



International Atlantic Salmon Research Board

ICRIS(19)04

*Report of the Inter-Sessional Meeting of the International Atlantic Salmon
Research Board (IASRB)*

ICRIS(19)04

Report of the Inter-Sessional Meeting of the International Atlantic Salmon Research Board (IASRB)

By conference call

Thursday 25 April 2019 – 13:00 UK local time

1. Opening of the meeting

1.1 The Chair welcomed the members of the International Atlantic Salmon Research Board and noted apologies from Cathal Gallagher (European Union), Tony Blanchard (Canada), and Alexander Khatuntsov (Russian Federation) for not being able to attend. He explained the work at hand, to seek feedback on the draft documents produced, revisions to the current Rules of Procedure of the International Atlantic Salmon Research Board (ICR(06)10), hereinafter referred to as the Board, as requested by Council in the 35th Annual Meeting in Portland, Maine, USA. The Chair explained that, although the conference call was only among the voting members of the Board, he had previously consulted with the current (Gérald Chaput (Canada)) and previous (Niall Ó Maoléidigh (European Union) Chairs of the Science Advisory Group, hereinafter referred to as the SAG, and the NGO representatives to the Board (Ken Whelan) and the SAG (Dave Meerburg) to seek their views on the proposed changes to the Rules of Procedure. In addition, the Chair had sent the draft documents to the Heads of Delegations, giving them the opportunity to comment on the process, as had been requested in 2018.

1.2 The following members of the Board participated in the meeting:

Raoul Bierach (Norway)

Rasmus Nygaard (Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)

Rory Saunders (Chair, United States)

Tim Sheehan (United States).

2. Adoption of the Agenda

2.1 The Board adopted its Agenda, ICRIS(19)02, (Annex 1).

3. Introductions (All)

3.1 The participants introduced themselves to each other given that there is a new member of the Board – Rasmus Nygaard (Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)).

4. Secretary's Review of Rules of Procedure – CNL(18)10 (Secretary)

4.1 The Secretary provided an overview of the paper that was provided to Council in 2018, explaining the genesis of the revision of the Rules of Procedure of the Board and the SAG.

4.2 The representative of Norway gave a brief overview of the establishment of the Board by the Council of NASCO and how the Board then established the SAG to help them with some of the duties. He explained that initially the main attendees of the Board meeting were the nominated Board members, possibly with an adviser, who was often a member of the SAG. Other advisers may have been present in a supporting capacity much like in the Council or Commission meetings. Generally, only the SAG Chair reported to the Board.

5. Consideration of Council's request (Chair)

5.1 The Chair explained the process thus far in the drafting of new Rules of Procedure for the Board and SAG. The Members of the Board, the Heads of Delegations, the current and previous Chair of the SAG and the NGO representatives to both the Board and the SAG have all been consulted by the Chair.

6. Consideration of Chair's Draft Rules of Procedure (Chair)

6.1 The Chair's initial proposal included revised Rules of Procedure for both the Board and the SAG as separate documents. The starting point for both documents was the existing Rules of Procedure for the Board. The Secretary's Review of the Rules of Procedure for the Board (CNL(18)10) was also considered in the development of the initial proposal by the Chair.

7. Guidance for the Chair (Discussion by all)

7.1 To complete the task assigned, the Chair sought guidance on a number of topics, including: an assessment of the Chair's draft documents; identification of further refinements to the Chair's draft documents including the necessity of clarifying membership status to the Secretary, the mechanism for that clarification, and communications at meetings; whether the nominated SAG members should be the Board scientific advisers; and to determine what *'the Board should consider appropriate arrangements for increasing NGO involvement in its work'* should translate into in light of this review of procedures.

7.2 The role of the SAG was discussed at length, to determine whether it should be considered a separate body with its own Rules of Procedure or if development of Terms of Reference by the Board would be more appropriate. In considering an approach forward, a wide range of challenges were discussed including potential duplication of effort by the Board and by the SAG in recent years; clarification on the mechanisms for communicating current membership of the SAG; and clarifying the process related to the tenure of the SAG Chair. This discussion also emphasised the importance of the SAG's role in delivering advice to the Board and retaining the Board's formal decision making on various issues under consideration.

7.3 Board members on the call suggested that developing Terms of Reference for the SAG would establish a stronger and clearer relationship between the SAG and the Board. Board members also suggested that if needed a list of duties for the SAG in the following year would need to be agreed by the Board each year and that this would best be accomplished by adding a bullet point to the Board's Rules of Procedure as follows: 'As needed, the Board may establish Terms of Reference for a Scientific Advisory Group (SAG). The Terms of Reference would outline tasks, timelines, meeting procedures for the SAG in a given year.' Thus, Board members on the call suggested that convening meetings of the SAG on an 'as needed' basis would result in a more dynamic relationship between the Board and the SAG, with the Board deciding actively

whether work by the SAG is needed and setting relevant Terms of Reference in each case.

- 7.4 Board members on the call also discussed the need for clarification as to who the Chair of the SAG would be and how that would be decided. The options discussed included a standing Chair with a time-limited duration and an alternative where the position of Chair was decided annually, when necessary, by the Board. Past practice has been that the Chair of the SAG was decided by SAG members. Board members on the call considered this an appropriate arrangement.
- 7.5 Additionally, Board members on the call discussed how the process for communicating membership of the SAG for each Party could also be clarified. In the past, the requests have always gone to the Heads of Delegations to appoint both the Board and the SAG members (and also the Board's advisers). Board members on the call suggested the Heads of Delegations should be asked every two years for the nominations for the SAG membership and this should be reflected in the Revised Rules of Procedure.
- 7.6 The role of the SAG in conducting the Inventory of Marine Research was also discussed. Overall, the Board members on the call suggested that Board members can request that their own scientific advisers complete the inventory on an annual basis and that the work need not be presented to both the Board and the SAG. Typically, it would then not be necessary for this to be included in Terms of Reference for the SAG if the work were simply delivered by the scientific advisers.
- 7.7 Given these changes to the way the SAG is convened there was general agreement that the Board's Rules of Procedure did not need to be changed to a large extent. However, clarification of the roles and responsibilities of the Board and its SAG needed to be delimited clearly to ensure clarity of function of the respective bodies. Developing the Terms of Reference for the SAG will require the Board to be more proactive.
- 7.8 The issue of who may be considered 'Board advisers' was also discussed. It was raised that the term 'adviser' pre-dated the formation of the SAG, which might be some of the reason for the confusion. The adviser's role was not originally confined to that of a scientific adviser. The representative of Norway described some of the original discussions around who would comprise the Board membership. The representative of Norway noted that Board members were typically Heads of Delegation who would likely need advice from experts in their decision making. While this issue was discussed in some detail, there did not seem to be the need to change the Rules of Procedure in this regard.
- 7.9 Consideration of NGO involvement was also discussed at length. The Board members noted that NGO involvement was of great value to the work of the Board and SAG, and thus it would be important for the NGO representative to retain the same ability to speak as the voting members of the Board even though the NGO representative would not be a voting member. While the contributions of NGOs to the work of the Board are valuable, Board members noted that it would be important that the NGO representative named by the NGO co-chairs would typically be the only NGO representative recognized by the Chair during meetings of the Board to maintain consistency and clarity in communications. The Chair agreed to ensure the revised proposed Rules of Procedure are in line with the discussion.
- 7.10 Finally, the frequency of Board meetings within the Annual Meeting was raised. It was noted that it may sometimes be useful to have a second Board meeting later in the week of the Annual Meeting to enable a more pro-active approach. For example, it may be

necessary to consult within delegations regarding a particular piece of work that the SAG may be asked to carry out. In this case, a second meeting could enable agreement on Terms of Reference for the SAG in the following year, after consultation.

8. Next Steps

- 8.1 The Chair agreed to revise the proposed Rules of Procedure document following this discussion and share it with the Board members for their consideration. The proposed revisions to the Rules of Procedure of the Board and the SAG will be discussed in the Board meeting and then in Council.

9. Other Business

- 9.1 Board members discussed the issue of clarity of communications in relation to the large numbers of attendees for meetings of the Board in recent years. It was suggested that it may be beneficial for the seating arrangements for the 2019 Board and SAG meeting to be similar to meetings of the Council and Commission. This suggestion would place seating around an inner table for the Board and appointed advisers only, with other attendees seated behind their respective members.

10. Close of Meeting

- 10.1 The Chair closed the meeting and thanked the Board members for a very useful discussion.

ICR(19)02

**Conference call of the International Atlantic Salmon Research Board
(IASRB)**

April 25, 2019

Agenda

1. Opening of the meeting
2. Adoption of the Agenda
3. Introductions (All)
4. Secretary's Review of Rules of Procedure – CNL(18)10 (Secretary)
5. Consideration of Council's request (Chair)
 - a) *'The IASRB had also considered this document (i.e. CNL(18)10) and had recommended that the Chair of the IASRB should propose new Rules of Procedure and clarify the Terms of Reference for the IASRB and the SAG, in consultation with the Secretary, members of the IASRB and current and past Chairs of the SAG. The representative of the EU stated that he would welcome the opportunity for the Parties to input into the drafting process.'*
6. Consideration of Chair's Draft Rules of Procedure (Chair)
7. Guidance for the Chair (Discussion by all)
 - a) To complete the task assigned, the Chair requires guidance on a number of topics including:
 - an assessment of the Chair's draft documents;
 - identification of further refinements to the Chair's draft documents including the necessity of clarifying membership status to the Secretary, the mechanism for that clarification, and communications at meetings, i.e. clarification of who should speak to the Board and SAG meetings;
 - whether the nominated SAG members should be the Board scientific advisers, as was originally suggested in 2002, alternatively, clarify the role of the Board advisers;
 - to determine what *'the Board should consider appropriate arrangements for increasing NGO involvement in its work'* should translate into in light of this review of procedures
 - other issues of relevance to the members, NGOs, and Heads of Delegations.
8. Next Steps

- a) Chair to issue draft revisions to the Rules of Procedure based on discussion and other communications before May 8, 2019. Secretary to disseminate to all delegates along with other Council papers.
 - b) Discussion at the Board meeting
 - c) Consideration by the Council
9. Other Business
10. Close of Meeting

Secretary and Chair of the IASRB
Edinburgh
25 April 2019