

	<p><b>Inter-Sessional Meeting of the Finance and Administration Committee</b></p> <p><i>Discussion on the Revision of the NASCO 2026 and Future Budgets in Light of Contribution Arrears</i></p>	<p><b>FACIS(26)02</b></p>
---	--	---------------------------

## ***Discussion on the Revision of the NASCO 2026 and Future Budgets in Light of Contribution Arrears***

### **Purpose**

At the recent Council Inter-Sessional meeting ([CNL IS\(25\)07](#)), Parties discussed the continued delay in payment of the Russian Federation’s 2024 and 2025 contributions. Council agreed that, if these payments are not received by the end of December 2025, the NASCO Finance and Administration Committee (FAC) should meet inter-sessionally, close to the final week of March 2026, to review the status of contributions and arrears for 2024-2026, consider any 2025 audit findings, and assess any implications for the 2026 budget.

The purpose of this paper is to support the FAC by assessing the financial implications for NASCO arising from the budget shortfall caused by contribution arrears for 2024 and 2025. It also outlines issues for the FAC to consider and make recommendations to Council regarding adjustments to the 2026 budget and funding to ensure priority expenditure is maintained while working within the current financial constraints.

### **Background**

In December 2025, at a Council Inter-Sessional meeting ([CNL IS\(25\)07](#)), a discussion was held on the NASCO 2027 Forecast Budget and the 2026-2030 Budgeting Plan. During this discussion, the Secretary raised the delay in the payment of the Russian Federation's Contributions for 2024 and 2025 and noted the potential implications on NASCO's 2026 and future budgets. He advised that the financial implications of the outstanding payments, should they not be received by year's end, would become clearer when the NASCO accounts were finalised and audited in February 2026.

Several Parties expressed concern about the current shortfall in the Contractual Obligations Fund, noting that the associated liability will continue to increase each year. They further observed that the Forecast Budget and Budgeting Plan presented did not move quickly enough to mitigate this liability. In addition, the importance of maintaining the Working Capital Fund was emphasised.

Council agreed to request the Secretariat continue its engagement with the Russian Federation to secure the outstanding contributions. Should payments not be received, then Council agreed to hold an inter-sessional meeting of the FAC to review the status of contributions for 2024, 2025 and 2026, the Audit findings, and any potential impacts on the 2026 budget.

The Council also requested the FAC review Council priorities and make recommendations on future budget allocations to individual budget line items for Council review. Based on this analysis, the FAC are further requested to review and make recommendations on the details of the five-year Budgeting Plan for 2026-2030.

### **Overview of the 2026 Financial Position and Budget**

In early January 2026, the Secretariat conducted an organizational financial liquidity analysis for the year ahead (Annex 1). This analysis took a precautionary approach by excluding the Russian Federation’s 2026 contribution, estimated at £72,775. It also assumed that all other income, both Parties’ Contributions and revenue from NASCO Headquarters, would be received in full. The analysis predicted a 2026 operating deficit of £67,774, with a year-end

cash reserve of £167,090. It is worth noting that the Working Capital Fund, currently standing at £197,000, also provides additional reserves. This analysis was reviewed by the NASCO auditors who noted in Paragraph 2.4.1 of the 2025 Audit closing letter:

*‘We have received the Secretary’s liquidity analysis and challenged the basis of the assessment. We are satisfied with the Secretary’s assessment.’*

In addition, the Secretariat will make a concerted effort in 2026 to reduce costs wherever possible. This includes a potential saving of approximately £10,000 in the budget allocated for the 2026 NASCO Annual Meeting (Aviemore).

Based on the 2025 audited accounts, alongside projected income for the year, the Secretariat confirms that with prudent financial management, the organization will be able to deliver against the agreed 2026 budget. Given the above analysis, **consideration could be given** to requesting that NASCO continue operating in accordance with the approved 2026 Budget, while prioritising cost-reduction opportunities wherever feasible.

### **Contractual Obligation Fund**

At the end of 2025, the Contractual Obligation Fund (COF) stood at £36,917, significantly below its established ceiling of £250,000. This fund has been used extensively to support lump-sum payments for NASCO Secretariat staff leaving the organization. Under the 2024 Staff Scheme ([CNL\(25\)45](#)), the parameters governing these payments were revised: staff appointed after June 2024 are no longer eligible for lump-sum payments; and the lump-sum calculation is now set at one-eighth of the final year’s after-tax gross salary for each year of service.

From a liability perspective, these changes clarified the total lump-sum entitlement for existing staff (pre-June 2024). See Section 7.11 of the NASCO Staff Handbook & Staff Rules, [CNL\(25\)45](#):

*‘For Secretariat members whose date of appointment is prior to 9 June 2024, prior to any Secretariat member leaving employment with NASCO, other than through termination due to gross misconduct, a lump sum payment will be made into that Secretariat member’s deferred salary account of one eighth after tax of the final year’s gross salary and allowances for each year of service with NASCO, fractions of a year to count pro-rata, or where a Secretariat member’s service with NASCO is or has been less than 38 hours per week, the full-time equivalent number of years.’*

At the Council Inter-Sessional meeting ([CNL IS\(25\)07](#)), several parties shared concerns around the current shortfall in the Contractual Obligation Fund. The potential liability for lump-sum payments increases with the employee's service. The Secretariat conducted a liability analysis of lump-sum payments and provided it to the NASCO auditors. This analysis indicated that the liability at the end of 2025 was £153,275, growing to an estimated £178,906 by the end of 2026. By 2030, should no staff member leave the organization, the fund liability is estimated at £289,000, exceeding the fund limit of £250,000.<sup>1</sup>

Paragraph 2.4.2 of the 2025 Audit closing letter notes:

*‘Based on our testing, we note that the Contractual Obligation Fund may be inadequate for ongoing lump sum obligations. We note the policy not to provide within the financial statements for these obligations, however we note that historically there has been budgetary allocation for future expected payment. We recommend that Council fully*

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that the details of the liability analysis are not provided in this paper, as it contains confidential information pertaining to staff salaries.

*review current and future lump sum obligations to ensure adequate budgetary allowance for future need in order to avoid unnecessary use of the Working Capital Fund.'*

With a view to immediately increasing the funds held in the COF, the Secretariat has reviewed other NASCO Funds. This review indicates that potential resources could be reallocated from both the Recruitment Fund and the Special Funds.

In 2016, the FAC agreed that £60,000 would be an appropriate ceiling for the Recruitment Fund (see [CNL\(16\)5](#), paragraph 4.3). The Recruitment Fund stands at £35,744; the average spend from this fund over the past 5 years, which was a busy recruitment period (Office Manager (Events), Administration Assistant, Assistant Secretary and Secretary), was approximately £6,000 per annum. Based on the liability analysis and the auditors' findings up to £20,000 could be transferred from the Recruitment Fund to the COF while still meeting any potential recruitment liabilities.

NASCO's Special Funds are intended to help smooth year-to-year fluctuations in the Organization's budget by providing resources for necessary, higher-cost intermittent activities, such as future performance reviews, International Year of the Salmon (IYS) legacy work (e.g. updates to the State of the Salmon report and follow-up symposia agreed by Council in 2019), as well as other occasional major projects (see [CNL\(20\)51rev](#), paragraph 4.3). A new Special Fund called the Periodic Projects Special Fund (PPSF) was established in 2020 with funds allocated in NASCO's annual budgets from 2017 (see [CNL\(16\)68](#), paragraph 5.2) to 2021 (see [CNL\(20\)51rev](#), Annex 9) to support IYS activities, the preparation and publication of the State of Knowledge papers and the development of the Wild Atlantic Salmon Atlas (WASA). A summary of contributions to the various Funds and the current PPSF balance, which stands at approximately £31,000, is given in Annex 2.

The majority of payments associated with these projects have now been completed. A total of €3,000 remains committed to NINA for publication costs for one of the State of Knowledge project papers. Ongoing annual costs for the Atlas and for the fourth reporting cycle database are approximately £350 each, totalling around £700 per year.

Given the above analysis, **consideration could be given** to NASCO's prioritisation of payments to the Contractual Obligations Fund (COF). Should this be the case, **further consideration** could be given to address immediate shortfalls in the COF, through reallocating up to £20,000 from the NASCO Recruitment Fund and £25,000+ from NASCO's Special Funds to the COF. If this reallocation of funds is recommended to and approved by Council, when considered alongside the 2026 budget allocation of £30,000, the expected total COF fund value by the end of 2026 would be £113,000. **Consideration could also be given** to raising the COF ceiling, given the long-term expectation of total potential liability.

### **Considerations for the 2027 Forecast Budget and Five-year Budgeting Plan for 2026 to 2030**

NASCO's 2025 accounts indicated an operational loss of £19,360, with a larger deficit avoided due to an exceptional tax rebate of £32,267. The 2026 NASCO Organizational Liquidity Analysis (Annex 1) projects an operational loss of £67,774. These losses reduce organizational reserves and given a level of uncertainty around contribution arrears, it is prudent to review forecast spending plans for 2027 and beyond. Indeed, the Council requested that the FAC review priorities and make recommendations on future budget allocations for a five-year Budgeting Plan for 2027-2031.

## ***Staff Costs***

From a NASCO budget perspective, the largest cost line item is Staff costs, which accounts for approximately 59% (£432,650) of the 2026 budget. The Secretariat has reviewed the current staffing levels, which have been in place since January 2018, with a particular focus on the delivery of the NASCO Ten-Year Strategy and operational requirements.

The Secretariat is delivery-focused and has a challenging work plan (see NASCO's Ten-Year Strategy and associated Action Plan ([CNL\(24\)71rev](#)), which runs through 2030. Delivery of this plan will require expanded workloads and skill sets and can only be achieved with the current staffing level. To this end, the role of each staff member is being reviewed, with a focus on staff development and strengthening a multi-functional team.

The Secretary is NASCO's Chief Administrative Officer and is supported by the Assistant Secretary, an Office Manager, a Communications and Publications Officer (part-time) and an Administrative Assistant. Each member of the Secretariat has distinctive duties and responsibilities in NASCO's work, which mainly consist of:

- administering the decisions of and managing the governance of NASCO's Council and its subsidiary bodies and delivering NASCO's programme of meetings and activities;
- leading the implementation of NASCO's new Ten-Year Strategy and associated Action Plan, including developing and implementing public relations and outreach;
- managing administrative and financial processes, and human resources; and
- managing the Headquarters Property in Edinburgh, which is owned by NASCO.

Benchmarking against other RMFOs is challenging, as each organization has different roles, structures, and responsibilities. Nonetheless, the review of staffing levels indicates that NASCO operates with comparatively lean resources (Annex 3).

It is worth noting that any changes to staffing levels or employment conditions must be undertaken in accordance with UK employment law. For example, a reduction in staffing would require the development of a fair and transparent process, which would typically begin with a voluntary redundancy exercise. The development of such a process would require support from external experts. In addition, any changes in staff numbers would likely necessitate redundancy payments and the activation of payments from the COF.

**Consideration could be given** to adjustments to staffing, however altering staff levels would be complex and may entail immediate costs of time and money to effectuate the processes, as well as long-term operational and strategic implications.

## ***Operational Budget***

### ***Scientific and Technical Advice to NASCO***

The operational budget, excluding staff costs and based on the 2026 budgetary figures, accounts for approximately 41% of overall NASCO expenditure. The largest element of this operational spend, nearly 11% of the 2026 budget (£78,500), relates to the provision of scientific advice from the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES).

The relationship between NASCO and ICES is outlined in the [NASCO Convention](#).

Article 4 of the NASCO Convention states that the functions of the Council shall be:

- (d) *to establish working arrangements with the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea and other appropriate fisheries and scientific organizations;*
- (e) *to make recommendations to the Parties, the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea or other appropriate fisheries and scientific organizations concerning the undertaking of scientific research;'*

Article 9 of the Convention states, where Articles 7 and 8 referred to the functions of the North American Commission (NAC), West Greenland Commission (WGC) and the North East Atlantic Commission:

*'In exercising the functions set out in Articles 7 and 8, a Commission shall take into account:*

- (a) *the best available information, including advice from the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea and other appropriate scientific organizations;'*

The current [Memorandum of Understanding \(MOU\)](#) between NASCO and ICES is due for review and updating since February 2025.

In 2025, ICES provided catch advice for the North-East Atlantic Commission (NEAC) area complexes at the Faroes, for mixed-stock fisheries in North America and for the West Greenland fishery. All advice for these fisheries over the past decade has recommended zero catch (Annex 4). In recent years, ICES advice to NASCO has also shifted towards multi-year catch advice. While the ICES Working Group on North Atlantic Salmon continues to deliver high-quality analysis and expertly responds to NASCO's questions, the constrained financial position raises the question of whether annual ICES advice remains necessary.

The cost-benefit of moving NASCO advice requests to ICES to a bi- or tri-annual basis to align with regulatory measures, or, indeed, with the critical points in the NASCO Action Plan ([CNL\(24\)71rev](#)), could be investigated. It is recognised that there would still be a need for ICES to collate, store and protect annual datasets provided by Parties / jurisdictions. The main workload of analysis and drafting of advice, however, could potentially be moved to a multi-annual function.

**Consideration could be given** to requesting the Secretariat to consult with NASCO's Standing Scientific Committee (SSC) to understand more fully any potential issues associated with moving towards the provision of multi-annual ICES advice. **Further to this**, should no major issues be identified, the FAC could **further consider recommending** engagement with ICES on the development of a new Memorandum of Understanding, which would include multi-annual advice and seek cost reductions from the current level of provision.

### ***Annual Meeting Cost to NASCO***

The budgetary allocation for NASCO to host the annual meeting accounted for 7.25% (£53,130) of the total 2026 NASCO budget. The new minimum meeting model represents a significant reduction from previous NASCO annual meeting costs, which often exceeded £100,000. At the recent Council Inter-Sessional ([CNL\\_IS\(25\)07](#)) meeting, it was agreed that NASCO would establish a fund to cover the costs associated with NASCO hosted annual meetings. However, Council did not identify where additional resources could be sourced to populate this Meeting Fund.

Budgetary analysis indicates that, in years when a Party or jurisdiction hosts the NASCO Annual Meeting, the NASCO annual budget could be reduced by approximately £40,000 based

on 2026 estimates. It is important to note, however, that the NASCO Secretariat still incurs additional costs in hosted years, including travel and subsistence expenses.

Parties and jurisdictions hosting NASCO meetings provide valuable opportunities for knowledge exchange at local, national, and international levels. It also strengthens NASCO's engagement with governments, key stakeholders and Indigenous Peoples, highlighting pressing issues related to salmon conservation.

Given the above analysis, **consideration could be given to** encouraging Parties / jurisdictions to host NASCO annual meetings, with a view to having hosting plans in place for three successive annual meetings.

### ***Organizational Income***

The above analysis addresses the main budgetary expenditure items, with a view to delivering future cost reductions for forecast budgets. In these times of financial constraint, it is also important to review opportunities to sustain or increase income.

### ***Charges for Non-Party Delegates at NASCO Annual Meetings***

A discussion at Council ([CNL IS\(25\)07](#)) considered the possibility of introducing fees for non-Party delegates attending the Annual Meeting. At this meeting, the NGO Co-Chairs noted that such fees could limit participation by Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Indigenous Peoples' representatives and institutions (IPRIs), particularly for smaller organizations. Council agreed that the matter would be revisited at the 2026 Annual Meeting of the FAC.

To support a review of this proposal, the Secretariat surveyed other RMFOs to understand their approach to charging for in-person and virtual attendance at meetings (Annex 5). This review indicated that no RMFOs surveyed charged for virtual participation at their meetings; two have fees for in-person attendance.

The introduction of a fee for non-delegate participation carries a risk of a decline in meeting attendance. This, in turn, could lessen face-to-face engagement and discussion, undermining NASCO's role and significantly impeding its ability to achieve several of its five core Objectives outlined in the Ten-Year Strategy, [CNL\(24\)71rev](#). Of particular concern are Objectives 1, 3 and 4, that NASCO will:

*'1. Ensure that guidance reflecting best management practice is produced and readily available to those seeking to take action to protect wild Atlantic salmon';*

*'3. Actively promote sustainable conservation and management practices by sharing best practice and holding Parties and jurisdictions accountable in implementing NASCO recommendations and guidance'; and*

*'4. Raise awareness and foster broad collaborative efforts with other international organizations and civil society to encourage decision-makers, the public, private sector and the scientific community to work towards solutions that overcome the challenges wild Atlantic salmon face'.*

Achieving these Objectives will require building basin-wide awareness, educating and encouraging action, promoting sustainable conservation and fostering collaboration ([CNL IS\(25\)02](#)).

However, there are significant costs associated with hosting an annual meeting. Some of these costs are directly linked to providing resources, such as larger meeting rooms, teas / coffees, and meeting support services, to accommodate non-Party delegates. The number of non-Party

delegates attending the NASCO Annual Meeting over the past five years is included in Annex 6.

Based on this analysis, **consideration could be given** to introducing a reasonable fee for in-person attendance by non-Party delegates at the annual meeting. If such a fee were introduced, its level should be set with careful attention to the risk of creating barriers to participation, particularly for smaller organizations.

### ***Recovery of Lost Income from Non-Payment of a NASCO Contribution***

The overall NASCO annual budget increases or decreases in line with inflation, using a formula outlined in the [NASCO Convention](#), Article 16(2), to calculate Parties' annual contributions: 30% of the budgeted cost is shared equally among Parties, with the remaining amount allocated based on confirmed catches. Given that NASCO has not received all Parties' contributions for 2024, 2025 and 2026, consideration should be given to how the Organization will be funded in such circumstances.

With a budget required for 2027 and forecast budgets through to 2031, the Secretariat has found that NASCO will run a deficit in 2026 and 2027 and it would be prudent for NASCO to discuss options to remain solvent should a Party or Parties be in arrears. Please also note the following from Paragraph 2.4.1 of the 2025 Audit's closing letter:

*'We note that the Organization has prepared a budget for 2026 however the budget for 2027 is likely to be revisited given the non-receipt of the Russian contribution. We have received the Secretary's liquidity analysis and challenged the basis of the assessment. We are satisfied with the Secretary's assessment.'*

*'We await Council's formal consideration of this matter and have sought representation from the Secretary that the Council are satisfied that NASCO operations, constitution and legal framework are unaffected by events and can continue to function.'*

In response to this request from the Auditors, and to avoid a Risk associated with a Party's nonpayment of annual Contributions, FAC should consider options to recommend to Council on ways to reduce the financial strain on the Organization. For example, Rule 7.2 of the Financial Rules permits voluntary contributions 'above and beyond' a member's contribution for 'policies, aims, and activities' of NASCO. These voluntary contributions are to be kept in a Trust or Special Fund that the Council can create, per Rule 6.1, and **consideration could be given** to NASCO Parties providing voluntary funds to ensure maintaining a financially sound base for the Organization.

## **Consideration Overview**

The following is a summary of issues contained in this paper for the FAC's consideration in making recommendations to Council:

**Consideration 1:** Should NASCO continue operating in accordance with the approved 2026 Budget, while prioritising cost-reduction opportunities wherever feasible.

**Consideration 2:** Should NASCO prioritise payments to the Contractual Obligations Fund (COF). In this regard, adjustments could be made for the 2026 NASCO Budget to re-allocate £20,000 from the Recruitment Fund and £25,000+ from the Special Funds to the COF. The original £30,000 2026 budgetary allocation to the COF could then be increased by £45,000, bringing the total fund value to £113,000 by the end of 2026. Consideration could also be given to raising the COF ceiling, given the long-term expectation of total potential liability.

**Consideration 3:** Should NASCO alter staffing levels. Analysis indicated that altering staff levels would be complex and may entail immediate costs of time and money to effectuate the processes, as well as long-term operational, and strategic implications.

**Consideration 4:** Should the Secretariat be requested to consult with NASCO's Standing Scientific Committee (SSC) to understand more fully any potential issues associated with moving towards the provision of multi-annual ICES advice. Based on this analysis, should no issues be identified, should NASCO engage with ICES on the development of a new Memorandum of Understanding, which could include a provision of multi-annual advice and seek cost reductions from the current level for the provision of this advice.

**Consideration 5:** Should NASCO encourage Parties / jurisdictions to host NASCO annual meetings, with a view to having hosting plans in place for three successive annual meetings.

**Consideration 6:** Should NASCO consider introducing a reasonable fee for in-person attendance by non-Party delegates at the annual meeting; if introduced, consideration should be given to the level of this fee, and if it should be set at a level that does not constitute a barrier to participation, particularly for smaller organizations.

**Consideration 7:** Should NASCO consider providing voluntary funds to cover any resulting shortfall due to arrears in payments.

### *2026 NASCO Organizational Liquidity Analysis*

<b>2026 NASCO Party Contributions</b>		<b>Notes</b>
UK	£34,391	
EU	£89,995	
Norway	£225,589	
Canada	£101,011	
US	£25,325	
Greenland/Faroes	£49,137	
Iceland	£78,108	
Russian Federation (RF)	£72,775	
Total	£676,331	
<b>Total less RF</b>	<b><u>£603,556</u></b>	
Known contributions	£603,556	
Known rental income	£64,000	
Known expenditure	-£735,330	<i>NASCO Agreed 2026 Budget</i>
<b>Operating deficit</b>	<b><u>-£67,774</u></b>	
Cash reserves	£613,298	<i>As at 31 December 2025</i>
excl Iceland	£535,190	<i>Iceland paid before December 2025</i>
<b>Funds</b>		
Working capital	£197,500	
Special	£35,500	
Recruitment	£30,409	
Contractual Obligation	£36,917	
<b>Liquidity</b>	<b><u>£167,090</u></b>	<i>Assuming receipt of all balances except from the Russian Federation This is current cash less forecast deficit, less funding obligations</i>

*Contributions to NASCO's Special Funds and End-of-year Balance 2025*

<b>Special Funds</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Payment</b>	<b>Source</b>
Special Fund established for IYS (with any surplus funds in 2016 and later years not needed for the Contractual Obligation Fund)	2016	£0.00	
Contribution to IYS fund in Budget	2017	£60,000.00	Parties (contribution in Budget)
Contribution to IYS fund in Budget	2018	£40,000.00	Parties (contribution in Budget)
Contribution to IYS fund in Budget	2019	£20,000.00	Parties (contribution in Budget)
Establishment of a new Special Fund called the Periodic Projects Special Fund (PPSF) with IYS fund surplus	2020	£60,800.00	IYS / SF (from Parties' contribution in Budget)
Contribution to PPSF in Budget	2021	£15,000.00	Parties (contribution in Budget)
<b>Balance at 31 December</b>	<b>2025</b>	<b>£35,651.16</b>	

*Comparison of Staffing Numbers*

RFMO	Staffing numbers
CCAMLR	22
GFCM	9
ICCAT	42
IWC	25
OSPAR	13
NAFO	11
NAMMCO	7
NEAFC	6
NASCO	4.5
NPFC	5
NPAFC	4
PSC	31
SPRFMO	4

*ICES Catch Advice to NASCO – Atlantic Salmon (2016–2026)*

Year (Fishing Season)	West Greenland (Catch Advice)	North America (Catch Advice)	North-East Atlantic (Faroes/NEAC Catch Advice)
2016	Zero / no mixed-stock options <sup>1</sup>	Zero / restricted <sup>1</sup>	Zero / no mixed-stock fishery <sup>1</sup>
2017	Zero / no mixed-stock options <sup>1</sup>	Zero / restricted <sup>1</sup>	Zero / no mixed-stock fishery <sup>1</sup>
2018	Zero / no mixed-stock options <sup>1</sup>	Zero / restricted <sup>1</sup>	Zero / no mixed-stock fishery <sup>1</sup>
2019	Zero / no mixed-stock options <sup>1</sup>	Zero / restricted <sup>1</sup>	Zero / no mixed-stock fishery <sup>1</sup>
2020	Zero / no mixed-stock options <sup>1</sup>	Zero / restricted <sup>1</sup>	Zero / no mixed-stock fishery <sup>1</sup>
2021	Zero / no mixed-stock options <sup>1</sup>	Zero / restricted <sup>1</sup>	Zero / no mixed-stock fishery <sup>1</sup>
2022	Zero / no mixed-stock options <sup>1</sup>	Zero / restricted <sup>1</sup>	Zero / no mixed-stock fishery <sup>1</sup>
2023	Zero / no mixed-stock options <sup>1</sup>	Zero / restricted <sup>1</sup>	Zero / no mixed-stock fishery <sup>1</sup>
2024	Zero (multiyear advice)	Zero (multiyear advice)	Zero (ICES advice applies for 2024/25)
2025	Zero (multiyear advice)	Zero (multiyear advice)	Zero (ICES advice applies for 2025/26)
2026	Zero (advised for 2026)	Zero (advised for 2026/27)	Zero (ICES advice applies for 2026/27)

<sup>1</sup>Historic pattern inferred from ICES recurrent advice structure: ICES uses the **Framework of Indicators (FWI)** to determine when sustainable mixed-stock fishery options exist; for most of the last decade, the advice has indicated *no mixed-stock catch options* for these distant water salmon fisheries, effectively resulting in zero catch guidance in reports and presentations to NASCO (e.g. 2021 NEAC advice remains valid for 2023/24).

***Questionnaire regarding charging Observers for participating in Annual Meetings***

<b>Name of Organization</b>	<b>Has your organization considered introducing fees for NGOs/Observers participation in an Annual Meeting?</b>	<b>If yes, when was this considered?</b>	<b>Has a participation fee been introduced?</b>	<b>If yes, what level of fee was introduced?</b>	<b>Is there a fee for participating in the virtual annual meeting?</b>	<b>If yes, what level of fee was introduced?</b>
Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization	Yes – Any NGO with observer accreditation may be required to pay a fee, which will cover the additional expenses generated by their participation, as determined annually by the Executive Secretary	At the 2013 NAFO Annual Meeting the recommendation to have an appropriate attendance fee be established and charged for accredited NGO observers was adopted.	Yes	This fee is based on the number of days the meeting takes place, is charged per person attending the meeting in person, and currently is as followed: • 1-4 Days: \$50.00 (CAD) • 5 Days: \$75.00 (CAD) • 6+ Days: \$100.00 (CAD) This amount is reviewed each year to ensure it is in line with the cost of additional participants	No	N/A

SPRFMO	No, not formally but this idea has been raised in the margins of meetings by some members. I will therefore be interested in your findings	Over the last couple of years	No	N/A	No	N/A
North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission	No.	It has not been considered in the NPAFC.	No.	Participation fee has not been introduced in the NPAFC.	No.	Fee for participating in the virtual and hybrid annual meetings has not been introduced in the NPAFC.
General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean - GFCM	No	Never considered	No	Not introduced	No	Not introduced
International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas - ICCAT	Yes.	1998	Yes.	For all in-person meetings: 500 US dollars for the first two participants and additional 350 US dollars for a third participant, noting that the number of observer delegation is limited to three.	So far, no.	N/A

NEAFC	Yes	In the margins of our last Annual Meeting in Nov 2025	No	N/A	No	N/A
Pacific Salmon Commission	No	NA	No	NA	No	NA

## Annex 6

### *NASCO's Annual Meetings: Attendance (in-person | virtual)*

<b>Year</b>	<b>SPM*</b>		<b>IGO</b>		<b>NGOs</b>		<b>IPRI</b> s		<b>Other Observers</b>		<b>Parties</b>		<b>Total</b>	
<b>2021 - (Online)</b>	4		8		30		N/A		1		115		158	
	<b>In person</b>	<b>Virtual</b>	<b>In person</b>	<b>Virtual</b>	<b>In person</b>	<b>Virtual</b>	<b>In person</b>	<b>virtual</b>	<b>In person</b>	<b>virtual</b>	<b>In person</b>	<b>virtual</b>	<b>In person</b>	<b>virtual</b>
<b>2022</b>	3	-	2	3	15	3	N/A	N/A	-	-	57	21	77	27
<b>2023</b>	1	1	1	1	20	10	N/A	N/A	10	5	76	28	108	45
<b>2024</b>	2	-	2	-	31	-	N/A	N/A	4	1	67	19	106	20
<b>2025</b>	1	3	1	-	29	3	4	1	-	-	61	22	96	29

\*France (in respect of St Pierre and Miquelon)