

*IP(20)09\_EU – Portugal*

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

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 noted that EU – Portugal did not submit a revised Implementation Plan following the November 2019 evaluation 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 – Portugal’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 – Portugal											

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

The Review Group considered that EU – Portugal’s response to question 4.5 to be one of the best examples of an answer to this question across the various plans, with an excellent approach to determining the location of aquaculture facilities in the fresh water and marine environments. They also considered the response to question 4.8 to be a very clear and well described answer.

**Questions on Salmon Management:** clear improvements are still required in several responses to the questions on salmon management to enable each of these sections to be considered as satisfactory. On reassessment of this section of the Plan, the Review Group considered that the responses to questions 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 (a)(i) were 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. However, the Review Group considered that threat / challenge H2 should be moved into the ‘Management of Salmon Fisheries’ section, i.e. section 2.8.

**SMART Actions:** all of the actions in EU – Portugal’s Implementation Plan require work to enable the Review Group to consider them to be satisfactory. Three of the five ‘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 EU – Portugal clearly towards the implementation of NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. The other two actions were considered to be neither SMART nor satisfactory. Of the three ‘Habitat Protection and Restoration’ actions one, action H2, was considered to be both SMART and satisfactory; one was considered to be SMART but unsatisfactory and the third was considered to be neither SMART nor satisfactory. Additionally, the Review Group considered that action H2 should be moved into the ‘Management of Salmon Fisheries’ section, i.e. section 2.9. All three of the actions on ‘Aquaculture, Introductions & Transfers & Transgenics’ were considered to be neither SMART nor satisfactory.

**Mandatory Actions:** no mandatory actions are applicable to EU – Portugal. However, the Review Group noted that should the experimental salmon farm enter into operation there would be a requirement to have mandatory action on the management of sea lice and containment.

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:**

**Portugal**

**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?	2	No clear objective stated – good background information on the actions and threats presented here.	No
1.2	What reference points (e.g. conservation limits, management targets or other measures of abundance) are used to assess the status of stocks?	2	The Review Group welcomed the addition of actions related to this point and looked forward to seeing progress under action F2 and F3.	No
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	The Review Group recommended that stock diversity assessment is taken into consideration in actions F2, F3 and F4.	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	The Review Group requested information on the amount of salmon produced by the experimental marine farm.	
1.7	Please describe the process used to consult NGOs and other stakeholders and industries in the development of this Implementation Plan.	2	The Review Group recognised the positive annual consultation for conservation presented. However, this does not specifically relate to the IP.  An IP should be prepared in consultation with NGOs and other relevant stakeholders and industries (reference the Guidelines document CNL(18)49).	No
<b>Overall score by Review Group for 1. Introduction</b>			<b>Unsatisfactory</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	The current descriptions are focused on delivery of activities; the IP would benefit from clear description of a conservation objective. This could be developed under action F5.	
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)?	2	The Review Group recommended that actions F2, F3, F4 and F5 might help develop further the decision making process for the management of salmon fisheries.	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 there and (c) what approach is taken to managing them that still promotes stock rebuilding?	1	More details of numbers related to fishers would be welcomed.	
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?	2	The answer describes the consultation process but not how the information resulting from these consultations, and other socio-economic factors, are taken into consideration during decision making on salmon fisheries management. (See section 2.9 of the Fisheries Guidelines Document CNL(09)43)	No
2.6	What is the current level of unreported catch and what measures are being taken to reduce this?	2	The Review Group required clarity on what measures will be taken to reduce the current level of unreported catch.	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?	2	The NASCO Council has asked that Parties undertake this assessment. Jurisdictions of the EU have been requested to undertake the assessment. The Review Group recommended that EU – Portugal consider undertaking the assessment and detail the timeframe this will be done in.	No
<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?	2	Although consideration of habitat is discussed in relation to the WFD and HDs, how the risks to productive capacity are identified and the principle of ‘no net loss’ are not addressed in the response to this question.	No
3.2	How are socio-economic factors taken into account in making decisions on salmon habitat management?	2	The answer describes the consultation process but not how the information resulting from these consultations, and other socio-economic factors, are taken into consideration during decision making on salmon habitat management (see section 3.9 of the Habitat Guidelines (CNL(10)51)	No
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>Unsatisfactory</b>	

<p><b>4. Management of Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers and Transgenics</b></p> <p><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>			
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?	1	The Review Group noted that should the experimental farm enter into operation there would be a requirement to address the questions and threats from aquaculture.
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?	1	The Review Group noted that should the experimental farm enter into operation there would be a requirement to address the questions and threats from aquaculture.
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) 1 b) 1 c) 1	The Review Group request that a response is given to this question.  A complete response needs to be given to question (a)(i) including ‘not applicable’ to the rest of the answers would be satisfactory.  The Review Group noted that should the experimental farm enter into operation there would be a requirement to address the questions and threats from aquaculture.
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?	2	The Review Group requested that consideration is given to the development of a risk based analysis for their stocking programme.	
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	
<b>Overall score by Review Group for 4. Management of Aquaculture, Introductions 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	A clearer specific description would be helpful	
Threat / challenge F3	Yes	A clearer specific description would be helpful	
Threat / challenge F4	Yes		
Threat / challenge F5	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	This threat is best addressed in section 2.8 on Fisheries Management	
Threat / challenge H3	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		
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>	Establishment of a Commission for the Monitoring of Diadromous Species Fisheries with a working group exclusively dedicated to the Atlantic salmon.	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(09)43, section 2.1a	Satisfactory	
<b>F2</b>	Perform a scientific assessment	Yes	No. The Review Group very much welcomed this action and felt it is appropriate;	‘Specific’ needs to be reflected more clearly. The Review Group expects to see this SMART descriptor		No. The Review Group considered that this action may in the future provide information to support NASCO’s	Unsatisfactory	

			however, more detail is required	adequately addressed		guidelines, CNL(09)43, section 2.5; however, more detail should be provided to enable a fuller review.		
<b>F3</b>	Operational Plan for the Monitoring and Management of Anadromous Fish in Portugal	Yes	Yes. The Review Group recommended that this action be supported by more specific details.			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(09)43, section 2.5e.	Satisfactory	
<b>F4</b>	Permanent International Commission	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(09)43, section 2.1a	Satisfactory	
<b>F5</b>	Establishing harmonized legislation regarding: fishing restrictions/interdictions, closures, minimum sizes, allowed gears, control and inspection in both rivers. Promote clarification actions among fishermen.	Yes	No	Specific, Measurable and Timely need to be reflected more clearly. The Review Group expects to see these SMART descriptors adequately addressed		No. The Review Group considered that this action may in the future provide information to support, CNL(09)43, section 2.5; however, more detail should be provided to enable a fuller review.	Unsatisfactory	

<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>	Assessing and enhancing ecosystem services provided by diadromous fish in a climate change context – DiadES	Yes	No. Not specifically salmon focused; this is an EU-funded research-focused project where applied measures are limited.	‘Relevant’ needs to be reflected more clearly. The Review Group expects to see these SMART descriptors adequately addressed		No. The Review Group does not consider, given the information presented, that this is in line with CNL(10)51.	Unsatisfactory	
<b>H2</b>	Red Book of freshwater and diadromous fishes and development of an	Yes	Yes. Monitoring of salmon for the HD is			Yes. However, the Review Group considered that this	Satisfactory, but it should be in the Fisheries	

	information system about these species.		targeted and focused with defined deliverables.			is in line with CNL(09)43, and this action would be better placed under the Fisheries Management section.	Management section.	
<b>H3</b>	Migra Miño-Minho Project:	Yes	Yes. Barriers to fish passage – mitigation to open up habitat. Only concern is it ends in 2019.			No. The Review Group considered that this is outside the timeline of the Implementation Plans (2019-2014).	Unsatisfactory	
<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>Unsatisfactory</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 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>A1</b>	Ensure the monitoring and control of the	Yes	No.	This is not an acceptable action		No.	Unsatisfactory	

	<p>facility and minimize the environmental impacts. To guarantee the physical-chemical quality and the biological safety of the discharged water in the natural environment.</p>		<p>The answer here refers to the current legislative process.</p>	<p>because it does not address any of the SMART descriptors. The Review Group expected to see all of the SMART descriptors adequately addressed</p>		<p>The Review Group considered that this action could be improved by making it more succinct and directly related to the conservation of wild salmon.</p>		
<b>A2</b>	<p>Prevent the escape of non-indigenous specimens to the natural environment, avoiding the ecological impact.</p>	Yes	No	<p>This is not an acceptable action because it does not address any of the SMART descriptors. The Review Group expected to see all of the SMART descriptors adequately addressed</p>		<p>No. The Review Group did not consider that this action clearly relates to SLG(09)5, and could be improved by making it more succinct and directly related to the conservation of wild salmon.</p>	Unsatisfactory	
<b>A3</b>	<p>Attribution and maintenance of a disease-free status for all aquaculture establishments.</p>	Yes	No. The answer here refers to the current legislative process.	<p>This is not an acceptable action because it does not address any of the SMART descriptors. The Review Group expected to see all of the SMART descriptors adequately addressed</p>		<p>No. The Review Group did not consider that this action clearly relates to SLG(09)5, and could be improved by making it more succinct and directly related to the conservation of wild salmon.</p>	Unsatisfactory	
<p><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></p>							<p><b>Unsatisfactory</b></p>	

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

<b>Mandatory action check</b>	<b>Is such a mandatory action required for this Party / jurisdiction?</b>	<b>Is such an action contained in the Implementation Plan?</b>
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>No</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Not applicable</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">However, the Review Group noted that should the experimental farm enter into operation there would be a requirement to have a mandatory action here.</p>
Each Party / jurisdiction with salmon farming should include at least one action relating to containment.	<b>No</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Not applicable</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">However, the Review Group noted that should the experimental farm enter into operation there would be a requirement to have a mandatory action here.</p>
<b>Overall score by Review Group</b>		<b>Satisfactory</b>