

IP(20)09_Canada

November 2020 Evaluation of the Revised Implementation Plan under the Third Reporting Cycle (2019 – 2024) from the Review Group to Canada

NASCO considers that the provision of Implementation Plans, together with annual reporting of progress on actions contained within them, is one of the most valuable mechanisms that it has developed. It is a vitally important mechanism to strengthen implementation of NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. Parties to NASCO have committed to the conservation of wild Atlantic salmon. Parties’ / jurisdictions’ Implementation Plans set out their planned actions and these are reviewed by an expert Review Group. Reporting is carried out annually on these Plans (see <https://nasco.int/conservation/implementation-plans-and-reporting/>).

The Council of NASCO agreed, in September 2020, that all Implementation Plans would be reviewed again in November 2020, in line with the Enhanced Guidance from the Council, CNL(20)55. This meant, in each case, that the most recent version of each Implementation Plan was reviewed, whether updates had been provided in 2020 or not, even where the Review Group had previously found the Implementation Plans to be satisfactory.

The Review Group thanks Canada for submitting their revised Implementation Plan, and for revising their Plan following the previous evaluations from the Review Group. It also noted the response to the letter sent from NASCO’s President, and the comments therein.

In line with the ‘Guidelines for the Preparation and Evaluation of NASCO Implementation Plans and for Reporting on Progress’, [CNL\(18\)49](#), (the IP Guidelines) and the ‘Enhanced Guidance for the Review of Implementation Plans’, [CNL\(20\)55](#), the infographic below shows the overview of the Review Group’s evaluation, in November 2020, of Canada’s Implementation Plan. Sections / areas considered to be ‘satisfactory’ are shown in green, and those which are ‘unsatisfactory’, in red.

	Questions on Salmon Management				Threats / Challenges to Wild 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 & Transgenics	Management of Salmon Fisheries	Habitat Protection & Restoration	Aquaculture, Introductions & Transfers & Transgenics	
Canada											

The Review Group reassessed the responses to questions, the threats / challenges and the actions in conjunction with the Enhanced Guidance, CNL(20)55, looking in greater detail at, and providing feedback relating to the achievement of, NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and

Guidelines. The Review Group, therefore, considered that Canada's Implementation Plan requires further work to achieve a satisfactory rating across all sections / areas of the Plan.

The Review Group considered that the responses to questions 2.1 and 3.3 were some of the best examples of answers to these questions across the various Implementation Plans. For question 2.2, the Review Group considered that Canada's response described the decision making process well and how the management actions relate to the stock-reference limits.

Questions on Salmon Management: clear improvements are required in several responses to the questions on salmon management to enable each of these sections to be considered as satisfactory. The response to question 4.3 was no longer considered to be satisfactory. However, the responses to questions 2.3(c) and 4.7 were considered, following their revision, to be satisfactory. The Review Group has provided detailed feedback to each response that was considered to be unsatisfactory.

Threats / Challenges to Wild Salmon: the Review Group considered that the identified threats and challenges to the management of wild Atlantic salmon identified under each theme all related clearly to NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.

SMART Actions: all of the 'Management of Salmon Fisheries' actions within the Plan were considered to be both SMART and satisfactory, i.e. the Review Group considered that those actions move Canada clearly towards the implementation of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. Two of the three 'Habitat Protection and Restoration' actions were considered to be both SMART and satisfactory; however, one was considered to be neither SMART nor satisfactory. Of the six actions on 'Aquaculture, Disease, Transfers & Transgenics' only one was considered to be both SMART and satisfactory; the remaining five were considered to be neither SMART nor satisfactory.

Mandatory Actions: the section overall was considered to be unsatisfactory because the actions required on sea lice and containment, given the marine aquaculture present in Canada, require substantial revision. At least one of the actions on both sea lice and containment should relate to the management of these issues to be in line with NASCO's Best Management Practice, SLG(09)5.

In the following Evaluation Form, the Review Group has provided guidance on its recommendations for improvements.

Evaluation in 2020 of Revised Implementation Plans Based on Enhanced Guidance from the Council

Under NASCO's third reporting cycle the Review Group is asked to evaluate the Implementation Plans submitted by Parties / jurisdictions in three key areas of assessment, by:

- 1. identifying whether the answers by each Party / jurisdiction to the questions posed in the Implementation Plan template are satisfactory;*
- 2. identifying clearly that 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*
- 3. assessing the description of each action to ensure that it adheres to the 'SMART' descriptors such that progress over time can be assessed objectively.*

This is described in detail in the 'Guidelines for the Preparation and Evaluation of NASCO Implementation Plans and for Reporting on Progress', CNL(18)49.

- 1. Answers to each question in the Implementation Plan template, CNL(18)50, are to be assessed as:*
 - 1. Satisfactory answers / information;*
 - 2. Unsatisfactory (including unclear or incomplete answers / information or clear omissions or inadequacies).*
- 2. NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines as they apply to the third cycle of reporting are listed throughout the Implementation Plan template, CNL(18)50.*
- 3. The Review Group will be required to assess the description of each action using the 'SMART' criteria laid out in the new Guidelines document, CNL(18)49, thereby assessing the quality of each of the actions, not just how clearly the actions are stated.*

Additionally, in 2020, the Council has provided enhanced guidance to the Review Group in their 'Enhanced Guidance for the Review of Implementation Plans' (CNL(20)55) whereby each section / area of the Implementation Plan will be scored as satisfactory or unsatisfactory; the actions will also be assessed on their ability to move the Party / jurisdiction clearly towards the implementation of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.

Through this process it will be possible to determine whether the Implementation Plan provides a fair and equitable basis for assessing the progress that the Party / jurisdiction will make in implementing NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.

Where a section / area is deemed by the Review Group to be unsatisfactory, the Implementation Plan will be returned to the Party / jurisdiction. The Review Group will provide a clear explanation of its decision to the Party / jurisdiction and, where feasible and appropriate, offer specific suggestions / recommendations for how it could be improved. The tables below, for each of the three main areas to be assessed, provide a template for evaluation in each case.

Party: **Canada**

Jurisdiction/Region:

Assessment area 1. Are the questions posed in the Implementation Plan template answered satisfactorily?

#	Question in IP Template	Initial Assessment (1 or 2)	Draft feedback on any improvements required (for answers assessed as 2)	Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?
1. Introduction				
1.1	What are the objectives for the management of wild salmon?	1		
1.2	What reference points (e.g. conservation limits, management targets or other measures of abundance) are used to assess the status of stocks?	1		
1.3	What is the current status of stocks under the new classification system outlined in CNL(16)11?	1		
1.4	How is stock diversity (e.g. genetics, age composition, run-timing, etc.) taken into account in the management of salmon stocks?	2	<p>Canada updated text here and noted that the COSEWIC Designatable Units (DUs) consider stock diversity prior to making management decisions. However, how this is completed is not described and it is beyond the capacity of the Review Group to investigate this process. It is also noted that the 2010 COSEWIC is under review.</p> <p>The Review Group considered that the answer will be improved with the provision of details of how exactly stock diversity is considered for all 857 rivers which are part of the 16 DUs.</p>	No
1.5	To provide a baseline for future comparison, what is the current and potential quantity of salmon habitat?	1		
1.6	What is the current extent of freshwater and marine salmonid aquaculture? <i>Append one or more maps showing the location of aquaculture facilities and aquaculture free zones in rivers and the sea.</i>	1		
1.7	Please describe the process used to consult NGOs and other stakeholders and industries in the development of this Implementation Plan.	1		
Overall score by Review Group for 1. Introduction			Unsatisfactory	

2. Management of Salmon Fisheries: <i>In this section please review the management approach to each of the fisheries in your jurisdiction (i.e. commercial, recreational and other fisheries) in line with the relevant NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. For Parties / jurisdictions that prosecute mixed-stock fisheries, there should be at least one action related to their management.</i>				
2.1	What are the objectives for the management of the fisheries for wild salmon?	1		
2.2	What is the decision-making process for the management of salmon fisheries, including predetermined decisions taken under different stock conditions (e.g. the stock level at which regulations are triggered)?	1	Changes noted to text in paragraph 2 contained mainly clarifications. The Review Group considered the answer to be in line with Sections 2.1 and 2.7 of the Fisheries Guidelines.	Yes
2.3	(a) Are fisheries permitted to operate on salmon stocks that are below their reference point (e.g. Conservation Limits)? If so, (b) how many such fisheries are there and (c) what approach is taken to managing them that still promotes stock rebuilding?	(a) 1 (b) 2 (c) 1	The word count has not been adhered to; it would help the Review Group if this is taken into account in future IP revisions. (b) This section has text changes. The Review Group found it difficult to establish from the response how many fisheries operate on catchments below their reference points (RP). The answer could be improved through the provision of simple numbers e.g. number of catchments and number of catchments below RP where fisheries operated. If required by Canada, this could be provided by region. (c) The answer has been improved to provide, as requested, a general overview of the stock rebuilding of populations below their reference points. The Review Group requested clarification as to how these principles are applied to the large number of catchments defined as 'at risk' or 'unknown' in question 1.3	a) Yes b) No c) Yes
2.4	(a) Are there any mixed-stock salmon fisheries? If so, (b) how are these defined, (c) what was the mean catch in these fisheries in the last five years and (d) how are they managed to ensure that all the contributing stocks are meeting their conservation objectives?	1		Yes. The Review Group considered the revised text

				to be in keeping with the original evaluation.
2.5	How are socio-economic factors taken into account in making decisions on management of salmon fisheries?	1		
2.6	What is the current level of unreported catch and what measures are being taken to reduce this?	1		
2.7	Has an assessment under the Six Tenets for Effective Management of an Atlantic Salmon Fishery been conducted? If so, (a) has the assessment been made available to the Secretariat and (b) what actions are planned to improve the monitoring and control of the fishery? (c) If the six tenets have not been applied, what is the timescale for doing so?	1		
Overall score by Review Group for 2. Management of Salmon Fisheries			Unsatisfactory	

3. Protection and Restoration of Salmon Habitat:				
<i>In this section please review the management approach to the protection and restoration of habitat in your jurisdiction in line with the relevant NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.</i>				
3.1	How are risks to productive capacity identified and options for restoring degraded or lost salmon habitat prioritised, taking into account the principle of 'no net loss' and the need for inventories to provide baseline data?	2	<p>The Review Group recognised the updated text here. However, it is still not clear how the risk to productive capacity is identified (e.g. barrier identification or juvenile indices), and there is no reference to inventories of baseline data to support analysis of risks.</p> <p>The Review Group acknowledged risk identification in relation to works in, or close to, habitat – the Review Group is looking for proactive analysis of habitat and risk assessment.</p> <p>The Review Group considered that the response is not in line with section 3 of the Habitat Guidelines (CNL(10)51).</p>	No
3.2	How are socio-economic factors taken into account in making decisions on salmon habitat management?	1		
3.3	What management measures are planned to protect wild Atlantic salmon and its habitats from (a) climate change and (b) invasive aquatic species?	1		

Overall score by Review Group for 3. Protection and Restoration of Salmon Habitat	Unsatisfactory
--	-----------------------

<p>4. Management of Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers and Transgenics <i>Council has requested that for Parties / jurisdictions with salmon farms, there should be a greater focus on actions to minimise impacts of salmon farming on wild salmonid stocks. Each Party / jurisdiction with salmon farming should therefore include at least one action relating to sea lice management and at least one action relating to containment, providing quantitative data in Annual Progress Reports to demonstrate progress towards the international goals agreed by NASCO and the International Salmon Farmers Association (ISFA):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% of farms to have effective sea lice management such that there is no increase in sea lice loads or lice-induced mortality of wild salmonids attributable to the farms; • 100% farmed fish to be retained in all production facilities. <p><i>In this section please provide information on all types of aquaculture, introductions and transfers, and transgenics (including freshwater hatcheries, smolt-rearing etc.</i></p>			
4.1	(a) Is the current policy concerning the protection of wild salmonids consistent with the international goals on sea lice and containment agreed by NASCO and ISFA? (b) If the current policy is not consistent with these international goals, when will current policy be adapted to ensure consistency with the international goals and what management measures are planned to ensure achievement of these goals and in what timescale?	(a) 1 (b) 1	Yes.
4.2	(a) What quantifiable progress can be demonstrated towards the achievement of the international goals for 100% of farms to have effective sea lice management such that there is no increase in sea lice loads, or lice-induced mortality of wild salmonids attributable to sea lice? (b) How is this progress monitored, including monitoring of wild fish? (c) If progress cannot be demonstrated, what additional measures are proposed and in what timescale?	(a) 2 (b) 2 (c) 2	<p>(a) Each answer should be self-contained and not rely on any other document for explanation.</p> <p>The Review Group noted the change of text but also that no information is presented to address the question in a).</p> <p>(b) Each answer should be self-contained and not rely on any other document, or any other section of the IP, for explanation.</p> <p>While some monitoring on sea farms takes place, it is unclear how progress is been documented. There is no information provided about monitoring of sea lice loads on wild salmonids, as outlined in SLG(09)5. Quantifiable progress could</p>

			involve showing a decreasing trend in monitored lice loads in the farmed and wild salmonid populations. (c) Each answer should be self-contained and not rely on any other section of the IP for explanation.	
4.3	(a) What quantifiable progress can be demonstrated towards the achievement of the international goals for achieving 100% containment in all (i) freshwater and (ii) marine aquaculture production facilities? (b) How is this progress monitored, including monitoring of wild fish (genetic introgression) and proportion of escaped farmed salmon in the spawning populations? (c) If progress cannot be demonstrated, what additional measures (e.g. use of sterile salmon in fish farming) are proposed and in what timescale?	(a) (i)2 (a) (ii)2 (b) 2 (c) 2	(a) Each answer should be self-contained and not rely on any other document for explanation. (a)(i) The quantitative information provided previously has been removed. (a)(ii) The Review Group recognised that Canada has implemented a number of actions from the BMP; however, no measurable quantifiable progress has been presented for containment. Quantifiable progress could involve showing a decreasing trend in, for example, the ‘number of incidents of escape events and standardised descriptions of the factors giving rise to escape events.’ SLG(09)5. (b) Each answer should be self-contained and not rely on any other document, or any other section of the IP, for explanation. The Review Group noted that some information is presented on the monitoring of escapes but no information on the monitoring of genetic introgression or impact on wild salmon. (c) Each answer should be self-contained and not rely on any other section of the IP for explanation.	Yes, partly.
4.4	What adaptive management and / or scientific research is underway that could facilitate better achievement of NASCO’s international goals for sea lice and	1		The Review Group considered the revised text

	containment such that the environmental impact on wild salmonids can be minimised?			to be in keeping with the original evaluation.
4.5	What is the approach for determining the location of aquaculture facilities in (a) freshwater and (b) marine environments to minimise the risks to wild salmonid stocks?	1		
4.6	What progress has been made to implement NASCO's guidance on introductions, transfers and stocking?	1		
4.7	Is there (a) a requirement to evaluate thoroughly risks and benefits before undertaking any stocking programme and (b) a presumption against stocking for purely socio-political / economic reasons?	a) 1 b) 1		
4.8	What is the policy / strategy on use of transgenic salmon?	1		
4.9	<i>For Members of the North-East Atlantic Commission only:</i> What measures are in place, or are planned, to implement the eleven recommendations contained in the 'Road Map' to enhance information exchange and co-operation on monitoring, research and measures to prevent the spread of <i>Gyrodactylus salaris</i> and eradicate it if introduced, including the development and testing of contingency plans?	1	N/A	
Overall score by Review Group for 4. Management of Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers and Transgenics			Unsatisfactory	

Assessment area 2. Are the threats and challenges to the management of wild Atlantic salmon identified under each theme related clearly to NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines?

2.8 Threats identified to wild salmon and challenges for management associated with their exploitation in fisheries, including bycatch of salmon in fisheries targeting other species	Initial Assessment (yes / no)	Draft feedback on any improvements required	Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?
Threat / challenge F1	Yes		
Threat / challenge F2	Yes		
Threat / challenge F3	Yes		
Threat / challenge F4	Yes		
Overall score by Review Group for 2.8: threats / challenges associated with exploitation in fisheries, including bycatch of salmon in fisheries targeting other species			Satisfactory

Copy and paste lines to add in other challenges in the relevant Implementation Plan

3.4 Threats identified to wild salmon and challenges for management in relation to estuarine and freshwater habitat.	Initial Assessment (yes / no)	Draft feedback on any improvements required	Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?
Threat / challenge H1	Yes		
Threat / challenge H2	Yes		
Threat / challenge H3	Yes		
Threat / challenge H4			
Overall score by Review Group for 3.4: threats / challenges in relation to estuarine and freshwater habitat			Satisfactory

Copy and paste lines to add in other challenges in the relevant Implementation Plan

4.10 Threats identified to wild salmon and challenges for management in relation to aquaculture, introductions and transfers, and transgenics.	Initial Assessment (yes / no)	Draft feedback on any improvements required	Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?
Threat / challenge A1	Yes	The language used to describe this threat should reflect information from NASCO's 2016 Theme-based Special Session which confirms that sea lice emanating from salmon aquaculture adversely impacts wild salmonids.	
Threat / challenge A2	Yes		
Threat / challenge A3	Yes	The Review Group recommended that the text should be confined to the identification of the threat / challenge to wild salmonids.	
Overall score by Review Group for 4.10: threats / challenges in relation to aquaculture, introductions and transfers, and transgenics			Satisfactory

Copy and paste lines to add in other challenges in the relevant Implementation Plan

Assessment area 3. Does each action adhere to the ‘SMART’ descriptors laid out in the new Guidelines document, CNL(18)49?

As a reminder, 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.

2.9 What SMART actions are planned during the period covered by this Implementation Plan (2019 – 2024) to address each of the threats and challenges identified in section 2.8 to implement NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines and demonstrate progress towards achievement of its goals and objectives for the management of salmon fisheries?								
#	Action in IP Template	Is the action clearly related to stated threat / challenge?	Is it ‘SMART’? (yes / no)	If ‘no’, which descriptor needs to be reflected more clearly in the action?	If the proposed monitoring is qualitative (as allowed in the Guidelines), is the reason and proposed non-quantitative alternative for monitoring progress acceptable?	Does the action move the Party / jurisdiction clearly towards the achievement of NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines?	Given the previous question, is the action considered satisfactory or unsatisfactory overall?	Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?
F1	Improve understanding of factors affecting survival at sea, to inform management	Yes	Yes. However, the Review Group would like to see further clarification on what range of management actions this research would be expected to support.			Yes. The Review Group considered that this research may relate to CNL(09)43, sections 2.5b and c.	Satisfactory	Yes
F2	Action against illegal fishing	Yes	Yes			Yes.	Satisfactory	

						The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(09)43, sections 2.2a and 2.3c.		
F3	Warm water protocols for adaptive management of recreational fisheries	Yes	Yes			The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(09)43, section 2.7a.	Satisfactory	
F4	Monitoring and management of Labrador mixed-stock fisheries	Yes	Yes			The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(09)43, section 2.8.	Satisfactory	Yes
Overall score by Review Group for 2.9: SMART actions to implement NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines and demonstrate progress towards achievement of its goals and objectives for the management of salmon fisheries							Satisfactory	

Copy and paste lines to add in other actions in the relevant Implementation Plan

3.5 What SMART actions are planned during the period covered by this Implementation Plan (2019 – 2024) to address each of the threats and challenges identified in section 3.4 to implement NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines and demonstrate progress towards achievement of its goals and objectives for the Protection, Restoration and Enhancement of Atlantic Salmon Habitat?								
#	Action in IP Template	Is the action clearly related to stated threat / challenge?	Is it 'SMART'? (yes / no)	If 'no', which descriptor needs to be reflected more clearly in the action?	If the proposed monitoring is qualitative (as allowed in the Guidelines), is the reason and proposed non-quantitative alternative for monitoring progress acceptable?	Does the action move the Party / jurisdiction clearly towards the achievement of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines?	Given the previous question, is the action considered satisfactory or unsatisfactory overall?	Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?
H1	Management of threats	Yes	Yes.			Yes.	Satisfactory	The suggestion on qualitative reporting

	related to industrial land-use activities		However, the Review Group considered that following the approach suggested might lend the action towards some level of qualitative reporting.			The Review Group considered that this is in line with the Habitat Guidelines, CNL(10)51.		has not been taken on board.
H2	Management of Acid Rain	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with the Habitat Guidelines, CNL(10)51, section 3.5h.	Satisfactory	
H3	Management of Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS)	Yes	No	Specific, Measurable and Timely need to be reflected more clearly. It is not clear how the action relates back to the conservation of salmon. There is limited information on how the numbers of salmon are currently affected and how this programme will report improvement.		No	Unsatisfactory	

				Time scales and monitoring weak.					
Overall score by Review Group for 3.5: SMART actions to implement NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines and demonstrate progress towards achievement of its goals and objectives for the Protection, Restoration and Enhancement of Atlantic Salmon Habitat							Unsatisfactory		

Copy and paste lines to add in other actions in the relevant Implementation Plan

4.11 What SMART actions are planned during the period covered by this Implementation Plan (2019 – 2024) to address each of the threats and challenges identified in section 4.10 to implement NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines and demonstrate progress towards achievement of its goals and objectives for aquaculture, introductions and transfers, and transgenics?								
#	Action in IP Template	Is the action clearly related to stated threat / challenge?	Is it ‘SMART’? (yes / no)	If ‘no’, which descriptor needs to be reflected more clearly in the action?	If the proposed monitoring is qualitative (as allowed in the Guidelines), is the reason and proposed non-quantitative alternative for monitoring progress acceptable?	Does the action move the Party / jurisdiction clearly towards the achievement of NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines?	Given the previous question, is the action considered satisfactory or unsatisfactory overall?	Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?
A1-A	Legislative and regulatory reform with respect to sea lice	Yes	No. Additionally, the Review Group considered that the action lends itself towards some level of qualitative reporting.	Specific, Measurable and Relevant need to be reflected more clearly. The Review Group noted that there are a number of different initiatives, only some of which are actionable. The Review Group found it difficult to relate proposed		No. While it is evident that lice monitoring will / is taking place on farmed salmon, it is not clear that the proposed action will protect wild salmon, as outlined in SLG(09)5. The Review Group recommended that monitoring also takes place on wild salmonid populations, as also outlined in SLG(09)5.	Unsatisfactory	No.

				changes in legislation to the improved sea lice control and protection of wild salmonids.				
A1-B	Enhanced use of non-therapeutic measures to address sea lice	Yes	No	Needs to be specific, measurable, relevant and timely. The Review Group expected to see these SMART descriptors adequately addressed		No. It is not clear that the proposed action will protect wild salmonids, as outlined in SLG(09)5.	Unsatisfactory	
A2-A	Policy dialogue and development with respect to containment of farmed fish	Yes	No	Needs to be specific, measurable, relevant and timely. The Review Group expected to see these SMART descriptors adequately addressed. The Review Group considered that this action needs to be made more succinct and could be split into a number of separate		No. The Review Group recognised Canada's efforts to address the NASCO goal to achieve 100% containment of farmed salmon, but it is not clear how the details of the action clearly demonstrates progress towards this goal, i.e. as laid out in SLG(09)5.	Unsatisfactory	No.

				SMART actions.				
A2-B	Technological advancement and research to support containment of farmed fish	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group assessment identified that this action is in line with reporting and tracking elements of SLG(09)5.	Satisfactory	
A3-A	Monitoring and control mechanisms with respect to Fish health and emerging diseases	Yes	No	Needs to be specific, measurable, relevant and timely. The Review Group expected to see these SMART descriptors adequately addressed. The Review Group considered that this action needs to be made more succinct and could be split into a number of separate SMART actions.		No. The Review Group recognised Canada's efforts to address NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines, but it does not demonstrate progress clearly towards the Williamsburg Resolution, CNL(06)48, section 2.	Unsatisfactory	
A3-B	Research and action with respect to fish health and emerging diseases	Yes	No	'Specific' needs to be reflected more clearly. The Review Group expected to see this SMART		No. The description of the action needs to be clearer and more succinct to enable the Review Group to evaluate progress	Unsatisfactory	

				descriptor adequately addressed. The description of the action needs to be clearer and more succinct to enable the Review Group to evaluate the other components of the action in line with the descriptors.		towards NASCO's Williamsburg Resolution, CNL(06)48, section 2.		
Overall score by Review Group for 4.11: SMART actions to implement NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines and demonstrate progress towards achievement of its goals and objectives for aquaculture, introductions and transfers, and transgenics							Unsatisfactory	

Copy and paste lines to add in other actions in the relevant Implementation Plan

Mandatory action check	Is such a mandatory action required for this Party / jurisdiction? (yes / no)	Is such an action contained in the Implementation Plan (yes / no)
For Parties / jurisdictions that prosecute mixed-stock fisheries, there should be at least one action related to their management.	Yes	Yes
Each Party / jurisdiction with salmon farming should include at least one action relating to sea lice management.	Yes	Yes, but they require substantial revision
Each Party / jurisdiction with salmon farming should include at least one action relating to containment.	Yes	No, as neither is a management action, moving towards the goal of 100% containment, and one requires substantial revision
Overall score by Review Group		Unsatisfactory