

Agenda item 7.1  
For adoption

**Council**

**CNL(12)12**

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



## CNL(12)12

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

1. In 2011, the Council considered the report of the 'Next Steps for NASCO' Review Group. The Group had *inter alia*, recommended that for the next cycle of reporting there should be some streamlining, with greater emphasis on monitoring and evaluation of activities with clearly identifiable, measurable outcomes and timescales. It was further recommended that future Focus Area Reports should be developed around specific themes and that progress on Implementation Plans could be assessed through Annual Reports which would be reviewed. The Council had established a Working Group to develop a framework for such future reporting and evaluation. This Group met in London during 28 – 30 November 2011 under the Chairmanship of Mr Ted Potter (EU) and its report is attached.
2. The Working Group consider that Implementation Plans are the key document in the next cycle of reporting which should provide a simple and transparent approach to report on progress in implementing NASCO's agreements etc. The success of the next reporting cycle will depend on the new Implementation Plans specifying clearly the actions each jurisdiction plans to take over a five-year period, the expected outcomes and the approach to monitoring, including enforcement. These plans should be reviewed. The Group recommends Annual Progress Reports that would also be reviewed, identifying the status of actions within the Implementation Plans with evaluation to assess if the commitments in the plans have been fulfilled and whether progress is being made towards achievement of the objectives.
3. To assist jurisdictions in developing their Implementation Plans and Annual Progress Reports, templates were developed by the Group together with guidance on the format and content of Plans and Reports and on their evaluation. A schedule for submission, review and distribution of these plans and reports is proposed.
4. The Group also recommended a new cycle of Focus Area Reports, developed around specific themes in order to encourage an exchange of information and in-depth consideration of approaches being used to address a particular threat to salmon stocks or challenge to management. In future, they could be called Special Session reports and would not be reviewed. A number of possible topics for Special Session reports are proposed.
5. The Council is asked to consider the report of the Working Group on Future Reporting under Implementation Plans and Evaluation of these Reports and decide on appropriate action.

Secretary  
Edinburgh  
4 April 2012



## WGFR(11)8

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

*NEAFC Headquarters, Berners Street, London, UK  
28 - 30 November 2011*

#### **1. Opening of Meeting**

- 1.1 The Chairman of the Working Group, Mr Ted Potter (European Union) opened the meeting and welcomed participants to London. He thanked the NEAFC Secretariat for hosting the meeting and for the excellent facilities provided. He indicated that apologies had been received from Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) and Norway who could not be represented at the meeting. He indicated that the Working Group had been established by the Council, in accordance with the recommendation of the 'Next Steps' Review Group, in order to develop a framework for reporting and evaluation that improves on the process used in the first cycle and assists jurisdictions in implementing NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. He noted that the Group would need to take account of the deliberations in the Council and the findings of previous Review Groups. A key outcome from the meeting would be a streamlined reporting system with templates to assist jurisdictions in developing their Implementation Plans and reporting on progress and guidelines on their completion and on the review process. He indicated that before it is presented to the Council, the Group's report would be considered by the External Performance Review Panel so that it could provide feedback to the Council. He also reminded the Group that the Council had not yet resolved its future role with regard to aquaculture.
- 1.2 The Secretary noted that the task before the Working Group was important because during the stakeholder consultation meetings the feedback received had indicated that while NASCO had developed good agreements there was a need for better progress with their implementation. Furthermore, Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) had suggested that the development of Implementation Plans and reporting and evaluation of progress would provide a mechanism to assess 'fairness and balance' in the measures being taken by Greenland and Faroes and those taken by States of Origin. There had been suggestions at NASCO's 2011 Annual Meeting that the efforts of States of Origin on salmon conservation would be a factor during the negotiation of new measures for the Greenland and Faroes fisheries in 2012. He noted that the challenge for the Working Group would be to find a way to streamline the reporting and evaluation process to ensure that NASCO receives the information it needs without placing an excessive burden on the Parties.
- 1.3 A list of participants is contained in Annex 1.

## **2. Adoption of Agenda**

2.1 The Working Group adopted its agenda, WGFR(11)3 (Annex 2).

## **3. Consideration of the Terms of Reference**

3.1 The Working Group's Terms of Reference are contained in the Report of the Twenty-Eighth Annual Meeting of the Council, CNL(11)43, and are as follows:

- (a) Develop new guidelines for the preparation of Implementation Plans, drawing on document NSTF(06)10 but with greater emphasis on monitoring and evaluation and including criteria for acceptability, and guidelines for the preparation of Annual Reports. These guidelines should describe the content and format of these reports, the timing for submission of these reports, and the timing and process for distribution of these reports;
- (b) Develop a process for the review of Implementation Plans and Annual Reports including the criteria to be used for the reviews, the timing of the reviews, the composition of the Review Groups, and arrangements for reporting on the reviews;
- (c) Develop a schedule for the development and review of Implementation Plans, submission and review of the Annual Reports, and planning for and conduct of theme-based FAR Special Sessions.

3.2 The Working Group reviewed its Terms of Reference and noted that these reflected the Council's initial thinking on future planning and reporting, in the light of the review of the 'Next Steps' process. Thus, the Council had indicated that the Implementation Plans might be the key documents in the second cycle of reporting and that reporting on progress in implementing the actions detailed in these Plans would be through Annual Progress Reports. Both the Implementation Plans and Annual Reports might be subject to critical review. The Group noted that if future reporting is through Annual Progress Reports there would be a need to improve on the current process and ensure there was a focus on the outcomes of the actions detailed in the Implementation Plans. The Group also noted that the Council had indicated that in the second cycle of reporting, the Focus Area Reports might be more themed-based and not subject to review. The Group discussed these proposals and concurred with this general approach.

## **4. Review of Previous Reporting and Evaluation Procedures**

4.1 The Secretary presented an overview of a document, NS(11)3, which had been tabled at the 'Next Steps' Review Group meeting and which provided a review of the process used for reporting and evaluation of the reports. The Review Group had concluded that the first cycle of reporting under the 'Next Steps' process had created a sound basis for assessing the measures being taken in accordance with NASCO's agreements and had highlighted where additional actions are needed. It had led to a

valuable exchange of information among the jurisdictions. However, while the first cycle of reporting had focused on the process, the Review Group had agreed that the next cycle should build on the strong foundation that has been laid and focus on: changes since the last reporting; actions taken and measurable outcomes; and furthering information exchange.

## **5. Future Preparation of Implementation Plans**

- 5.1 The 'Next Steps' Review Group had proposed that Implementation Plans would be the key document in the next reporting cycle. In these plans, each jurisdiction would describe the activities and actions it intends to undertake over a five year period and emphasis should be given to clearly identifiable measurable outcomes and timescales and monitoring and evaluation of activities. The 'Next Steps' Review Group had suggested that it would assist the streamlining of future reporting if templates were developed to facilitate the development of consistent plans and reports.
- 5.2 The Working Group discussed this approach and agreed that it provided a sound way forward. The Group considers that the purpose of Implementation Plans is to provide a simple and transparent approach for reporting on the implementation of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. It noted that the success of the next reporting cycle would depend on new Implementation Plans specifying clearly the actions (i.e. specific tangible activities) each jurisdiction plans to take over a five year period, the expected outcomes (i.e. a measure of success of the action) and the approach to monitoring the effectiveness of the actions, including enforcement. It also agreed that there was a need for Implementation Plans to be presented in a clear and straight-forward manner so that they are easily understood by both managers and stakeholders. To assist jurisdictions in developing their Implementation Plans, the Review Group developed a template, WGFR(11)4 (Annex 3). This template includes sections on: the general status of stocks and their management; details of the threats and management challenges relating to management of fisheries, habitat protection and restoration, and aquaculture and related activities; and the actions to be taken to address these threats and challenges and the expected outcomes.
- 5.3 The Group also developed guidance on the content and format of Implementation Plans and a schedule for their submission and review and this is contained in section 2 of document WGFR(11)5 (Annex 4). This guidance should be made available to the jurisdictions together with the template. Furthermore, as the new Implementation Plans are expected to address issues on which additional actions were recommended in the first cycle of reviews, the Group suggests that the Secretariat be asked to compile these recommendations for each jurisdiction and send them to the jurisdictions at the same time as the template and guidance. The Group also recommends that the next cycle of reporting should commence with the preparation and review of Implementation Plans in 2012/2013 and that these Plans cover the period 2013-2018.
- 5.4 The Group was aware that a concern had been raised by the International Salmon Farmers' Association that the NGOs had been able to circulate aquaculture FARs widely before the industry had seen them. The Aquaculture FAR Review Group had

proposed that, for the second cycle, reports should be made available on the NASCO website. The Working Group agrees with this recommendation and has proposed appropriate timing in sections 2.4 and 3.3 of document WGFR(11)5 (Annex 4).

## **6. Evaluation of Implementation Plans**

6.1 The Group discussed the arrangements for evaluation of Implementation Plans. The purpose of this evaluation would be to ensure that, as far as possible, the Implementation Plans provide a fair and equitable description of the actions that each jurisdiction plans to take to implement NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. The Group recommends a two-stage process involving an initial screening by the Secretariat, to ensure that time is not wasted on a full critical review of plans that contain significant omissions, and then an examination by a Review Group to evaluate the quality of the information provided. At either stage, plans may be returned to jurisdictions to address shortcomings.

6.2 The Group recommends that the membership of the Review Group should be modified from the first cycle to include one more representative from the Parties. The Review Group would, therefore, comprise:

- one representative from 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 Group recommends that members of the Review Group should normally be appointed for a period up to three years to ensure continuity (see also paragraph 8.1 below).

6.3 The Group considered that the review procedures used in the first reporting cycle had been fair and effective and recommends that they be adopted for the next cycle of Implementation Plans.

6.4 The Review Group developed guidance on the evaluation of Implementation Plans that is contained in section 2 of document WGFR(11)5 (Annex 4). The Group discussed whether the report of the Implementation Plan Review Group should be presented to the Council in a Special Session or in plenary. Special Sessions are more informal and allow for interventions by all delegates but the Group concluded that as it is the Parties' responsibility to report to NASCO it would be more appropriate for Heads of Delegations to respond to the assessments of the Implementation Plans. The Group also discussed whether the review should involve a quantitative or qualitative approach and recommends that a three-tier system should be used as follows:

1. 'Satisfactory answers/information';
2. 'Unclear or incomplete answers/information'; and
3. 'Clear omissions or inadequacies in answers/information'.



- 6.5 After submission, the Secretariat would conduct an initial review and any Implementation Plan considered to contain clear omissions would be returned to the jurisdiction concerned with clear guidance on the additional information required. The purpose of this initial review is to avoid time being wasted by the Review Group on incomplete Plans.
- 6.6 All Implementation Plans, including re-submitted plans, would then be subject to critical review by the Review Group. Any Implementation Plans having sections scored in categories 2 and 3 would be returned to the jurisdiction for re-drafting with clear guidance on the improvements required. These comments would not be made public. Where the Review Group considered that Implementation Plans still contained sections scored in category 3 after re-submission, these would be highlighted in the Review Group's report to Council. The jurisdictions would then be given the opportunity to respond to the comments during the Council meeting and to update their Implementation Plan after the Council Meeting.

## **7. Future Preparation of Annual Progress Reports**

- 7.1 The 'Next Steps' Review Group had proposed that jurisdictions should provide an Annual Progress Report identifying the status of actions within their Implementation Plan as well as available data on monitoring the effectiveness of those actions and that these reports should be evaluated to review if the commitments in the plan have been fulfilled and whether progress was being made towards achievement of the stated objectives.
- 7.2 The Group considers that 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.
- 7.3 The Group reviewed the current format for the Annual Returns to NASCO and used this as a basis to develop a new template for the Annual Progress Reports, WGFR(11)6 (Annex 5). In particular, it was agreed that the original guidance on completion should be incorporated within the requests for information and new elements were included to allow for progress to be reported on each action in the Implementation Plan, the expected outcome from the action, and the results of monitoring of the effectiveness of the action. With regard to catch statistics, the Group recommends that in future the Council ask that reported and unreported catches be provided to NASCO, not only as totals but also divided between in-river, estuarine and coastal catches as this information will assist in consideration of progress in the management of fisheries.
- 7.4 The Group also developed guidance on the content and format of Annual Progress Reports and a schedule for their submission and review, and this is contained in

section 3 of document WGFR(11)5 (Annex 4). To aid completion of the template, the Group recommends that the Secretariat incorporate the actions specified in the Implementation Plans in the Annual Progress Report template for each jurisdiction

- 7.5 The Group noted that under the Convention, the North American Commission has a broader mandate than the North-East Atlantic and West Greenland Commissions. The reporting under the Convention by Members of the NAC is consequently broader than for the other two Commissions and includes information in relation to by-catch of salmon and alteration of fishing patterns. While the Group is aware that these aspects are included in the request for advice from ICES, it wishes to bring this difference in reporting requirements to the Council's attention.

## **8. Future Evaluation of Annual Progress Reports**

- 8.1 The Working Group recommends that, as with the Implementation Plans, the Annual Progress Reports should be subject to a critical evaluation process but realises that the time available for this will be limited to a period of less than two months, because the catch statistics are not available until March. It is essential, therefore, that reminders are sent out by the Secretariat well before the deadline and that jurisdictions submit their Annual Progress Reports by the proposed deadline of 1 April. A critical evaluation of the progress that has been made on the actions in the Implementation Plan will be conducted by the Review Group appointed by the Council. Where there are shortcomings, the Review Group will develop a list of questions to be sent to the jurisdiction for response at the Annual Meeting. The Group proposes that the reporting to the Council on the outcome of these evaluations be conducted in plenary session and not Special Sessions (see paragraph 6.4 above).
- 8.2 The Review Group developed guidance on the evaluation of Annual Progress Reports which is contained in section 3 of document WGFR(11)5 (Annex 4).

## **9. Planning for Theme-based (previously Focus Area Report) Special Sessions**

- 9.1 The 'Next Steps' Review Group had suggested that there might be a new cycle of Focus Area Reports but that these should be developed around specific themes. For example, during the year when the focus area is habitat protection and restoration the theme might be an exchange of information on fish passage issues with reports solicited from jurisdictions and presented during the Special Session.
- 9.2 The purpose of these Special Sessions is to encourage an exchange of information and more in-depth consideration of the approaches being used to address a particular threat to salmon stocks or challenge to management. The Group considered that, given the very different nature and purpose of these theme-based reports, it would be confusing to continue to refer to them as Focus Area Reports and agreed to describe them as theme-based Special Session reports.

9.3 The Working Group considered that theme-based Special Sessions could be helpful to NASCO. The Group recommends that at the Annual Meeting a year prior to the planned Special Session, the Council should determine the theme of the Special Session and appoint a Steering Committee comprising two representatives from the Parties and one representative from the NGOs, with expertise relating to the theme. The Steering Committee would work with the Secretariat to plan for the Special Session and define its objectives and would invite experts from within the Parties and, where appropriate, from outside the NASCO community to participate in the Special Session. Invited contributors would be asked to provide papers for the Special Session which will be distributed with the mailing of Council papers prior to the Annual Meeting. These contributions would not be subject to evaluation. Contributors would make presentations at the Special Session which would be chaired by a member of the Steering Committee. Following the Annual Meeting, the Steering Committee would prepare a report of the Special Session, synthesising the management implications.

9.4 The Group noted that it had been the Council's intention to hold a Special Session on 'Incorporating socio-economic factors in management decisions' at its 2012 Annual Meeting but that this was likely to be postponed until 2013. The Working Group considered that the following topics would be useful subjects for subsequent Special Sessions; the Group's initial priorities are marked (\*):

*Management of Salmon Fisheries*

- Management of mixed-stock fisheries\*;
- Catch and release.

*Habitat Protection and Restoration*

- Managing salmon under a changing climate\*;
- Fish passage at hydro-electric facilities\*;
- Water use and management.

*Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers and Transgenics*

- Developments in containment technology including closed containment systems\*;
- Integrated sea lice control on fish farms;
- Stock rebuilding programmes including approaches to stocking.

*Others*

- Managing stock diversity;
- Outreach and education programmes.

## **10. Arrangements for Presentation of the Group's Report at the 2012 Special Session**

10.1 The Working Group agreed that its report to the Council at the 2012 Annual Meeting should be presented by its Chairman and that the representatives of the Parties and the NGOs on the Group would contribute to the discussion of the Group's findings. The Working Group did not feel that there would be any benefit from presenting its

findings in a Special Session since the decisions on the future reporting arrangements would be a matter for the Council to agree.

**11. Any Other Business**

11.1 There was no other business.

**12. Report of the Meeting**

12.1 The Working Group agreed the report of its meeting.

**13. Close of Meeting**

13.1 The Chairman thanked the participants for their contributions and closed the meeting.

***List of Participants***

Mr Jaakko Erkinaro	Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute, Finland
Dr Peter Hutchinson	NASCO Secretariat, UK
Mr Ted Potter (Chair)	CEFAS, UK
Mr Chris Poupard	Chairman of NASCO's NGOs, UK
Dr Sergey Prusov	PINRO, Russian Federation
Ms Susan Rocque	Fisheries and Oceans, Canada
Mr Rory Saunders	NOAA Fisheries, US
Ms Sue Scott	Atlantic Salmon Federation, Canada
Dr Malcolm Windsor	NASCO Secretariat, UK



**WGFR(11)3**

*Agenda*

1. Opening of Meeting
2. Adoption of Agenda
3. Consideration of the Terms of Reference
4. Review of Previous Reporting and Evaluation Procedures
5. Future preparation of Implementation Plans (IPs), including:
  - a. content and format
  - b. criteria for acceptability
  - c. preparation of guidelines
6. Future evaluation of Implementation Plans (IPs), including:
  - a. composition of Review Groups
  - b. criteria to be used for reviews
  - c. arrangements for reporting on the review
  - d. schedule for submission, review and distribution of IPs
7. Future preparation of Annual Reports (ARs), including:
  - a. content and format
  - b. criteria for acceptability of ARs
  - c. preparation of guidelines
8. Future evaluation of Annual Reports (ARs), including
  - a. AR review process
  - b. criteria to be used for reviews
  - c. arrangements for reporting on the reviews
  - d. schedule for submission, review and distribution of ARs
9. Planning for theme-based Focus Area Report (FAR) Special Sessions, including:
  - a. potential topics
  - b. content and format of FARs
  - c. schedule for submission of FARs
  - d. conduct of Special Sessions
  - e. reporting on Special Sessions
10. Arrangements for presentation of the Group's report at the 2012 Special Session
11. Any Other Business
12. Report of the Meeting
13. Close of Meeting





**WGFR(11)4**

***NASCO Implementation Plan for the period 2013-18***

***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.***

*Questions in the Implementation Plan refer to 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’).*

<b>Party:</b>	
<b>Jurisdiction/Region:</b>	

<b>1. Introduction</b>		
<b>1.1 What are the objectives for the management of wild salmon? (Max 200 words)</b>		
<b>1.2 What reference points (e.g. conservation limits, management targets or other measures of abundance) are used to assess the status of stocks? (Max 200 words) (Reference: Sections 2.4 and 2.5 of the Fisheries Guidelines)</b>		
<b>1.3 To provide a baseline for future comparison, what is the current status of stocks relative to the reference points described in 1.2, and how are threatened and endangered stocks identified?</b>		
Category	Description of category and link to reference points	No. rivers
1		
2		
3		
4		
<i>Insert additional categories as required</i>		
<b>TOTAL:</b>		

Additional comments:	
<b>1.4</b>	<b>How is stock diversity (e.g. genetics, age composition, run-timing, etc.) taken into account in the management of salmon stocks?</b> <i>(Max 200 words)</i>
<b>1.5</b>	<b>To provide a baseline for future comparison, what is the current and potential quantity of salmon habitat?</b> <i>(Max 200 words)</i> <i>(Reference: Section 3.1 of the Habitat Guidelines)</i>
<b>1.6</b>	<b>What is the current extent of freshwater and marine salmonid aquaculture?</b>
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.	
<b>1.7</b>	<b>To aid in the interpretation of this Implementation Plan, have complete data on rivers within the jurisdiction been provided for the NASCO rivers database?</b> <i>Yes/no/comments</i>

<b>2. Fisheries Management:</b>
<p><b>2.1 What are the objectives for the management of the fisheries for wild salmon? (Max. 200 words)</b></p>
<p><b>2.2 What is the decision-making process for fisheries management, including predetermined decisions taken under different stock conditions (e.g. the stock level at which fisheries are closed)? (Max. 200 words)</b>  <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></p>
<p><b>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? (Max 200 words.)</b>  <i>(Reference: Section 2.7 of the Fisheries Guidelines)</i></p>
<p><b>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? (Max. 300 words in total)</b>  <i>(Reference: Section 2.8 of the Fisheries Guidelines)</i></p>
(a)
(b)
(c)

<b>2.5 How are socio-economic factors taken into account in making decisions on fisheries management?</b> (Max. 200 words) (Reference: Section 2.9 of the Fisheries Guidelines)	
<b>2.6 What is the current level of unreported catch and what measures are being taken to reduce this?</b> (Max. 200 words) (Reference: Section 2.2 of the Fisheries Guidelines and the Minimum Standard)	
<b>2.7 What are the main threats to wild salmon and challenges for management in relation to fisheries, taking into account the Fisheries Guidelines and the specific issues on which action was recommended for this jurisdiction in the Final Report of the Fisheries Management FAR Review Group, (CNL(09)11)?</b>	
Threat/ challenge F1	
Threat/ challenge F2	
Threat/ challenge F3	
Threat/ challenge F4	

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

<b>2.8 What actions are planned to address each of the above threats and challenges in the five year period to 2018?</b>		
<b>Action F1:</b>	Description of action:	
	Planned timescale:	
	Expected outcome:	
	Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement:	
<b>Action F2:</b>	Description of action:	
	Planned timescale:	
	Expected outcome:	
	Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement:	

<b>Action F3:</b>	Description of action:	
	Planned timescale:	
	Expected outcome:	
	Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement:	
<b>Action F4:</b>	Description of action:	
	Planned timescale:	
	Expected outcome:	
	Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement:	

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

<b>3. Protection and Restoration of Salmon Habitat:</b>	
<b>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)</b> <i>(Reference: Section 3 of the Habitat Guidelines)</i>	
<b>3.2 How are socio-economic factors taken into account in making decisions on salmon habitat management? (Max. 200 words)</b> <i>(Reference: Section 3.9 of the Habitats Guidelines)</i>	
<b>3.3 What are the main threats to wild salmon and challenges for management in relation to estuarine and freshwater habitat taking into account the Habitat Guidelines, and the specific issues on which action was recommended for this jurisdiction in the Final Report of the Habitat Protection, Restoration and Enhancement FAR Review Group, (CNL(10)11)?</b>	
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 actions are planned to address each of the above threats and challenges in the five year period to 2018?**

<b>Action H1:</b>	Description of action:	
	Planned timescale:	
	Expected outcome:	
	Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement:	
<b>Action H2:</b>	Description of action:	
	Planned timescale:	
	Expected outcome:	
	Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement:	
<b>Action H3:</b>	Description of action:	
	Planned timescale:	
	Expected outcome:	
	Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement:	
<b>Action H4:</b>	Description of action:	
	Planned timescale:	
	Expected outcome:	
	Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement:	

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

<b>4. Management of Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers, and Transgenics:</b>
<b>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)</b>
(a)
(b)
<b>4.2 What progress can be demonstrated towards the achievement of the international goals for effective sea lice management such that there is no increase in sea lice loads or lice-induced mortality of wild stocks attributable to sea lice? (Max. 200 words)</b> <i>(Reference: BMP Guidance)</i>
<b>4.3 What progress can be demonstrated towards the achievement of the international goals for ensuring 100% containment in (a) freshwater and (b) marine aquaculture facilities? (Max. 200 words each)</b> <i>(Reference: BMP Guidance)</i>
(a)
(b)



<b>4.4 What progress has been made to implement NASCO guidance on introductions, transfers and stocking? (Max. 200 words)</b> <i>(Reference: Articles 5 and 6 and Annex 4 of the Williamsburg Resolution)</i>	
<b>4.5 What is the policy/strategy on use of transgenic salmon? (Max. 200 words)</b> <i>(Reference: Article 7 and Annex 5 of the Williamsburg Resolution)</i>	
<b>4.6 What measures are in place to prevent the introduction or further spread of <i>Gyrodactylus salaris</i>? (Max. 200 words)</b>	
<b>4.7 What are the main threats to wild salmon and challenges for management in relation to aquaculture, introductions and transfers, and transgenics, taking into account the Williamsburg Resolution, the BMP Guidance and specific issues on which action was recommended for this jurisdiction in the Final Report of the Aquaculture FAR Review Group, (CNL(11)11)?</b>	
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.*

<b>4.8 What actions are planned to address each of the above threats and challenges in the five year period to 2018?</b>		
<b>Action A1:</b>	Description of action:	
	Planned timescale:	
	Expected outcome:	
	Approach for monitoring effectiveness:	

<b>Action A2:</b>	Description of action:	
	Planned timescale:	
	Expected outcome:	
	Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement:	
<b>Action A3:</b>	Description of action:	
	Planned timescale:	
	Expected outcome:	
	Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement:	
<b>Action A4:</b>	Description of action:	
	Planned timescale:	
	Expected outcome:	
	Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement:	

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

WGFR(11)5

***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 which address the Organization's principal areas of concern for the management of salmon stocks. The overall goals for NASCO and its Parties in relation to the 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;
- NASCO Guidelines for the Protection, Restoration and Enhancement of Atlantic Salmon Habitat, CNL(10)51;
- 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';
- Guidance on Best Management Practices to Address Impacts of Sea Lice and Escaped Farmed Salmon on Wild Salmon Stocks, SLG(09)5.

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 jurisdictions.

This document describes the structure and content of the 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, 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 will be the key document in the second reporting cycle but that greater emphasis will be placed on: 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 Implementation Plans will be focused around the three main theme areas.

### 2.1 *Structure, Format and Content of Implementation Plans*

The Implementation Plans will be prepared using the agreed template, WGFR(11)4. 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. 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 (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;
- 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.

By way of clarification, **actions**, which are the key element of the Implementation Plans, are specific tangible activities that a Party or jurisdiction intends 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.

**Measurable outcomes** are a measure of success of the action. If 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. In the above examples, the measurable outcome of the action of requiring containment management systems could be the demonstration of a reduction in the number of escapees detected in salmon rivers and for the action to reduce the fishing season, the

measurable outcome may be reduced catches in the mixed-stock fishery and increased spawning escapement.

## **2.2 *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.

## **2.3 *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 not their Party or Organization. To provide continuity, they should normally be appointed to serve for a period of up to three years and will also undertake the evaluation of the Annual Progress Reports. 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 3.2).

## **2.4 *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, 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, including specific issues for recommended actions identified for the jurisdiction in the reports of the FAR Review Groups;
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 gaps in the Draft Implementation Plans in any of the above areas they will be returned to the jurisdiction for further drafting. In cases of uncertainty, the Secretariat will refer to the Review Group.

Once accepted (i.e. following re-submission, where appropriate), the Implementation Plans will then be made available on the NASCO website to permit equal access to the information to all stakeholders.

## **2.5 *Critical Evaluation of Implementation Plans***

Once accepted the Implementation Plans will be examined by a Review Group which will evaluate the quality of the information provided in the above areas and determine whether this provides a fair and equitable basis for assessing the progress that the jurisdiction will make in implementing NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. Answers to each question will be assessed as:

1. Satisfactory answers/information.
2. Unclear or incomplete answers/information.
3. Clear omissions or inadequacies in answers/information.

Implementation Plans which include answers in categories 2 and 3 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 reassessed by the Review Group to determine whether the areas highlighted have been addressed or a satisfactory explanation of the original content has been provided.

## **2.6 *Reporting to the Annual Meeting***

Where the Review Group considers that there are still clear omissions or inadequacies in the answers/information provided (category 3), 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.

## **2.7 Schedules for Submission, Review and Distribution of Implementation Plans**

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

<b>Date</b>	<b>Action required</b>
June 2012	NASCO Council finalises arrangements and appoints Review Group. Secretary requests submission of Implementation Plans
31 October 2012	Deadline for submission of Implementation Plans to Secretary
30 November 2012	Feedback to jurisdictions from Secretariat on acceptability of the Implementation Plans
31 December 2012	Deadline for submission of re-drafted Implementation Plans to Secretary
7 January 2013	Implementation Plans distributed to Review Group and uploaded to NASCO website
January/February 2013	Review Group meets and develops its evaluation of the Implementation Plans
1 March 2013	Implementation Plans requiring modification returned to jurisdictions with clear guidance on the Review Group's recommendations for improvements
15 April 2013	Deadline for submission of final Implementation Plans
1 May 2013	Final Implementation Plans and Review Group's assessments uploaded to NASCO website
June 2013	Review Group's report presented to the Council

## **3. 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.

### **3.1 Structure, Format and Content of Annual Progress Reports**

Each year the jurisdictions should prepare Annual Progress Reports using the agreed reporting template WGFR(11)6. These should provide information on progress against actions in their Implementation Plans relating to management of salmon fisheries (section 2.8), habitat protection and restoration (section 3.4) and aquaculture and related activities (section 4.8) 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.

### **3.2 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 (see section 2.3 above). 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, by correspondence, 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 develop a list of questions which will be sent to the jurisdiction. Jurisdictions will be asked to respond to these at the Annual Meeting of the Council.

### **3.3 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:

<b>Date</b>	<b>Action required</b>
5 January	The Secretariat will send the template for Annual Progress Reports to each jurisdiction
1 March	Secretariat to send reminders for completion of Annual Progress Reports
1 April	Deadline for submission of Annual Progress Reports to Secretariat Annual Progress reports made available on the website
1 May	Completion of review by Review Group and provision of list of questions for jurisdictions, where required.
June	Jurisdictions to respond to any questions from the Review Group at Annual Meeting of the Council



**WGFR(11)6**

*Annual Progress Report on Actions taken under Implementation Plans for the Calendar Year 2014*

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 **by 1 April 2014**.

<b>Party:</b>	
<b>Jurisdiction/Region:</b>	

<b>1: Changes to the Implementation Plan</b>
<b>1.1 Describe any proposed revisions to the Implementation Plan and, where appropriate, provide a revised plan.</b>
<b>1.2 Describe any major new initiatives or achievements for salmon conservation and management that you wish to highlight.</b>

<b>2: Stock status and catches.</b>
<b>2.1 Provide a description of any significant changes in the status of stocks relative to the reference points described in the Implementation Plan and of any new factors which may significantly affect the abundance of salmon stocks.</b>

<b>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’).</b>				
	In-river	Estuarine	Coastal	Total
(a) provisional nominal catch (which may be subject to revision) for 2013 (tonnes)				
(b) confirmed nominal catch of salmon for 2012 (tonnes)				
(c) estimated unreported catch for 2013 (tonnes)				
(d) number and percentage of salmon caught and released in recreational fisheries in 2013.				

### **3: Implementation Plan Actions.**

#### **3.1 Provide an update on progress against actions relating to the Management of Salmon Fisheries (section 2.8 of the Implementation Plan)**

<b>Action F1:</b>	Description of Action:	
	Expected Outcome:	
	Monitoring/Enforcement Results:	
	Ongoing/completed:	
	Achieved objective?	
<b>Action F2:</b>	Description of Action:	
	Expected Outcome:	
	Monitoring/Enforcement Results:	
	Ongoing/completed:	
	Achieved objective?	
<b>Action F3:</b>	Description of Action:	
	Expected Outcome:	
	Monitoring/Enforcement Results:	
	Ongoing/completed:	
	Achieved objective?	
<b>Action F4:</b>	Description of Action:	
	Expected Outcome:	
	Monitoring/Enforcement Results:	
	Ongoing/completed:	
	Achieved objective?	

<b>3.2 Provide an update on progress against actions relating to Habitat Protection and Restoration</b> ( <i>section 3.4 of the Implementation Plan</i> )		
<b>Action H1:</b>	Description of Action:	
	Expected Outcome:	
	Monitoring/Enforcement Results:	
	Ongoing/completed:	
	Achieved objective?	
<b>Action H2:</b>	Description of Action:	
	Expected Outcome:	
	Monitoring/Enforcement Results:	
	Ongoing/completed:	
	Achieved objective?	
<b>Action H3:</b>	Description of Action:	
	Expected Outcome:	
	Monitoring/Enforcement Results:	
	Ongoing/completed:	
	Achieved objective?	
<b>Action H4:</b>	Description of Action:	
	Expected Outcome:	
	Monitoring/Enforcement Results:	
	Ongoing/completed:	
	Achieved objective?	

<b>3.3 Provide an update on progress against actions relating to Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers and Transgenics</b> ( <i>section 4.8 of the Implementation Plan</i> )		
<b>Action A1:</b>	Description of Action:	
	Expected Outcome:	
	Monitoring/Enforcement Results:	
	Ongoing/completed:	
	Achieved objective?	
<b>Action A2:</b>	Description of Action:	
	Expected Outcome:	
	Monitoring/Enforcement Results:	
	Ongoing/completed:	
	Achieved objective?	

<b>Action A3:</b>	Description of Action:	
	Expected Outcome:	
	Monitoring/Enforcement Results:	
	Ongoing/completed:	
	Achieved objective?	
<b>Action A4:</b>	Description of Action:	
	Expected Outcome:	
	Monitoring/Enforcement Results:	
	Ongoing/completed:	
	Achieved objective?	

<b>4: Additional information required under the Convention</b>
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.

<b>North American Commission Members only:</b>
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.