

IP(20)09_EU – Spain (Galicia)

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

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 – Spain (Galicia) 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 – Spain (Galicia)’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 – Spain (Galicia) | | | | | | | | | | | |

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 – Spain (Galicia)'s Implementation Plan requires further work to achieve a satisfactory rating across all sections / areas of the Plan.

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. On its reassessment, the Review Group considered that the responses to the following questions were satisfactory: 1.4; 1.6 1; 2.1; 2.7(a); and 3.3(a). However, the response to question 4.7 was no longer considered 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 there should be threats and / or challenges to the management of wild Atlantic salmon provided in relation to the theme area of 'Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers, and Transgenics'. This section was, therefore, considered to be unsatisfactory.

SMART Actions: in the area 'Management of Salmon Fisheries' the section was considered as unsatisfactory because there are four threats identified but only one action is included. The IP Guidelines specify that '*actions should be clear and concise and planned to address the threats / challenges identified in the Implementation Plan in a targeted fashion in order to improve implementation of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.* Each action should, therefore, be related to a specific threat / challenge. In the area 'Habitat Protection and Restoration', although the Review Group considered the actions to be satisfactory, as with the area 'Management of Salmon Fisheries', each threat / challenge needs an accompanying action. The actions as identified do not, therefore, align with the threats / challenges identified in the Implementation Plan. In the area 'Aquaculture, Disease, Transfers & Transgenics' there were no actions and the Review Group considered that there should be at least one threat / challenge identified with an accompanying action.

Mandatory Actions: it is unclear if EU – Spain (Galicia)'s Implementation Plan should contain a mandatory action on mixed-stock fisheries. However, the Review Group considered that there should be actions on the management of sea lice and containment given the marine aquaculture present in EU – Spain (Galicia).

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: | Spain (Galicia) |
|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|

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 | The Review Group recommended the development of a joint Spanish – Portuguese management plan for the Miño River. | 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 | Whilst parr are monitored it would be necessary to see the development of reference points e.g. Conservation Limits to meet NASCO’s Guidelines for the Management of Salmon Fisheries, CNL(09)43 – see sections 2.4 and 2.5. | 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? | 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 | A map is required. | Partly – no map provided. |
| 1.7 | Please describe the process used to consult NGOs and other stakeholders and industries in the development of this Implementation Plan. | 2 | An IP should be prepared in consultation with NGOs and other relevant stakeholders and industries (reference the Guidelines document CNL(18)49). | No |
| Overall score by Review Group for 1. Introduction | | | Unsatisfactory | |

2. Management of Salmon Fisheries:

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.

| | | | | |
|------------|--|----------------------|---|--|
| 2.1 | What are the objectives for the management of the fisheries for wild salmon? | 1 | The Review Group recommended that the high level objective is more clearly stated, as in Q1.1 | Yes |
| 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 | | Text expanded |
| 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? | 2 | It is still unclear what measures are in place to rebuild wild self-sustaining salmon stocks with the fishery being dependant on stocking. | No |
| 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? | 2 | It is still unclear whether there is really a mixed-stock fishery (MSF) as this is not defined and appears to be contrary to the NASCO definition of a MSF. | No changes made |
| 2.5 | How are socio-economic factors taken into account in making decisions on management of salmon fisheries? | 2 | In the response the question 2.3, information is provided that suggests socio-economic considerations influence management decisions. Some consideration about how those pressures are balanced in light of section 2.9 of NASCO's Fisheries Management Guidelines CNL(09)43 should be provided here. | No clear additional information provided |
| 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 the level of unreported catch and 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? | a) 1 b) 2 c) 2 | The Review Group considered that parts b) and c) are applicable here given that an assessment has been conducted. | No |

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| Overall score by Review Group for 2. Management of Salmon Fisheries | Unsatisfactory |
|--|-----------------------|

3. Protection and Restoration of Salmon Habitat:
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.

| | | | | |
|------------|--|--------------|--|--------|
| 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 | How the risks to productive capacity are identified 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? | a) 1 b) 2 | b) no information is provided on what management measures are planned to protect salmon from invasive aquatic species. | Partly |

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| 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? | 2 | The Review Group seeks to understand why 'not applicable' is given as an answer. An experimental facility is in place that could impact wild salmon stocks so the Review Group considered that these questions should be answered. | No |
| 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? | 2 | The Review Group seeks to understand why 'not applicable' is given as an answer. An experimental facility is in place that could impact wild salmon stocks so the Review Group considered that these questions should be answered. | No |
| 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? | 2 | No quantifiable progress has been demonstrated to the Review Group (e.g. number of incidents of escape events and standardised descriptions of the factors giving rise to escape events). Without knowledge of the management regime it was difficult for the Review Group to make recommendations on improvements. Consideration should be given to the Best Management Practice Guidance, SLG(09)5. | No |
| 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? | 2 | The Review Group seeks to understand why 'no information available' is given as an answer. An experimental facility is alluded to that could impact wild salmon stocks so the | No |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--------------|---|----|
| | | | Review Group considered that these questions should be answered. | |
| 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? | (a)1 (b)2 | Please provide an answer for (b) The Review Group recommended that a risk-based site selection is developed as outlined in SLG(09)5. | No |
| 4.6 | What progress has been made to implement NASCO's guidance on introductions, transfers and stocking? | 2 | Whilst fish of local origin are used for the stocking programme, it is unclear what measures are in place to ensure that the stocking programme is for conservation purposes (class III rivers). Consideration should be given to the Williamsburg Resolution, CNL(06)48. | No |
| 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 noted that the answers do not demonstrate a precautionary approach. Are there measures in place to differentiate stocked fish from wild fish and to protect wild stocks? While the questions are answered it is not clear that consideration has been given to the Williamsburg Resolution, CNL(06)48. | No |
| 4.8 | What is the policy / strategy on use of transgenic salmon? | 2 | The Review Group seeks clarification on whether EU Policy is followed in relation to this. | No |
| 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 answer 'not applicable' is not appropriate for this question as <i>G. salaris</i> is potentially a threat to all wild Atlantic salmon stocks. 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 |
| 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 | Yes | | |
| 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 | | Threats concerning the experimental salmon farm should be outlined. | No |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|-----------------------|
| Threat / challenge A2 | | Threats concerning the potential impact of the stocking programme on wild salmon stocks could be outlined. | No |
| Threat / challenge A3 | | | |
| Threat / challenge A4 | | | |
| Overall score by Review Group for 4.10: threats / challenges in relation to aquaculture, introductions and transfers, and transgenics | | | Unsatisfactory |

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? |
| F4 | Stocking Miño’s tributaries in Portugal and Spain presently not used by salmon with parr of local origin (river Tea). | Yes | Yes | | | Yes. However, the Review Group considered that this relates more to the Williamsburg Resolution, CNL(06)48, than the Fisheries Guidelines, CNL(09)43. | Satisfactory | |
| 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 | | | | | | | Unsatisfactory There are four threats identified but only one action is included. | |

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 | Design and testing of new passage facilities for some tributaries of the Miño river. | No | Yes. The Review Group has re-evaluated this action and agrees it is connected to several threats. | | | Yes. The Review Group considered that it moves towards CNL(10)51, section 2, on salmon habitat requirements | Satisfactory | No |
| H2 | Permeabilization or demolition of barriers in the Miño system | No | Yes. The Review Group has re-evaluated this action and agrees it is connected to several threats. | | | Yes. The Review Group considered that it moves towards CNL(10)51, section 2, on salmon habitat requirements | Satisfactory | No |
| 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 | | | | | | | Satisfactory However, each threat needs an action. The actions as identified do not align with the threat identified above. | |

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 | None outlined | | | | | | | |
| A2 | | | | | | | | |
| 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 No actions outlined. Consideration should be given to a suite of threats / challenges and associated actions. | |

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. | It is unclear whether the Miño fishery is a mixed-stock fishery. Clarity is required as to whether this fishery meets the NASCO definition of a mixed stock fishery (section 2.8 of CNL(09)43). No actions are outlined to manage the Miño fishery | It is unclear whether the Miño fishery is a mixed-stock fishery. Clarity is required as to whether this fishery meets the NASCO definition of a mixed stock fishery (section 2.8 of CNL(09)43). No actions are outlined to manage the Miño fishery. |
| Each Party / jurisdiction with salmon farming should include at least one action relating to sea lice management. | Yes | No actions are outlined. |
| Each Party / jurisdiction with salmon farming should include at least one action relating to containment. | Yes | No actions are outlined. |
| Overall score by Review Group for Mandatory Actions | | Unsatisfactory |