IP Special Session of the Council on the Evaluation of Implementation Plans Under the Third Reporting Cycle (2019 to 2024) CNL(21)55



Date: 5th May 2021

Presenter: Dr Cathal Gallagher



Introduction and Background



- Entering the third cycle of reporting, the Council's intention was to further strengthen the reporting process by:
 - addressing shortcomings in previous IP / APR as in Annex 1 of the New IP Guidelines

 – CNL(18)49;
 - progress toward attainment of NASCO's goals can objectively be assessed over time.

Third cycle is a much more stringent process with:

- opportunities to demonstrate commitment to NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines; and
- resources are assigned to actions.





Overview

- Review Group's assessments rely upon instructions for evaluation given in the 'Guidelines for the Preparation and Evaluation of NASCO Implementation Plans and for Reporting on Progress', CNL(18)49, hereinafter the 'IP Guidelines';
- the IP Guidelines emphasise that Implementation Plans should provide a fair and equitable account of the actions that each Party or jurisdiction plans to take to implement NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.



IP Guidelines Emphasise



Overview:

 clearly identify the threats and challenges under each theme area related to NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines;





IP Guidelines Emphasise



Overview:

- include at least one action on sea lice management for those jurisdictions with salmon farms;
- include at least one action on containment of farmed salmon for those jurisdictions with salmon farms;
- including at least one action on mixed-stock fisheries for those jurisdictions that prosecute mixed-stock fisheries;
- among other things (see Section 2.1 CNL(18)49)

SMART Actions



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.

	9
Threat /	Relevant
challenge F1	Reievaiit
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 fiveyear period to 20242 Action V1: Description of Specific action: Planned timescale **Timely** (include milestones where appropriate: Expected outcome: Approach for monitoring Measureable effectiveness & enforcement: Funding secured for Choose an item. both action and Ambitious yet achievable monitoring programme?

Review Group



Members: Pade

Cathal Gallagher

Europe (Chair)

Paddy Gargan

SSC

Dan Kircheis

North America

Lawrence Talks

UK

Michael Millane

Europe

Katrine Kærgaard

Denmark(FI&G)

Paul Knight

NGO

Steve Sutton

NGO

Co-ordinators:

Emma Hatfield

Wendy Kenyon





IP Evaluations

- initial assessment by Secretariat to ensure mainly identify significant omissions.
- The initial reviewers would:
 - develop the initial assessment of the assigned Implementation Plans lead discussion;
 - when needed, develop clear guidance for the Party / jurisdiction on how to improve descriptions of actions (or other components of the Implementation Plan) in consultation with the Review Group at the meeting;
 - lead discussion of that guidance at the meeting; and
 - remain anonymous in the report.



IP Evaluations

- consistent assessment by the Review Group was facilitated using a template focusing on the three key areas set out in the IP Guidelines to ensure that:
 - answers by each Party / jurisdiction to the questions posed in the IP template are satisfactory;
 - the threats and challenges to the management of wild Atlantic salmon identified under each theme are related to NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines; and
 - each action adheres to the 'SMART' descriptors such that progress over time can be assessed objectively.



Ground Rules

- jurisdiction whose Implementation Plan was being reviewed would not be present during the initial review of that Plan;
- following the completion of all the initial evaluations, the Review Group would re-examine these to ensure consistency. List of standard replies and comments developed to support consistency.



Overall Process Timelines



Date/Deadline	Major Action	Progress			
1st Feb 2019	Deadline for submission of Implementation Plans to the Review Group	10 plans received			
28th Feb - 13th May 2019	Review concluded 1st evaluation of the IPs (see CNL(19)14)	20 plans reviewed; 1 IP Acceptable			
6th June 2019	IP Review Group presentation to Council				
1st November 2019	Deadline for submission of revised Implementation Plans to NASCO	16 revised Plans submitted			
18th to 22nd November 2019	Meets and develops its 2nd evaluation of the revised Implementation Plans	Considerable progress by almost all Parties / jurisdictions. Still only 2 IPs acceptable			
1st May 2020	Il leadline for revised IP to be submitted to NAS(1)	No Special Session in 2020 - IPs not discussed until November 2020			
1st November 2020	Deadline for revised IPs				
16th to 27th November, 4th, 11th, 16th & 17th December 2020	Implementation Plans Revised guidance	21 IPs review (1 new IP); 12 IPs were revised from 2019. 1 IP satisfactory in all areas			
1st April 2021	Deadline for submission of Annual Progress Reports to Secretariat	19 of 21 APRs			
19th to 28th April 2021	APR Review Group review progress against IPs reviewed in November 2020	19 of 21 APRs reviewed			
1 November 2021 / 2022 / 2023	Deadline for return of modified Implementation Plans to NASCO for inclusion in APR template				
31 December 2021 / 2022 / 2023	Deadline for return of modified Implementation Plans to NASCO for inclusion in APR template				

First Evaluation of IPs



- many IPs required substantial guidance from the Review Group to be brought in line with the IP Guidelines, often:
 - IP Guidelines had not been followed, especially in relation to the provision of SMART actions;
 - actions lacked clear descriptions and were combined with the expected outcome; and
 - actions were very long and difficult to interpret. In line with the IP Guidelines, the Review Group considered that SMART actions should be clear and concise.
- the Review Group developed a list of common challenges and solutions.

First Evaluation of IPs



- the Review Group did not consider it appropriate to prescribe
 what it considered to be a clear action for each unclear action
 presented. Rather, the Review Group developed its guidance for
 each Party / jurisdiction to refer to each of the SMART descriptors
 that had not been addressed with the comment that these
 aspects should be addressed in the revised Implementation Plan
 in each case;
- a score of '1' (satisfactory) for an answer simply meant that a satisfactory answer had been provided and did not indicate that the Party / jurisdiction was necessarily meeting NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements or Guidelines:
 - a response to a question may be satisfactory if an action had been included in the Implementation Plan to address any major shortcoming.

Feedback to the Parties / jurisdictions

- the Review Group's initial assessments of the 20 IPs were sent to Parties / jurisdictions with clear guidance for improvement (30th April);
- one IP was considered to be acceptable:
 - Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) –
 Greenland;
 - all 1's Satisfactory, all threats and challenges relevant, all actions SMART and relevant to threats, all mandatory actions present.
- many IPs required substantial guidance from the Review Group to be brought in line with the IP Guidelines; and
- developing feedback to each of the Parties / jurisdictions was considerably more work than anticipated.

Second Evaluation of IPs



- RG assessed 16 revised IPs;
- Guidelines for the Preparation and Evaluation of NASCO IPs and for Reporting on Progress – CNL(18)49. This document stated that no Implementation Plan will be accepted until all actions are deemed satisfactory (i.e. SMART) by this Review Group;
- failure by some Parties / jurisdictions to adopt actions specifically aimed at protecting wild salmonids from the adverse impacts of aquaculture escapes and sea lice - in line with the International Goals agreed by NASCO and ISFA.





Second Evaluation



Infographic to Show the Status of the Various Sections of the Implementation Plans After Two Rounds of Review

	Key											
		Fully acceptable	e after 1st roun	d of review								
		Fully acceptable	e after 2nd rou	nd of review								
		Progress betwe	en reviews; res	sponse / actions	not yet fully ac	ceptable						
		No progress be	tween reviews;	response / acti	ons not yet acco	eptable						
		No acceptable	actions									
	Qu	estions on Saln	non Manageme	ent	Threats / o	Threats / challenges to Wild Salmon			SMART Actions			
	Management	Fisheries Management	Habitats	Aquaculture, disease, transfers & transgenics	Fisheries Management	Habitats	Aquaculture, disease, transfers & transgenics	Fisheries Management	Habitats	Aquaculture, disease, transfers & transgenics		
Canada												
DFG Faroe Islands						No salmon habitat			No salmon habitat			
DFG Greenland					Accepted after	first round review						
EU-Denmark					No threats given			No actions given				
EU-Finland												
EU-France												
EU-Germany												
EU-Ireland												
EU-Portugal										No aquaculture		
EU-Spain (Asturias)							No aquaculture			No aquaculture		
EU-Spain (Cantabria)					No revis	sions to IP						
EU-Spain (Galicia)					No revis	sions to IP						
EU-Spain (Navarra)	No revisions to IP											
EU-Sweden												
EU-UK (England & Wales)												
EU-UK (Northern Ireland)												
EU-UK (Scotland)												
Norway												
Russian Federation												
United States												



Enhanced Guidance for Third IP Review



- Enhanced Guidance CNL(20)55:
 - there will be no overall classification of an IP as 'acceptable' or 'unacceptable'. Instead section (1), and each area of sections (2), (3) and (4), should be categorised as either 'satisfactory' or 'unsatisfactory';
 - where the Review Group considered that an action moved the Party /
 jurisdiction clearly towards the implementation of NASCO's Resolutions,
 Agreements and Guidelines even if the action was not entirely in line with
 the SMART criteria, the Review Group considered such an action as
 satisfactory; and
 - Where the action adhered to the SMART criteria, but the action was considered not to move the Party / jurisdiction towards the implementation of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines, it was be deemed unsatisfactory;
- the Review Group gave a clear explanation of their assessment in their feedback and where feasible and appropriate, offered specific suggestions / recommendations for how it could be improved.

NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines



List extracted from CNL(19)14 ~ interim report

- -DAISCO resisted in the surface entertrip to a Restro Fist homie a delin han element of
- Atlantic Salmon Habitat, CNL(10)51
- -Report of the Working Group on Stock Classification, CNL(16)11;
- -Guidance on Best Management Practices to address impacts of sea -Minimum Standard for Catch Statistics, CNL(93)51
 lice and escaped farmed salmon on wild salmon stocks (\$1.G(09)5)
 -Revised matrix for the application of the six tenets for effective

 THUIDGETHE FOR APPLICATIONS APPLICATIONS (CNL(04)57); and
- -NAGA MBløntofeAbtionofonfthenApplicexichnofythenRrecogniemation on ARMROFINGP Fleedrighten Film February Restationally Properties of the Restation of the Rest



Overview of the Third IP Review NASC



Infographic to Show the Status of the Various Sections of the Implementation Plans After the Third Round of Review

	Key										
	,	Section / area	'satisfactory'								
		Section / area 'unsatisfactory'									
		,									
	Que	Questions on Salmon Management			Threats / Challenges to Wild Salmon			SMART Actions			Mandatory Actions
	Introduction / Background	Management of Salmon Fisheries	Habitat Protection & Restoration	Aquaculture, Introductions &Transfers & Transgenics	Management of Salmon Fisheries	Habitat Protection & Restoration	Aquaculture, Introductions &Transfers & Transgenic	Management of Salmon Fisheries	Habitat Protection & Restoration	Aquaculture, Introductions &Transfers & Transgenics	
Canada											
DFG Faroe Islands									Not applicable		
DFG Greenland							Not applicable			Not applicable	
EU-Denmark											
EU-Finland											
EU-France											
EU-Germany											
EU-Ireland											
EU-Portugal											
EU-Spain (Asturias)											
EU-Spain (Cantabria)											
EU-Spain (Galicia)											
EU-Spain (Gipuzkoa)											
EU-Spain (Navarra)											
EU-Sweden											
UK - England and Wales											
UK - Northern Ireland											
UK - Scotland											
Norway											
Russian Federation											
United States											

General Feedback Third IP Review



- Parties / jurisdictions with responsibility to regulate salmon farming industries need to adhere specifically to NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines directed at the protection of wild salmon;
- cross-jurisdictional issues need consideration:
 - management of catchments with shared jurisdiction; and
 - aquaculture issues originating from salmon farms in other jurisdictions;
- how should conservation hatcheries/freshwater hatcheries be considered in the section of the IP pertaining to management of aquaculture?
- revised IPs should be submitted by 1 November (in this and subsequent years to 2023).
- Council to agree that questions / actions etc. deemed as satisfactory are not revised (unless clarification is requested), and revised sections are highlighted clearly; and
- the IP / APR Review Group considered that it is inappropriate to consider progress on unsatisfactory' actions. Therefore, during the APR Review Group meeting, only 'satisfactory' actions will be reviewed.

Letters and Feedback



- President issued first IP-related letters to Parties / jurisdictions on 16th October 2020 and 21st December 2020:
 - responses to the second letter were received from all Parties, except from DFG –
 Faroe Islands, and DFG Greenland, who has provided a fully satisfactory IP.
- Intersessional Correspondence received from Canada and US, summarised as follows:
 - revised guidance for IP review may have been misinterpreted;
 - clarification in relation to commercial hatcheries and conservation hatcheries;
 - suggested representation from Parties be added to the IP Review Group as observers;
 - France on behalf of St. Pierre et Miquelon (SPM) does not submit an IP / APR for SPM.
 Given SPM's status as an observer, information that would be contained if an IP was produced could add to the conservation picture;
 - more opportunities for Parties / jurisdictions to interact with the RG;
 - suggestion for no formal revision of the IPs until the Performance Review Panel provides advice on how the process might be revised to better meet its objectives; and
 - replace the use of the term 'fish farm' with 'aquaculture facilities'.

RG Queries



- what is the end date for facilitation of IP revisions 2021/2022/2023?
- the RG request that Council consider that responses / actions in IPs that are reviewed and deemed satisfactory do not get changed over the life of the plan;
- APR reviews only to take consideration of satisfactory actions?
- cross-jurisdictional issues need consideration (fishery management & aquaculture);
- conservation hatcheries / freshwater hatcheries be considered in the section of the IP pertaining to management of aquaculture?
- the RG has started to discuss the IP process and potential improvements.



Comments and Questions



