

CNL(18)49

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 (CNL(98)46) 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 that address the Organization's principal areas of concern for the management of salmon stocks. The threats and challenges to wild salmon vary widely across jurisdictions. However, there are three theme areas and the overall goals for NASCO and its Parties in relation to these 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. These guidelines are intended to serve as guidance to the NASCO Parties / jurisdictions for the management of wild salmon fisheries subject to their national legislation;
- NASCO Plan of Action for the Application of the Precautionary Approach to the Protection and Restoration of Atlantic Salmon Habitat, CNL(01)51. The NASCO Plan of Action provides the guiding principles and the means to implement the Precautionary Approach with regard to habitat management;
- NASCO Guidelines for the Protection, Restoration and Enhancement of Atlantic Salmon Habitat, CNL(10)51. This document guides NASCO Parties / jurisdictions in making further progress in implementing NASCO's agreements for the protection and restoration of salmon habitat;
- 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'. This document consolidated a series of previous measures and added new elements related to mitigation and corrective measures, implementation, burden of proof, risk assessment, stocking Atlantic salmon, river classification and zoning to guide NASCO Parties / jurisdictions in these areas;
- Guidance on Best Management Practices to Address Impacts of Sea Lice and Escaped Farmed Salmon on Wild Salmon Stocks, SLG(09)5. This guidance document was agreed by NASCO and the International Salmon Farmers' Association in 2009. It is intended to

supplement the Williamsburg Resolution and to assist the Parties / jurisdictions in managing salmon aquaculture (in co-operation with their industries), and in developing NASCO Implementation Plans, among other things.

Other important documents include the Report of the Working Group on Stock Classification, CNL(16)11, the Minimum Standard for Catch Statistics, CNL(93)51, the 'revised matrix for the application of the six tenets for effective management of an Atlantic salmon fishery', WGCST(16)16¹, the Guidelines for incorporating social and economic factors in decisions under the Precautionary Approach (CNL(04)57), and the 'Road Map' to enhance information exchange and co-operation on monitoring, research and measures to prevent the spread of *G. salaris* and eradicate it if introduced, NEA(18)08. These are listed individually in the Implementation Plan template given that they are referenced within that document.

The purpose of Implementation Plans and Annual Progress Reports is to provide a succinct, transparent, fair and balanced approach for reporting on the implementation of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines by the Parties / jurisdictions. These were key elements of the 'Next Steps for NASCO' process and, following an External Performance Review in 2012 (CNL(12)11), a strengthened Implementation Plans and Annual Progress Reports process was adopted by Council as an alternative to the Convention change recommended during the Review. While there have been improvements over the second cycle of reporting, Council has expressed a wish to strengthen the IP / APR process still further in the third reporting cycle, including a greater emphasis on Parties / jurisdictions working toward the achievement of the NASCO goals for sea lice and containment by the end of the reporting period. Clarification of the link between the changes proposed by the IP / APR Review Group to strengthen the IP / APR process and the changes made to the Guidelines and templates for the third reporting cycle is given in Annex 1.

This document describes the structure and content of Implementation Plans in the third reporting cycle, the criteria that will be used for their review and acceptance, and the procedures for reporting and evaluating progress through the Annual Progress Reports. This document is also intended to assist Parties / jurisdictions with the development of their Implementation Plans and Annual Progress Reports.

2. Implementation Plans

Implementation Plans are the key documents in the third reporting cycle. They are focused around the three theme areas and emphasise: the actions to be taken over the period of the Implementation Plan (2019 – 2024); clearly identifiable measurable outcomes and timescales; and appropriate monitoring to evaluate the effectiveness of the measures taken.

The key element of an Implementation Plan is the **action**. Actions are specific, measurable, ambitious yet achievable, relevant and timely activities that a Party or jurisdiction intends to undertake during the specified term of the Implementation Plan to address threats and management challenges. In general, actions are implemented as part of a strategy or plan to achieve a desired goal. A goal may be the elimination of escapes from aquaculture cages whereas the specific **action** could be to require containment management systems for all marine cages by 2024. Similarly, a goal may be to reduce exploitation in a mixed-stock fishery whereas

¹ This document can be obtained from the NASCO Secretariat; email hq@nasco.int

the **action** could be to reduce the netting effort through a reduction in the open season each year.

2.1 Structure, Format and Content of Implementation Plans

An Implementation Plan should:

- apply to all the stocks / fisheries managed within a jurisdiction;
- apply for a number of years (2019 – 2024 in this case), and generally require no annual modification unless circumstances change significantly;
- be clear and concise;
- be prepared in consultation with NGOs and other relevant stakeholders and industries;
- include actions contained within the first and second cycle of Implementation Plans where they are still relevant in addressing a threat or challenge identified in the Implementation Plans in the third reporting cycle;
- contain at least one action related to the management of a mixed-stock fishery for Parties or jurisdictions that prosecute them;
- contain at least one action related to NASCO and ISFA’s goal for sea lice and at least one action related to NASCO and ISFA’s goal for containment for Parties or jurisdictions with salmon farms;
- 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. In light of the need to move toward more measurable actions to demonstrate progress toward attainment of NASCO’s goals, a ‘SMART’ approach must be taken in the third cycle of reporting. ‘SMART’ stands for:
 - S – Specific – actions should be clear and concise and planned to address the threats / challenges identified in the Implementation Plan in a targeted fashion in order to improve implementation of NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines;
 - M – Measurable – for each action there should be an expected outcome and a monitoring programme that will allow progress to be measured and reported through the Annual Progress Reports for evaluation by the Review Group;
 - A – Ambitious yet Achievable – actions and associated monitoring programmes should be ambitious in scope, given the current status of wild Atlantic salmon around the North Atlantic, and the Council’s recognition of the need to improve commitment to NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. It should be clearly stated that funding is in place, or is expected to be in place, to allow implementation of proposed actions / monitoring programmes during the specified period covered by the Implementation Plan;
 - R – Relevant - actions must relate clearly to the main threats and / or challenges identified in the Implementation Plan in a timely fashion, taking into account the provisions in NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines;
 - T – Timely – in general, all actions in the Implementation Plan should achieve their expected outcome within the specified period covered by the Implementation Plan. Where appropriate, actions may cover a period of less or more than the specified period of the Implementation Plan. Where appropriate, milestones that are expected

to be achievable within the period covered by the Implementation Plan should be specified.

In summary, actions in Implementation Plans need to be ‘SMART’ to enable the evaluation of progress toward the attainment of NASCO’s goals. A wide array of tools is available online to assist Parties / jurisdictions in developing ‘SMART’ actions.

The ‘SMART’ approach includes reporting on both quantitative and qualitative information. Quantitative information is expected wherever possible and should be presented to demonstrate progress made over the period of the plan towards NASCO’s goals. This should be clear and concise. Where a deviation must be made from a quantitative metric, the reason for the deviation should be explained. Where quantitative information is not relevant, specific milestones can be used to describe progress towards the achievement of a given action towards the achievement of NASCO’s goals.

When an action is taken by a Party or jurisdiction it should result in a measurable outcome; this is referred to as the ‘expected outcome’ in the Implementation Plan template.

Some examples of ‘SMART’ actions, together with an idea of how progress towards the expected outcome could be measured, are:

- undertake genetic stock-identification studies to determine the level and extent of stock mixing in salmon fisheries by 2024;
 - progress against this action could be reported using a mixture of qualitative and quantitative milestones, e.g. year 1 – an appropriate literature review was undertaken; year 2 – sampling of 15 sites was carried out to collect baseline genetic information to inform a mixed-stock analysis; year 3 – 10 samples per week were collected from the fishery, etc.
- by 2024, remove 10 barriers to fish passage;
 - the expected outcome could be measured in terms of the number of fish barriers removed or in the number of kilometres of river made accessible by their removal.
- by 2024, ensure that 100% of all salmon farms implement single year-class stocking;
 - in this example progress could be demonstrated by specifying the proportion of farms implementing single year-class stocking each year leading up to 100% implementation by 2024, i.e. the expected outcome.
- verify compliance with the relevant Code of Containment for all fish farms that will achieve NASCO and ISFA’s goal of 100% containment by 2024;
 - in this example, progress could be reported annually to demonstrate the overall trend towards complete compliance, i.e. the expected outcome.

The Implementation Plans should be prepared using the agreed template, CNL(18)50.

2.2 Review and Evaluation 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 the Implementation Plans

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.

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, and if time permits, the NASCO Secretariat will check the Implementation Plans for the following information:

1. provision of answers to all the questions, except where these are indicated to be inappropriate for the Party or jurisdiction;
2. provision of lists of threats to wild salmon and challenges for management related to the three theme areas;
3. provision of actions to address the main threats and challenges, which include measurable outcomes, and monitoring that will be undertaken to assess the effectiveness of the action and the planned timescale for the action.

Where there are obvious gaps in the Implementation Plans in any of the above areas they will be referred to the Party or jurisdiction for correction. In cases of uncertainty, the Secretariat will refer to the Review Group.

Evaluation of Implementation Plans

After the initial assessment by the Secretariat, each Implementation Plan will be examined by a Review Group that will evaluate the quality of the information contained and determine whether it provides a fair and equitable basis for assessing the progress that the Party or jurisdiction will make in implementing NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.

The key to assessing progress toward NASCO's goals objectively (through the reporting of annual progress, see section 3 below) is the development of 'SMART' actions. Articulating clearly the criteria upon which Implementation Plans will be evaluated is key to the success of the third reporting cycle.

The Review Group will assess, therefore, whether or not actions in each theme area (i.e. management of salmon fisheries, protection and restoration of Atlantic salmon habitat, and management of aquaculture, introductions and transfers and transgenics) are 'SMART'. If they are not 'SMART,' they will be referred to the relevant Party or jurisdiction for modification with clear guidance on the way that the Review Group considers that the Implementation Plan should be improved. If an action is not 'SMART' then it is difficult to assess progress objectively. Furthermore, actions must focus on the main threats and challenges identified in the Implementation Plans. Implementation Plans will not be accepted until all actions are deemed satisfactory by the Review Group.

Additionally, answers to each question will be assessed as:

1. Satisfactory answers / information, including measurable ('SMART') objectives;
2. Unsatisfactory (including unclear or incomplete answers / information or clear omissions or inadequacies).

Implementation Plans with acceptable actions but that include answers in category 2 above will be also returned to Parties or 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.

Resubmitted Implementation Plans will be reassessed by the Review Group, according to the schedule in section 2.5 below, to determine whether the areas highlighted have been addressed or a satisfactory explanation of the original content has been provided.

If after the second round of review the Implementation Plan still contains unsatisfactory information it will need to be resubmitted no later than 1 November 2019 and the Review Group will reassess it by correspondence during November 2019 to ensure adequate time for the preparation of the associated Annual Progress Report template.

In subsequent years, Parties / jurisdictions may wish to modify their Implementation Plans if circumstances change significantly. In the third cycle of reporting, the Review Group will evaluate these modified Implementation Plans by correspondence during November of that year to ensure adequate time for the preparation of the associated Annual Progress Report template.

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 and not their Party or Organization. To provide continuity, they should be appointed to serve for a period of at least three years; new members are encouraged to join, periodically, to provide fresh perspectives. The NASCO Secretariat will co-ordinate the Review Group's work but will not serve as reviewers. The Review Group will also review the Annual Progress Reports (see section 3.2).

2.4 Reporting to the Annual Meeting

The Review Group will present its evaluation of the Implementation Plans to the Annual Meeting of the Council in a Special Session, highlighting shortcomings in Implementation Plans that are considered unsatisfactory and giving suggestions for how these might be addressed, at the same time as providing examples of good practice within the Implementation Plans. The President will lead the discussions with Parties / jurisdictions concerning any shortcomings in their Implementation Plans and those Parties / jurisdictions will have an opportunity to revise their Implementation Plans after the Annual Meeting. Where the Review Group considers that there are still clear omissions or inadequacies in the actions or the answers

/ information provided (category 2), these shortcomings will be listed in their report to the Council.

2.5 Schedules for Submission, Review and Distribution of Implementation Plans

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

Date / deadline	Responsibility	Action required
11 October 2018	Secretary	Initiates the third cycle of reporting through requests to submit new Implementation Plans
1 February 2019	Parties / jurisdictions	<u>Deadline</u> for submission of Implementation Plans to Secretary
7 February 2019	Secretary	Distributes Implementation Plans to Review Group
26 – 28 February 2019	Review Group	Meets and develops its evaluation of the Implementation Plans
15 March 2019	Secretary	Returns Implementation Plans requiring modification to Parties / jurisdictions with clear guidance on the Review Group's recommendations for improvements
1 May 2019	Parties / jurisdictions	<u>Deadline</u> for submission of revised Implementation Plans
May 2019	Review Group	Reviews revised Implementation Plans by correspondence
27 May 2019	Secretary	Emails Review Group's assessments of revised Implementation Plans to NASCO Heads of Delegation
June 2019	Review Group	Presents report to the Council in Special Session
Summer 2019	Secretary	Uploads accepted Implementation Plans to NASCO website
1 November 2019	Parties / jurisdictions	<u>Deadline</u> for submission of revised Implementation Plans to NASCO
30 November 2019	Secretary	Either: Uploads accepted Implementation Plans to NASCO website Or: Returns revised Implementation Plans to Parties / jurisdictions with clear guidance on the Review Group's recommendations for improvements
31 December 2019	Parties / jurisdictions	<u>Deadline</u> for return of revised Implementation Plans to NASCO for inclusion in APR template
1 November 2020 / 2021 / 2022 / 2023	Parties / jurisdictions	<u>Deadline</u> for modified Implementation Plan in the event of circumstances changing significantly
30 November 2020 / 2021 / 2022 / 2023	Secretary	Either: Uploads accepted modified Implementation Plans to NASCO website Or: Returns modified Implementation Plans to Parties / jurisdictions with clear guidance on the Review Group's recommendations for improvements

31 December 2020 / 2021 / 2022 / 2023	Parties / jurisdictions	<u>Deadline</u> for return of modified Implementation Plans to NASCO for inclusion in APR template
---	----------------------------	---

3. Annual Progress Reports

The Annual Progress Reports are the primary medium through which NASCO is able to assess progress towards the achievement of its Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines and report on its activities through the provision 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 (to begin in 2020 after Implementation Plans are finalised)

Each year the Parties / jurisdictions should prepare Annual Progress Reports using the agreed reporting template CNL(18)51. These should provide information on progress against actions in their Implementation Plans relating to management of salmon fisheries, habitat protection and restoration and aquaculture and related activities, 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 Party / jurisdiction, together with any shortcomings identified by the IP / APR Review Group for each specific action (from 2021).

3.2 Review and Evaluation 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). The purpose of the evaluation will be to ensure that Parties / jurisdictions have provided a clear account of their 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 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 highlight these in a table at the end of the evaluation for each Party / jurisdiction, detailing for each action whether the progress reported is satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Parties / jurisdictions will be expected to respond to these shortcomings at the Annual Meeting of the Council and these shortcomings should then be addressed in the Annual Progress Reports for the following year, commencing in 2021.

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:

Date	Responsibility	Action required
5 January	Secretariat	Sends the template for Annual Progress Reports to each Party / jurisdiction
1 March	Secretariat	Sends reminders for completion of Annual Progress Reports
1 April	Parties / jurisdictions	<u>Deadline</u> for submission of Annual Progress Reports to Secretariat
	Secretariat	Annual Progress Reports made available on the website
Mid-April	Review Group	Meets and develops its evaluation of the Annual Progress Reports
1 May	Review Group	Completion of review
Annual Meeting	Parties / jurisdictions	Respond to shortcomings identified by the Review Group at the Annual Meeting of the Council and address these shortcomings in the APR for the following year

Under this reporting cycle, Annual Progress Reports will be submitted in 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024 and 2025.

3.4 Reporting to the Annual Meeting

The Review Group will present its evaluation of the Annual Progress Reports to the Annual Meeting of the Council in a Special Session, highlighting examples of good practice within the Annual Progress Reports. The President will ask the Chair to introduce any shortcomings within individual Annual Progress Reports and the President will then invite representatives of the relevant Parties / jurisdictions to take the floor in turn and respond to the Review Group's critique.

RGFR(18)03

Clarification of the link between the changes proposed by the IP / APR Review Group and the changes made to the Guidelines and templates for the third reporting cycle.

Issue identified by the IP / APR Review Group	Redrafting Group on Future Reporting solution
<i>Shortcomings</i>	
<p>The most common and most serious shortcoming continues to be a lack of quantitative data to demonstrate progress towards achieving NASCO goals, particularly relating to the protection of wild fish from the impacts of salmon farming – specifically lice management and containment.</p>	<p>The emphasis on, and clarification of, a ‘SMART’ approach to goal setting and reporting in the new Guidelines document is intended to give clear guidance to jurisdictions to enable this shortcoming to be addressed.</p> <p>A greater emphasis on actions to minimise the impacts of salmon farming on wild Atlantic salmon has been highlighted consistently in IP / APR Review Group reports and by the Working Group on Future Reporting. This emphasis has been incorporated in the new Guidelines document and Implementation Plan template with the addition of a number of new questions therein.</p>
<p>The lack of clarity in the actions in Implementation Plans, which makes evaluation of progress difficult within Annual Progress Reports.</p>	<p>The emphasis on, and clarification of, a ‘SMART’ approach to goal setting and reporting in the new Guidelines document is intended to give clear guidance to jurisdictions to enable this shortcoming to be addressed.</p>
<p>The Review Group had previously noted the difficulty in assessing progress on actions that are unclear or imprecise. Greater efforts should be made in the next round of Implementation Plans to ensure that all actions are clearly and concisely described. Any Implementation Plans that do not do so should not be accepted by the Review Group but returned to the Party / jurisdiction for revision.</p>	<p>The emphasis on, and clarification of, a ‘SMART’ approach to goal setting and reporting in the new Guidelines document is intended to give clear guidance to jurisdictions to enable this shortcoming to be addressed.</p> <p>A clear process for review of proposed actions in the Implementation Plans is described in the new Guidelines document.</p>
<p>Not all Parties / jurisdictions have provided an Implementation Plan or a complete Implementation Plan, even though the second reporting cycle is almost completed.</p>	<p>A greater emphasis has been placed on timely reporting consistent with the new schedule. Lack of reporting and late reporting still remains a major concern for the third cycle of reporting.</p>

Some actions appeared to have little relevance to achieving NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.	Far greater emphasis has been placed on the attainment of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines in the new Guidelines document and Implementation Plan template.
In some instances, there had been a lack of consultation with stakeholders and NGOs in the development of the 2013–2018 Implementation Plans.	There is a new question in the Implementation Plan template to address this shortcoming.
There had been a failure to submit Annual Progress Reports according to the agreed deadline of 1 April by some jurisdictions, giving the IP / APR Review Group little or no time to conduct its evaluations.	A greater emphasis has been placed on timely reporting consistent with the new schedule. Lack of reporting and late reporting still remains a major concern for the third cycle of reporting.
There had been a failure to address issues identified in questions developed by the IP / APR Review Group in the first three years of the second reporting cycle.	In 2017 the decision was taken by Council to replace questions with an analysis of shortcomings by the IP / APR Review Group for each APR. The recommendation for the third cycle of reporting is that representatives of relevant jurisdictions should respond to identified shortcomings in their individual APRs at the APR Special Session in the relevant year (see section 3.4 of the new Guidelines document).
There was unclear reporting through many Annual Progress Reports, some of which was too brief or, indeed, overly long but still unclear, and several were reliant on weblinks, references and other external sources of information which the IP / APR Review Group does not have time to assess.	The emphasis on, and clarification of, a 'SMART' approach to goal setting and reporting in the new Guidelines document is intended to give clear guidance to jurisdictions to enable this shortcoming to be addressed. Each section of the APR now contains the following text ' <i>While referring to additional material (e.g. via links to websites) may assist those seeking more detailed information, this will not be evaluated by the Review Group.</i> '
Some actions have not yet commenced, even though the second reporting cycle is near completion.	The emphasis on, and clarification of, a 'SMART' approach to goal setting and reporting in the new Guidelines document is intended to give clear guidance to jurisdictions to enable this shortcoming to be addressed, and in particular, the emphasis on actions being ambitious yet achievable. Additionally, the new Guidelines document (section 2.1) allows for actions not yet started, but still felt to be relevant, to be included in the third cycle of reporting.
<i>Recommendations for improvement</i>	
In the next round of Implementation Plans, it may be necessary to include specific topic	The new Guidelines document states clearly that Implementation Plans must contain

<p>areas on which Parties / jurisdictions would be expected to provide an action if they do not demonstrate that they are fully compliant with NASCO agreements and guidelines.</p>	<p>certain actions (section 2.1) for mixed-stock fisheries, sea lice and containment for relevant jurisdictions.</p>
<p>Greater efforts should be made in the next round of Implementation Plans to ensure that all actions are clearly and concisely described. Implementation Plans which do not contain clear actions should not be accepted by the IP / APR Review Group and should be returned to the Party / jurisdiction for revision.</p>	<p>The emphasis on, and clarification of, a ‘SMART’ approach to goal setting and reporting in the new Guidelines document is intended to give clear guidance to jurisdictions to enable this shortcoming to be addressed. A clear process for review of proposed actions in the Implementation Plans is described in the new Guidelines document.</p>
<p>There may be a need to include some standard questions in the template for the next round of Implementation Plans with a view to ensuring that such information is provided by all Parties / jurisdictions (e.g. relating to sea lice levels and containment within marine salmon farms).</p>	<p>The approach taken here is that standard questions have not been developed because the Group felt that there should be some leeway for jurisdictions to develop actions consistent with their legislative instruments. However, the new Guidelines document states clearly that Implementation Plans must contain certain actions (section 2.1) for mixed-stock fisheries, sea lice and containment for relevant jurisdictions.</p>
<p>The Review Group had also highlighted that timely reporting was essential if the evaluations were to be fair and balanced.</p>	<p>A greater emphasis has been placed on timely reporting consistent with the new schedule. Lack of reporting and late reporting still remains a major concern for the third cycle of reporting.</p>
<p>The Review Group considers that it would be clearer to use only three choices: ‘Not Started’, ‘Ongoing’, ‘Completed’ for the 2018 APRs and recommends that the Council requests that the Secretary makes this change to the reporting template.</p>	<p>This issue was addressed with changes made to the APR template in 2018.</p>
<p>The Review Group proposes that for the 2018 APRs, rather than developing questions for response by the Parties / jurisdictions concerned it details its evaluation of progress on each action in a table at the end of each review, highlighting shortcomings, and that Parties / jurisdictions are asked to address these in the APR for the following year. The Review Group recognises that the current APR cycle is close to completion but believes that this approach might be a valuable improvement that could be used in the next reporting cycle.</p>	<p>This issue was addressed with changes made to the APR process in 2018. In 2017 the decision was taken by Council to replace questions with an analysis of shortcomings by the IP / APR Review Group for each APR. The recommendation for the third cycle of reporting is that representatives of relevant jurisdictions should respond to identified shortcomings in their individual APRs at the APR Special Session in the relevant year (see section 3.4 of the new Guidelines document).</p>
<p>The Review Group noted that all the</p>	<p>The Working Group on Future Reporting</p>

Members of the West Greenland Commission had agreed to apply the Six Tenets for Effective Management of an Atlantic Salmon Fishery in order to evaluate the monitoring and control measures applying to their salmon fisheries. These tenets have already been applied to the salmon fishery at West Greenland and led to the adoption of an Updated Plan for Implementation of Monitoring and Control Measures in the Salmon Fishery at West Greenland, progress on which had been reported in the 2016 APR for Greenland, CNL(16)21. There had been some discussions within the West Greenland Commission as to whether the six tenets might be applied more widely to include all NASCO Parties / jurisdictions. If that is done, consideration might be given to including a section in the new IPs dealing with the monitoring and control elements covered by the six tenets.

addressed this issue and a new question was added to the Implementation Plan template (question 2.7).