

IP/APR Report 2022



Report of the Meeting of the Implementation Plan / Annual Progress Report Review Group for the Review of Annual Progress Reports under the Third Cycle of Reporting (2019 – 2024)

Date: 7th June 2021

Presenter: Dr Cathal Gallagher

IP/APR Review Group



Members:

Cathal Gallagher	Europe (Chair)
Paddy Gargan	SSC
Dan Kircheis	North America
Lawrence Talks	UK
Michael Millane	Europe
Sissel Fredsgaard	Denmark(FI&G)
Goodbrand, Livia	Canada
Paul Knight	NGO
Steve Sutton	NGO

Co-ordinators:

Emma Hatfield
Wendy Kenyon



Introduction and Background



- 2nd APR review in the 3rd cycle (2020 review was cancelled)
 - No specific TOR for the APR review relied on CNL(18)49 (*Preparation and Evaluation of NASCO Implementation Plans and for Reporting on Progress*)
 - Secretariat designed review template (CNL40.2178 A3)
 - Lead/Initial reviewers assigned
 - Review Group – Satisfactory Actions only (CNL(21)07)
 - Ground rules:
 - *Only info in the APR & IP to be reviewed*
 - *Reviewers not present for own jurisdictional APR*
 - *Initial reviewer to remain anonymous*



APR Evaluation timeline 2021



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	Deadline for revised IP to be submitted to NASCO	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	Review Group meets and develops its 3rd evaluation of the revised 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 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 2022	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.	

APR Evaluation Std Text



Progress of actions evaluated and categorised against:

NS = Not Started;

OG = Ongoing – clear progress;

OG-NP = Ongoing – no progress;

OG-UD = Ongoing – unable to determine progress;

CD = Completed – clear progress;

CD-NP = Completed – without clear progress;

Progress deemed ongoing - reporting improvement provided

Progress not able to be determined (standard descriptors):

- action not yet started;
- lack of quantitative data to demonstrate progress;
- reliance on references to websites or publications;
- reporting timeframe not clearly specified;
- no progress has been made in the reporting year;
progress report is unclear.



APR RG noted shortcomings



- Reporting on activities in years prior to the reporting year
 - Quantitative information on trends would be welcome
- Expected outcomes, Approach to monitoring and Planned timescales as laid out in the IP informs the basis for the evaluation
- Succinct progress reports expected
- Complete – not clear in some APR (should be ongoing)
- Where action not started – start date should be provided
- Full details of APR reports for parties/jurisdictions on NASCO Website



APR Review Group Feedback



- The RG wishes to commend EU – Germany as a positive model for clear and concise reporting on progress.
- The RG noted some exemplary examples of international fisheries management co-operation to support the conservation of wild Atlantic salmon. The Group would like to draw attention to the habitat restoration carried out in the cross-border river Minho / Mina in Portugal / Spain and the closure of all fisheries in the Teno / Tana river system in Finland / Norway
- CNL(22)16 contains further positive feedback from various Parties/jurisdictions

APR Review Group Feedback



- The RG requested some minor APR template changes for subsequent years, see CNL(22)16: The secretariat has implemented these change.
- The RG request considerations from the Council regarding the fourth reporting cycle. These included:
 - multi-part actions are difficult to review. Simple, significant, single, actions are requested in future Implementation Plans;
 - a recommendation that actions be limited to those substantially relevant to wild salmon conservation and management;
 - for actions that will extend beyond the lifetime of the IP, milestones for the current reporting period should be included in the action, to enable assessment of progress.

Comments and Questions

