

*IP(20)09\_EU – France*

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

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 EU – France for submitting their revised Implementation Plan, and for revising their Plan following the previous evaluations from the Review Group.

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 EU – France’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	
EU – France											

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 EU – France’s Implementation Plan requires further work to achieve a satisfactory rating across all sections / areas of the Plan.

**Questions on Salmon Management:** the Review Group considered that the responses to the questions asked in two of the four sections were satisfactory. On reassessment, the Review Group considered that the answers to questions 4.1 and 4.3(a)(ii) were satisfactory. However, clear improvements are required in several responses to the questions on salmon management in the other two sections to enable all of the sections to be considered as satisfactory. The Review Group has provided detailed feedback to each response that is 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. Additionally, the Review Group appreciated that EU – France has taken the effort to identify both the threats to wild salmon and the challenges for management in each of the three theme areas.

**SMART Actions:** all of the ‘Habitat Protection and Restoration’ and ‘Aquaculture, Introductions & Transfers & Transgenics’ actions within the Plan were considered to be both SMART and satisfactory, i.e. the Review Group considered that those actions move EU – France clearly towards the implementation of NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. Two of the three ‘Management of Salmon Fisheries’ actions were also considered to be both SMART and satisfactory. However, one, action F4, was considered to be unsatisfactory even though it is a SMART action.

**Mandatory Actions:** this section was considered to be unsatisfactory overall because none of the ‘Aquaculture, Introductions & Transfers & Transgenics’ actions relate to the management of the impacts of sea lice on wild Atlantic salmon from salmon farming or containment of the farmed salmon. The International Goals in the Best Management Practice Guidance, SLG(09)5, state, respectively for sea lice and containment, ‘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’ and ‘100% farmed fish to be retained in all production facilities’. For this section to be considered as satisfactory, mandatory actions on effective sea lice management and on the management of containment are required.

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:**            **European Union**

**Jurisdiction/Region:**

**France**

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

#	Question in IP Template	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?
<b>1. Introduction</b>				
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		Yes
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?	1		Yes
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		
<b>Overall score by Review Group for 1. Introduction</b>			<b>Satisfactory</b>	

<b>2. Management of Salmon Fisheries:</b> <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	The word count has not been adhered to; it would help the Review Group if this is taken into account in future IP revisions.	No
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	1		

	there and (c) what approach is taken to managing them that still promotes stock rebuilding?			
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		
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?	2	The Review Group considered that the text provided does not answer the question directly. The Review Group was expecting quantitative estimates of unreported catch, or measures being taken to establish it.	No
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		
<b>Overall score by Review Group for 2. Management of Salmon Fisheries</b>			<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	

<b>3. Protection and Restoration of Salmon Habitat:</b>				
<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?	1	The Review Group again recommended that consideration is given to the ‘no net loss’ principle.  The word count has not been adhered to; it would help the Review Group if this is taken into account in future IP revisions.	
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		

<b>Overall score by Review Group for 3. Protection and Restoration of Salmon Habitat</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
--	---------------------

<p><b>4. Management of Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers and Transgenics</b>  <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"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 100% farmed fish to be retained in all production facilities.</li> </ul> <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>			
<b>4.1</b>	(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?	1	Yes
<b>4.2</b>	(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?	2	<p>(a) The Review Group could not determine from this answer whether or not there is quantifiable progress towards the international goal of no increase in sea lice loads or lice-induced mortality of wild salmonids attributable to the farms, as outlined in SLG(09)5.</p> <p>(b) When progress can be demonstrated, it should include a description of the monitoring of wild fish.</p> <p>(c) Given the comments provided in b) it was not clear to the Review Group how the proposed measures outlined in (c) would support the conservation of wild salmon.</p>
<b>4.3</b>	(a) What quantifiable progress can be demonstrated towards the achievement of the international goals for achieving 100% containment in all (i) freshwater and	a)i) 2 a)ii) 1	(a)(i) The Review Group recommended that consideration is given to monitoring the

	(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?	b) 2 c) 2	wild salmon population for escapes, to enable quantifiable progress to be demonstrated.  (b) The Review Group recommended that consideration is given to a monitoring programme on the impact of escapes on wild populations.  (c) The Review Group suggested that consideration is given to the recommendations in (a)(i) and (b)	
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 containment such that the environmental impact on wild salmonids can be minimised?	1		
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?	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?	2	The Review Group recommended that consideration be given to the development of a plan in line with the 11 recommendations contained in the Road Map.	No
<b>Overall score by Review Group for 4. Management of Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers and Transgenics</b>			<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	

**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?**

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

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

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

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



<b>4.10 Threats identified to wild salmon and challenges for management in relation to aquaculture, introductions and transfers, and transgenics.</b>	<b>Assessment (yes / no)</b>	<b>Draft feedback on any improvements required</b>	<b>Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?</b>
Threat / challenge A1	Yes		
Threat / challenge A2	Yes	The Review Group welcomed this threat / challenge. However, in light of NASCO's goals of zero impacts on wild fish, if presence of sea lice is detected, further monitoring and plans to reduce sea lice on the farm will be needed and the number of lice per salmon and the number of salmon should be recorded.	
Threat / challenge A3	Yes		
<b>Overall score by Review Group for 4.10: threats / challenges in relation to aquaculture, introductions and transfers, and transgenics</b>			<b>Satisfactory</b>

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.

<b>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?</b>								
<b>#</b>	<b>Action in IP Template</b>	<b>Is the action clearly related to stated threat / challenge?</b>	<b>Is it ‘SMART’? (yes / no)</b>	<b>If ‘no’, which descriptor needs to be reflected more clearly in the action?</b>	<b>If the proposed monitoring is qualitative (as allowed in the Guidelines), is the reason and proposed non-quantitative alternative for monitoring progress acceptable?</b>	<b>Does the action move the Party / jurisdiction clearly towards the achievement of NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines?</b>	<b>Given the previous question, is the action considered satisfactory or unsatisfactory overall?</b>	<b>Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?</b>
<b>F1</b>	Diadromous Good Ecological Status indicators	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(09)43, section 2.2.	Satisfactory	
<b>F2</b>	Conservation limits for fished French rivers	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(09)43, section 2.4.	Satisfactory	
<b>F4</b>	Determine the origin of salmon caught in estuaries and rivers	Yes	Yes. However, the Review Group			No. The Review Group does not consider, given	Unsatisfactory	

	through scientific studies		requested specific information on the rationale and purpose of the project.			the information presented, that this is in line with CNL(09)43.		
<b>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</b>							<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	

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

<b>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?</b>								
<b>#</b>	<b>Action in IP Template</b>	<b>Is the action clearly related to stated threat / challenge?</b>	<b>Is it 'SMART'? (yes / no)</b>	<b>If 'no', which descriptor needs to be reflected more clearly in the action?</b>	<b>If the proposed monitoring is qualitative (as allowed in the Guidelines), is the reason and proposed non-quantitative alternative for monitoring progress acceptable?</b>	<b>Does the action move the Party / jurisdiction clearly towards the achievement of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines?</b>	<b>Given the previous question, is the action considered satisfactory or unsatisfactory overall?</b>	<b>Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?</b>
<b>H1</b>	Improve upstream and downstream movement by reducing the impacts of obstacles on the main watercourses populated by salmon (removing, levelling	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(10)51, section 3.5e.	Satisfactory	

	or modifying obstacles).							
<b>H2</b>	Identify strategic salmon spawning and nursery habitats and match these with appropriate regulatory instruments for their protection.	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(10)51, section 3.1.	Satisfactory	
<b>H3</b>	Improving the function of 'weakened' habitat.	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(10)51, sections 3.5a, e, and f.	Satisfactory	
<b>H4</b>	Co-ordinate salmon action plans with existing planning and management documents.	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(10)51, section 3.4	Satisfactory	
<b>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</b>							<b>Satisfactory</b>	

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

<b>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?</b>								
<b>#</b>	<b>Action in IP Template</b>	<b>Is the action clearly related to</b>	<b>Is it 'SMART'?</b> (yes / no)	<b>If 'no', which descriptor needs to be</b>	<b>If the proposed monitoring is qualitative (as allowed in the</b>	<b>Does the action move the Party / jurisdiction clearly towards</b>	<b>Given the previous question, is the action considered satisfactory or</b>	<b>Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?</b>

		stated threat / challenge?		reflected more clearly in the action?	Guidelines), is the reason and proposed non-quantitative alternative for monitoring progress acceptable?	the achievement of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines?	unsatisfactory overall?	
<b>A1</b>	Assessment of stocking practices	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(06)48, Article 5.	Satisfactory	
<b>A2</b>	Implementing reporting specifically on sea lice	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to SLG(09)5 on sea lice.	Satisfactory	
<b>A3</b>	Monitoring escapes from commercial marine salmon farms	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to SLG(09)5 on containment	Satisfactory	
<b>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</b>							<b>Satisfactory</b>	

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?	Is such an action contained in the Implementation Plan?
For Parties / jurisdictions that prosecute mixed-stock fisheries, there should be at least one action related to their management.	<b>No</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>

Each Party / jurisdiction with salmon farming should include at least one action relating to sea lice management.	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b> <b>The action relates only to monitoring. The Review Group expected to see an action in relation to sea lice management</b>
Each Party / jurisdiction with salmon farming should include at least one action relating to containment.	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b> <b>The action relates only to monitoring. The Review Group expected to see an action in relation to containment</b>
<b>Overall score by Review Group</b>		<b>Unsatisfactory</b>