO at the June 2007 meeting. The ICES Working Group updated the FWI in April 2009 and again in April 2012. The updated FWI was accepted by NASCO in June 2012 and is to be used for determining whether or not catch advice will be requested from ICES for the June 2013 meeting.

A coordination group (Rory Saunders, Ted Potter, and Kristina Guldbaek of Greenland, and myself) working on behalf of NASCO has been established. The group is asking you to update the 2012 data for the rivers included in the framework.

The attached spreadsheet contains the list of rivers which are in the framework for 2012 and I am requesting you to input the corresponding returns or return rates for the most recent year, 2012. Note I think the WGNAS erroneously included indicators in the framework which I don't think are continued into 2012 – these are the LaHave hatchery smolt return rates, the Liscomb River hatchery return rate, and the East Sheet Harbour hatchery return rates for Scotia-Fundy region. These were included in error in the FWI and their exclusion at this stage will not affect the FWI.

Some indicators were dropped relative to the previously used FWI and for Quebec, several new indicators were added.

For your information, I have included the 2008-09 data for each of the indicators which have been assembled in previous years. I have indicated to the best of my knowledge the contacts for each river. If the contact is not appropriate, please forward the request to the appropriate person or indicate to me who that person is and I will request the information.

The framework of indicators analysis is to be completed by January 31 2013, therefore, the coordination group would appreciate receiving your inputs by Wednesday, January 23, 2013. Please return your inputs to me. Please feel free to contact me or Rory if you have any questions.

[Bonjour,](#)

[NASCO emploie un cadre d'indicateurs afin d'évaluer si une ré-évaluation complète des avis multi-années pour la pêche au Groenland serait nécessaire pour une année dite. Le cadre d'indicateurs a été développé par le CIEM en 2007 et accepté par l'OCSAN en juin 2007. Le groupe de travail du CIEM a mis à jour le cadre en avril 2009 et en avril 2012 et l'OCSAN a accepté le cadre révisé en juin 2009 et en juin 2012 afin de savoir si le d'avis devrait être demandé au CIEM pour la réunion de l'OCSAN de juin 2013.](#)

[Un groupe de coordination \(Rory Saunders, Ted Potter, et and Kristina Guldbaek du Groenland et moi-même\) a été formé pour entreprendre ce travail pour l'OCSAN. Le groupe de coordination sollicite présentement vos données pour 2012 propres aux rivières/indicateurs dans le cadre. Le fichier Excel en pièce-jointe comprend la liste des rivières qui sont incluses dans le cadre de 2012. Notez que le](#)

groupe de travail a inclus dans le cadre des indicateurs qui selon mes meilleurs connaissances ne sont plus disponibles pour 2012 – les taux de retours de saumons de pisciculture pour la rivière LaHave, Liscomb et East Sheet Harbour pour la région Scotia-Fundy. Je crois que ces indicateurs ont été mis par erreur et leurs exclusions présentement n'a aucun effet sur l'utilisation du cadre.

Certains indicateurs ont été exclus du cadre révisé tandis que pour la région Québec, plusieurs indicateurs ont été ajoutés.

Pour votre information, j'ai inclus les données pour 2008-09 pour chacun des indicateurs qui ont été assemblés pour les années antérieures. A mes meilleurs connaissances, j'ai indiqué la personne contacte pour chaque rivière ou région. Si la personne indiquée n'est pas la bonne, pourriez-vous transmettre ce message à la bonne personne ou m'aviser et j'entreprendrai la communication avec elle moi-même.

On nous demande de compléter l'analyse du cadre d'indicateur pour le 31 janvier 2013 alors le groupe de coordination serait reconnaissant si le fichier pourrait nous être retourné d'ici mercredi le 23 janvier, 2013. Vous pouvez retourner vos informations à moi-même. Vous pouvez me contacter directement si vous avez des questions.

Merci

Gérald Chaput

Annex 5. Data inputs to Indicator Framework for 2008-2010, 2012.

Contact / Contacte	Geographic Area / Région	River and Indicator / Rivière et indicateur	Units / Unités	2008	2009	2010	2012	Comment / Commentaire 2012
Rory Saunders	USA	Penobscot 2SW Returns	Number of 2SW fish (wild & hatchery)	1,377	1757	861	600	
		Penobscot 1SW Returns	Number of 1SW fish (wild & hatchery)	736	197	435	13	
		Penobscot 2SW Survival (%)	Return rate (%) of hatchery smolts to 2SW fish	0.24	0.30	0.16	0.094	
		Penobscot 1SW Survival (%)	Return rate (%) of hatchery smolts to 1SW fish	0.12	0.04	0.07	0.001	
		Narraguagus Returns	Number of fish all ages and sizes	23	38	75	17	1 CRF was handled. There were 74 Redds, so the adult return number is a minimum. The redds regression estimate is 48.
Jamie Gibson (DFO) or	Scotia-Fundy	Saint John Return Large	Number of large salmon (wild)	143	337	275	71	
Ross Jones (DFO) or		Lahave Return Large	Number of large salmon (wild)	192	103	103	76	
		St. Mary's Return Large	Number of large salmon (wild)	65	99	26	NA	No St. Mary's adult assessment performed in 2012
		Baddeck Return Large	Number of large salmon (wild)	129	134	202		
Alex Levy (DFO)		North Return Large	Number of large salmon (wild)	454	468	343	240	Preliminary, based on recreational catch cards returned to date
		Saint John Survival Hatchery 2SW (%)	Return rate (%) of hatchery smolts to 2SW fish	0.05	0.14	0.13	0.066	
		Saint John Survival Hatchery 1SW (%)	Return rate (%) of hatchery smolts to 1SW fish	0.70	0.13	0.14	0.017	
		Saint John Return 1SW	Number of small salmon (wild)	796	437	1708	48	
		LaHave Return 1SW	Number of small salmon (wild)	1,158	327	586	55	
		St. Mary's Return 1SW	Number of small salmon (wild)	656	265	137	NA	No St. Mary's adult assessment performed in 2012
		North Return 1SW	Number of small salmon (wild)	176	95	73		
		Lahave Survival 2SW (%)	Return rate (%) of hatchery smolts to 2SW fish					
		Lahave Survival 1SW (%)	Return rate (%) of hatchery smolts to 1SW fish					
		Liscomb Survival Hatchery 2SW (%)	Return rate (%) of hatchery smolts to 2SW fish					
		East Sheet Harbour Hatchery Survival 2	Return rate (%) of hatchery smolts to 2SW fish					
Scott Douglas (DFO)	Gulf	Miramichi Return 2SW	Number of 2SW fish	11,500	13,100	8,517	9,500	69% 2SW in 13,600 large salmon
		Miramichi Return 1SW	Number of 1SW fish	31,600	12,370	50,200	8,000	
		Margaree Return Small	Number of small salmon (all)	1,311	276	na		
Mélanie Dionne (MRNF)	Quebec	Cascapédia (Q1) Return Large	Retour de pluribermarin / number of large salmon	1,119	1,723	2,256	1999	
		Bonaventure (Q1) Return Large	Retour de pluribermarin / number of large salmon	753	1,430	1,851	1001	
		Grande Rivière (Q2) Return Large	Retour de pluribermarin / number of large salmon	337	442	577	261	
		Saint-Jean (Q2) Return Large	Retour de pluribermarin / number of large salmon	605	722	898	530	
		Dartmouth (Q2) Return Large	Retour de pluribermarin / number of large salmon	348	653	580	661	
		Madeleine (Q3) Return Large	Retour de pluribermarin / number of large salmon	623	620	620	737	
		Sainte-Anne (Q3) Return Large	Retour de pluribermarin / number of large salmon	584	632	731	571	
		Mitis (Q3) Return Large	Retour de pluribermarin / number of large salmon	464	945	470		
		De la Trinité (Q7) Return Large	Retour de pluribermarin / number of large salmon	328	216	258	285	
		Godbout Return Large	Retour de pluribermarin / number of large salmon				598	
		York (Q2) Return Return Large	Retour de pluribermarin / number of large salmon				1211	
		Grande Rivière (Q2) Return Small	Retour de madeleineau / return of small salmon				112	
		Saint-Jean (Q2) Return Small	Retour de madeleineau / return of small salmon				171	
		Godbout Return Small	Retour de madeleineau / return of small salmon				273	
		De la Trinité (Q7) Return Small	Retour de madeleineau / return of small salmon				263	
		De la Trinité (Q7) Survival Large (%)	Taux de retour redibermarin (%) / return rate (%) large salmon				0.62	
		De la Trinité (Q7) Survival Small (%)	Taux de retour (%) madeleineau / return rate (%) small salmon				0.60	
	Saint-Jean (Q2) Survival Small (%)	Taux de retour (%) madeleineau / return rate (%) small salmon				0.38		
Geoff Veinott (DFO)	Newfoundland	Terra Nova Return Small	Number of small salmon (wild)	3,575	2,503	4,147		
		Exploits Return Small	Number of small salmon (wild)	31,823	32,252	39,130	25349	
		Middle Brook Return Small	Number of small salmon (wild)	2,167	1,842	2,574	2828	
		Gander Return Small	Number of small salmon (wild)	22,442	18,883	23,184	22652	
		Torrent Return Small	Number of small salmon (wild)	5,847	2,758	4,861	3950	
		Western Arm Brook Survival Small (%)	Return rate (%) of wild smolts to small salmon	11.6	6.1	9.6		

Annex 6. Comments of data providers with respect to indicators in each area.

Newfoundland Region

From: Veinott, Geoff

Sent: January-08-13 3:34 PM

To: Chaput, Gerald

Subject: FW: Data to run the Framework of indicators for NASCO / données pour faire tourner le cadre d'indicateurs pour l'OCSAN

Hi Gerald, NL rivers updated. Just for the record; we don't do a count on Gander. It is estimated based on a count on a tributary (Salmon Brook) and therefore the Gander count has quite a lot of uncertainty around it.

Geoff

USA indicators

From: Cox, Oliver N [mailto:Oliver.N.Cox@maine.gov]

Sent: January-15-13 12:19 PM

To: Rory Saunders - NOAA Federal; Trial, Joan

Cc: Chaput, Gerald

Subject: RE: Data to run the Framework of indicators for NASCO / données pour faire tourner le cadre d'indicateurs pour l'OCSAN

Rory and Gerald,

I have filled in the Maine section of your spreadsheet. There is a comment next to the Narraguagus data. We counted 18 returns (17 sea run and 1 captive reared); however, we documented 74 redds. It appears that we had a lot of returns ascend the dam during high flows. Based on the redds regression, the number of returns is closer to 48.

Let me know if you have any question concerning the data.

Oliver

Oliver Cox
Maine Department of Marine Resources
Division of Sea Run Fisheries and Habitat
650 State Street, Bangor, Maine 04401
207.941.4487

Scotia-Fundy area

From: Hansen, Christine

Sent: January-22-13 1:36 PM

To: Chaput, Gerald

Cc: Levy, Alex L; Gibson, Jamie

Subject: RE: Data to run the Framework of indicators for NASCO / données pour faire tourner le cadre d'indicateurs pour l'OCSAN

Hi Gérald,

I have attached the updated WGC-FWI excel file. It now includes estimates of 2012 LaHave Return Large, LaHave Return 1SW, and North Return Large. The seining/snorkeling assessment of St. Mary's was not conducted in 2012, so the St. Mary's returns have been assigned an 'NA' in the spreadsheet.

Cheers,

Christine.

Annex 7. Indicator Framework sheet with 2012 analysis.

Catch Advice		Catch option > 0 (Yes = 1, No = 0)		0								
Overall Recommendation												
No Significant Change Identified by Indicators												
Geographic Area	River/ Indicator	2012	Ratio Value to Threshold	Threshold	True Low	True High	Indicator State	Probability of Correct Assignment	Indicator Score	Management Objective Met?	Comment 2012	
USA	Penobscot 2SW Returns	600	42%	1415	100%	92%	-1	1	-1			
	Penobscot 1SW Returns	13	3%	377	83%	88%	-1	0.83	-0.83			
	Penobscot 2SW Survival (%)	0.094	41%	0.23	100%	60%	-1	1	-1			
	Penobscot 1SW Survival (%)	0.001	1%	0.09	85%	73%	-1	0.85	-0.85			
	Narraguagus Returns	17	17%	100	95%	61%	-1	0.95	-0.95			
	<i>possible range</i>					-0.93	0.75					
	Average			21%						-0.93	No	
Scotia-Fundy	Saint John Return Large	71	2%	3,329	96%	100%	-1	0.96	-0.96			
	Lahave Return Large	76	27%	285	77%	85%	-1	0.77	-0.77			
	St. Mary's Return Large			221	100%	73%					No assessment	
	North Return Large	240	34%	712	95%	67%	-1	0.95	-0.95			
	Saint John Return 1SW	48	2%	2,276	86%	80%	-1	0.86	-0.86			
	LaHave Return 1SW	55	3%	1,679	94%	67%	-1	0.94	-0.94			
	St. Mary's Return 1SW			2,038	95%	93%					No assessment	
	Saint John Survival 2SW (%)	0.066	30%	0.22	95%	81%	-1	0.95	-0.95			
	Lahave Survival 2SW (%)			0.24	81%	81%					Excluded	
	Saint John Survival 1SW (%)	0.017	2%	0.76	86%	73%	-1	0.86	-0.86			
	Lahave Survival 1SW (%)			1.44	92%	78%					Excluded	
	Liscomb Survival 2SW (%)			0.05	86%	91%					Excluded	
	East Sheet Harbour Survival 2SW (%)			0.02	67%	82%					Excluded	
<i>possible range</i>					-0.90	0.79						
Average			14%						-0.90	No		
Gulf	Miramichi Return 2SW	9,500	60%	15,800	100%	85%	-1	1	-1			
	Miramichi Return 1SW	8,000	19%	41,790	89%	67%	-1	0.89	-0.89			
	<i>possible range</i>					-0.95	0.76					
	Average			40%						-0.95	No	
Quebec	Cascapédia Return Large	1999	88%	2,280	69%	92%	-1	0.69	-0.69			
	Bonaventure Return Large	1001	68%	1,479	75%	81%	-1	0.75	-0.75			
	Grande Rivière Return Large	261	59%	442	100%	94%	-1	1	-1			
	Saint-Jean Return Large	530	70%	758	86%	89%	-1	0.86	-0.86			
	Dartmouth Return Large	661	87%	756	86%	89%	-1	0.86	-0.86			
	Madeleine Return Large	737	113%	653	70%	93%	1	0.93	0.93			
	Sainte-Anne Return Large	571	132%	433	67%	88%	1	0.88	0.88			
	Godbout Return Large	598	93%	641	86%	100%	-1	0.86	-0.86			
	De la Trinite Return Large	285	74%	385	75%	100%	-1	0.75	-0.75			
	York Return Return Large	1211	86%	1405	63%	83%	-1	0.63	-0.63			
	Grande Rivière Return Small	112	56%	199	59%	80%	-1	0.59	-0.59			
	Saint-Jean Return Small	171	43%	394	53%	80%	-1	0.53	-0.53			
	Godbout Return Small	273	54%	508	85%	92%	-1	0.85	-0.85			
	De la Trinite Return Small	263	66%	399	89%	83%	-1	0.89	-0.89			
	De la Trinite Survival Large (%)	0.62	127%	0.49	88%	96%	1	0.96	0.96			
	De la Trinite Survival Small (%)	0.60	40%	1.49	63%	89%	-1	0.63	-0.63			
	Saint-Jean Survival Small (%)	0.38	53%	0.72	100%	64%	-1	1	-1			
<i>possible range</i>					-0.77	0.88						
Average			77%						-0.48	No		
Newfoundland	Exploits Return Small	25349	102%	24,924	83%	56%	1	0.56	0.56			
	Middle Brook Return Small	2828	151%	1,868	84%	63%	1	0.63	0.63			
	Gander Return Small	22652	122%	18,521	79%	63%	1	0.63	0.63			
	Torrent Return Small	3950	95%	4,154	94%	64%	-1	0.94	-0.94			
	<i>possible range</i>					-0.85	0.62					
	Average			118%						0.22	Yes	
Labrador	<i>possible range</i>											
	Average								NA	Unknown		
Southern NEAC	<i>possible range</i>											
	Average								NA	Unknown		

Annex 8. Review and confirmation of results by members of the Framework of Indicators Working Group for West Greenland Commission.

From: Chaput, Gerald
Sent: January-26-13 3:08 PM
To: 'Ted Potter (Cefas)'; Rory Saunders; krgu@nanoq.gl
Subject: RE: Results and draft report of the FWI for 2012

Hello,

The 2012 FWI data from North American regions were received and compiled into the FWI Worksheet. A draft report has been prepared and is attached. I am including with this email the Excel spreadsheet that contains the data inputs and the FWI Worksheet.

The conclusion is that there has not been a significant change in the indicators and a re-assessment is not required.

I would appreciate if you could review the report and the spreadsheet and return your comments and edits to me by Wednesday Jan. 30, 2013 so that we can meet the requested deadline of January 31, 2013.

If you are able to respond by Jan. 30, please let me know along with an expected date of response. I will then notify NASCO accordingly.

Thank you for your contributions,

Best regards
Gérald Chaput

Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans | Ministère des pêches et des océans
P.O. Box 5030 | C.P. 5030
Moncton
NB | N-B
Canada
E1C 9B6

Gerald.Chaput@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

Telephone | Téléphone : 506 851 2022

Facsimile | Télécopieur : 506 851 2620

From: Ted Potter (Cefas) [mailto:ted.potter@cefass.co.uk]
Sent: January-28-13 6:34 AM
To: Chaput, Gerald
Cc: Rory Saunders; krgu@nanoq.gl
Subject: FW: Results and draft report of the FWI for 2012

Hi Gérald

Thank you again for agreeing to act as coordinator for the FWI Working Group this year.

I have reviewed the data and the draft Working Group report and can confirm that I agree with the overall conclusion that the FWI does not show that there has been a significant change in the indicators used, and therefore a re-assessment of the ICES management advice for the 2013 fishery is not required.

I have made a few minor editorial suggestions on the text.

Best regards
Ted

From: Rory Saunders - NOAA Federal [mailto:rory.saunders@noaa.gov]
Sent: January-30-13 3:10 PM
To: Ted Potter (Cefas)
Cc: Chaput, Gerald; krgu@nanoq.gl
Subject: Re: FW: Results and draft report of the FWI for 2012

Hello Gerald:

Thank you for agreeing to do this again. Everything appears to be in order (including Ted's edits), and I agree with the conclusion. Thank you very much.

RS

From: Kristina Guldbæk [mailto:KRGU@nanoq.gl]
Sent: February-07-13 12:36 PM
To: Chaput, Gerald; Ted Potter (Cefas); Rory Saunders; hq@nasco.int
Cc: Emanuel Rosing; Officiel post til APNN Naalakkersuisoqarfik
Subject: SV: Results and draft report of the FWI for 2012

Dear all,

I can confirm that we here in Greenland have no objections or comment to the conclusion of the draft report from Gerald. That no re-assessment of the ICES management advice for the West Greenland salmon fishery 2013 is required.

I apologize for the late answer. With an upcoming election for the Greenlandic parliament, things have been very busy here at the office.

All the best from a snowy and windy Nuuk.

Med venlig hilsen . Best regards

Kristina Guldbæk
AC-Fuldmægtig . Head of Section



NAALAKKERSUISUT
GOVERNMENT OF GREENLAND

Departementet for Fiskeri, Fangst og Landbrug . Ministry of Fisheries, Hunting and Agriculture
Direkte. direct: +299 345329
Mbl. cellphone: +299 253671
Email: krgu@nanoq.gl

[Http://www.nanoq.gl](http://www.nanoq.gl)