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





Date: 7th June 2022 **Presenter:** Dr Cathal Gallagher

Introduction and Background

- NASCO
- 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



the Ma	t of challenges in attaining the goals set out in the NASCO Guidelines for inagement of Salmon Fisheries, identify the threats to wild salmon and ges for management associated with their exploitation in fisheries.	
Threat /	Relevant	
challenge F1	NEIEVAIIL	
Threat /		
challenge F2		
Threat /		
challenge F3		
Threat /		
challenge F4		

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



Review Group



Members:

- Cathal Gallagher Paddy Gargan Dan Kircheis Lawrence Talks Michael Millane Katrine Kærgaard Paul Knight Steve Sutton
- Europe (Chair) SSC North America UK Europe Denmark(FI&G) NGO NGO

Co-ordinators:

Emma Hatfield Wendy Kenyon





IP Evaluations

- initial assessment by Secretariat to identify significant omissions.
- The initial reviewers would:
 - develop the initial assessment of the assigned Implementation Plans and 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 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 Implementations Plans	Considerable progress by almost all Parties/jurisdictions. Still only 2 IPs acceptable.				
1st May 2020	\mathbf{D}	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		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 Report 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				
15th to 19th November 2021	Review Group meets and develops its 4th evaluation of the revised Implementation Plans Revised guidance.	17 revised IPs received and reviewed				
11th to 14th April & 3rd May	APR Review Group review progress against IPs reviewed in November 2021	20 of the 21 Aps received by deadline				
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.					

1st Evaluation of IPs feedback



- 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 acceptabl	e after 1st roun	d of review							
		Fully acceptabl	e after 2nd rou	nd of review							
		Progress betwe	en reviews; res	ponse / actions	not yet fully ac	ceptable					
		No progress be	tween reviews;	response / acti	ons not yet acce	eptable					
		No acceptable	actions								
	Q	uestions on Saln	non Manageme	int	Threats / o	challenges to W	ild 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	ions to IP					
EU-Spain (Galicia)					No revis	ions to IP					
EU-Spain (Navarra)					No revis	ions 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.



List extracted from CLN (19)14 ~ interim report

-AASteorGaifterlinesrfogemetertif 6,0 Resto Fitheriand Ehhanden ment of

Atlantic Salmon Habitat, <u>CNL(10)51</u> -Report of the Working Group on Stock Classification, <u>CNL(16)11</u>;

-Guidance on Best Management Practices to address impacts of sea -Minimum Standard for Catch Statistics, <u>CNL(93)51</u> lice and escaped farmed salmon on wild salmon stocks (<u>SLG(09)5</u>) -Revised matrix for the application of the six tenets for effective mainleft for the six tenets for effec

=NAGC MBlorntofeAntianefonfthemAntiplicetichangehanRrecoupienation on ARMRBFING? FeseBreffatiannerds Brest 969 pievent AthentifeSourog G. salaris Habitat, <u>CNL (01)51</u>; and eradicate it if introduced', <u>NEA(18)08</u>



Overview of the Third IP Review

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

	Кеу										
		Section / area	'satisfactory'								
		Section / area	'unsatisfactory	(*							
	Questions on Salmon Management				Threats / C	hallenges to W	Vild 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.

June 2021 IP discussion at Council



- there should be no major change to the IP process;
- Parties / jurisdictions may, on a voluntary basis, submit a revised IP for review;
- with respect to the inclusion of the terms 'fish farms' and 'aquaculture' in the IP template, the status quo should be maintained until the fourth reporting cycle, at which point the IP template should be revised to clarify what information is being requested;
- national legislation should not be considered a mitigating circumstance to allow otherwise unsatisfactory IP actions to be satisfactory;



June 2021 IP discussion at Council



 that Parties / jurisdictions should be able to make revisions to accepted questions / actions. If a change is made to an IP, whether to a satisfactory or unsatisfactory question / action, the Party / jurisdiction should identify clearly what has been changed and why; and

• the Review Group should provide positive feedback to the Parties / jurisdictions on those aspects of the IPs that the Review Group considers are moving the Parties / jurisdictions clearly towards the achievement of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. In addition, significant improvements by the Parties should be communicated on the NASCO website and social media



June 2021 IP discussion at Council



Council agreed in June 2021 to revise the review process to enable a dialogue between the Review Group and Parties / jurisdictions on the unsatisfactory elements of their IPs.

Chair and NASCO Secretariat facilitated dialog with five Parties / jurisdictions:

- Canada
- EU Germany
- EU Finland
- EU Spain
- EU Sweden

Theme-based Special Session on Aquaculture during 2021:

'A renewed request be made from the NASCO Council that all Parties and jurisdictions with salmon farming produce SMART actions in their revised Implementation Plans for the management of lice and escapes. These actions should reflect strong and sustained progress towards meeting the goals of 100% containment of farmed fish, and for 100% of farms to have effective sea lice 3 management. Monitoring of sea lice and escapes should only be a secondary activity to research or assess the effectiveness of the main action.'

Overview of the 4th IP Review



	Kau									1	
	Кеу		land of a stand								
	50	Section / area									
	50	Section / area partly 'satisfactory'; % satisfact			ctory denoted						
		Section / area	'unsatisfactory	/'							
											Mandatory Actions
	Qu	estions on Saln	non Manageme	ent	Threats / C	Threats / Challenges to Wild Salmon			SMART 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				59						33	33
EU - Denmark		86		82							
EU - Finland 📩											
EU - Germany											
EU - Ireland				59						33	
EU - Portugal	57	57	50	76				67			
EU - Spain (Asturias)				82							
EU - Spain (Cantabria)				94							67
EU - Spain (Galicia)	71	50	25	35				50			67
EU - Spain (Gipuzkoa)								67			
EU - Spain (Navarra) 🛛 📩											
EU - Sweden				94				90			
Norway				65					50	92	67
UK - England and Wales	3										
UK - Northern Ireland										83	67
UK - Scotland				41						40	33
United States				88						75	67

The RG recommended again that the Parties / jurisdictions with responsibility to regulate salmon farming industries should adhere specifically to NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines directed at the protection of wild salmon



Additional to comments noted during 2020 review, CNL(21)07.

The RG noted that the review process, following the provision of the Enhanced Guidance, CNL(20)55, has enabled it to reach a greater understanding of how NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines are being taken into consideration in the work of the Parties and jurisdictions. It has also enabled the Group to reflect this back to the Parties / jurisdictions.

To enable its feedback to be discussed amongst NASCO delegates, the RG recommended that consideration be given to facilitating an IP Special Session at the 2022 Annual Meeting.

The RG requested that no further guidance on the review of IPs be forthcoming from Council.





However, the RG noted that it was unclear from the original whether any / all revisions of each IP should also 'be prepared in consultation with NGOs and other relevant stakeholders and industries'. The RG proposed this issue should be clarified during discussions for the fourth cycle of reporting.

In line with the IP Guidelines, any revised IPs should be submitted by 1 November in 2022 (and in 2023).

Parties / jurisdictions should submit their Annual Progress Report (APR) on the basis of their most recent IP submitted. The Chair and Secretary to determine the best approach as to whether both satisfactory and unsatisfactory actions will be reviewed. Any decision reached will be communicated clearly to the Parties.



Comments and Questions



