

IP(20)09_Norway

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

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 Norway 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 Norway’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	
Norway											

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 Norway's Implementation Plan requires further work to achieve a satisfactory rating across all sections / areas of the Plan.

The Review Group considered the response to question 2.6 to be one of the better responses to this question among the IPs, and that the breakdown of unreported catch provided important information. The information provided in 4.3 (b) was also considered to be a good example of monitoring of genetic introgression and numbers of escaped salmon. With respect to the response to question 4.4, the Review Group recognised Norway's considerable research efforts in this area. The initiatives to reduce sea lice and escapes are well established and welcomed. The Review Group considered the response to question 4.7 to provide a very good example of an objective-based approach. The Review Group considered Action F3 to be clearly stated with clear milestones for reporting on progress.

Questions on Salmon Management: clear improvements are required in several responses to the questions on aquaculture, introductions and transfers and transgenics to enable each of these sections to be considered as satisfactory. The response to question 4.9 was no longer considered to be satisfactory – further information has been requested. 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.

SMART Actions: all of the 'Management of Salmon Fisheries' actions within the Plan were considered to be both SMART and satisfactory, i.e. the Review Group considered that those actions move Norway clearly towards the implementation of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. Two of the four 'Habitat Protection and Restoration' actions were considered to be both SMART and satisfactory, one was considered to be SMART but unsatisfactory and a fourth was considered to be neither SMART nor satisfactory. Of the thirteen actions on 'Aquaculture, Introductions & Transfers & Transgenics', all but one were considered to be both SMART and satisfactory; one action, A2 was considered to be SMART but the Review Group considered that it does not move Norway clearly towards the implementation of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines and is, therefore, unsatisfactory.

Mandatory Actions: the section overall was considered to be unsatisfactory because the action required on sea lice, given the marine aquaculture present in Norway, requires substantial revision and was, therefore unsatisfactory.

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: Norway

Jurisdiction/Region:

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

#	Question in IP Template	Initial Assessment (1 or 2)	Draft feedback on any improvements required (for answers assessed as 2)	Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?
1. Introduction				
1.1	What are the objectives for the management of wild salmon?	1		
1.2	What reference points (e.g. conservation limits, management targets or other measures of abundance) are used to assess the status of stocks?	1		
1.3	What is the current status of stocks under the new classification system outlined in CNL(16)11?	1		
1.4	How is stock diversity (e.g. genetics, age composition, run-timing, etc.) taken into account in the management of salmon stocks?	1		
1.5	To provide a baseline for future comparison, what is the current and potential quantity of salmon habitat?	1		
1.6	What is the current extent of freshwater and marine salmonid aquaculture? <i>Append one or more maps showing the location of aquaculture facilities and aquaculture free zones in rivers and the sea.</i>	1		
1.7	Please describe the process used to consult NGOs and other stakeholders and industries in the development of this Implementation Plan.	1		
Overall score by Review Group for 1. Introduction			Satisfactory	

2. Management of Salmon Fisheries: <i>In this section please review the management approach to each of the fisheries in your jurisdiction (i.e. commercial, recreational and other fisheries) in line with the relevant NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. For Parties / jurisdictions that prosecute mixed-stock fisheries, there should be at least one action related to their management.</i>				
2.1	What are the objectives for the management of the fisheries for wild salmon?	1		
2.2	What is the decision-making process for the management of salmon fisheries, including predetermined decisions taken under different stock conditions (e.g. the stock level at which regulations are triggered)?	1		

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	c) The Review Group queried if the answer provided in part c gives consideration to the exploitation to distant coastal fisheries, identified in part b, noting section 2.7e of the Fisheries Guidelines, CNL(09)43.	
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	c) The Review Group seeks clarity that all stocks exploited in mixed-stock fisheries are from catchments attaining their CL, in line with the Fisheries Guidelines, CNL(09)43, section 2.8.	
2.5	How are socio-economic factors taken into account in making decisions on management of salmon fisheries?	1		
2.6	What is the current level of unreported catch and what measures are being taken to reduce this?	1		
2.7	Has an assessment under the Six Tenets for Effective Management of an Atlantic Salmon Fishery been conducted? If so, (a) has the assessment been made available to the Secretariat and (b) what actions are planned to improve the monitoring and control of the fishery? (c) If the six tenets have not been applied, what is the timescale for doing so?	1		
Overall score by Review Group for 2. Management of Salmon Fisheries			Satisfactory	

3. Protection and Restoration of Salmon Habitat: <i>In this section please review the management approach to the protection and restoration of habitat in your jurisdiction in line with the relevant NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.</i>				
3.1	How are risks to productive capacity identified and options for restoring degraded or lost salmon habitat prioritised, taking into account the principle of ‘no net loss’ and the need for inventories to provide baseline data?	1		
3.2	How are socio-economic factors taken into account in making decisions on salmon habitat management?	1	The Review Group seeks clarity on whether the socio-economic factors are considered in non-hydro salmon habitat management.	
3.3	What management measures are planned to protect wild Atlantic salmon and its habitats from (a) climate change and (b) invasive aquatic species?	1		

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

<p>4. Management of Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers and Transgenics <i>Council has requested that for Parties / jurisdictions with salmon farms, there should be a greater focus on actions to minimise impacts of salmon farming on wild salmonid stocks. Each Party / jurisdiction with salmon farming should therefore include at least one action relating to sea lice management and at least one action relating to containment, providing quantitative data in Annual Progress Reports to demonstrate progress towards the international goals agreed by NASCO and the International Salmon Farmers Association (ISFA):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% of farms to have effective sea lice management such that there is no increase in sea lice loads or lice-induced mortality of wild salmonids attributable to the farms; • 100% farmed fish to be retained in all production facilities. <p><i>In this section please provide information on all types of aquaculture, introductions and transfers, and transgenics (including freshwater hatcheries, smolt-rearing etc.</i></p>			
4.1	(a) Is the current policy concerning the protection of wild salmonids consistent with the international goals on sea lice and containment agreed by NASCO and ISFA? (b) If the current policy is not consistent with these international goals, when will current policy be adapted to ensure consistency with the international goals and what management measures are planned to ensure achievement of these goals and in what timescale?	(a) 1 (b) 2	(a) The Review Group seeks clarity on how Norway’s vision of zero escapes is captured in their policy, to meet NASCOs goals, as outlined in SLG(09)5. (b) The Review Group seeks to understand when Norway will update their sea lice policy to be consistent with NASCO goals as outlined in the BMP Guidance, SLG(09)5.
4.2	(a) What quantifiable progress can be demonstrated towards the achievement of the international goals for 100% of farms to have effective sea lice management such that there is no increase in sea lice loads, or lice-induced mortality of wild salmonids attributable to sea lice? (b) How is this progress monitored, including monitoring of wild fish? (c) If progress cannot be demonstrated, what additional measures are proposed and in what timescale?	(a) 2 (b) 1 (c) 2	(a) No demonstrable progress has been shown. The Review Group noted reference to the traffic light system, but it should be designed to move Norway’s policy towards the international goals of no lice-induced mortality as outlined in the BMP Guidance, SLG(09)5. (c) It is unclear how the new proposals will demonstrate progress beyond what is currently accepted by Norway and move it towards the international goals for sea lice management.
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	(a) 2 (b) 1	(a) While a table of reported escapes has been provided, no quantifiable progress is

	(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?	(c) 2	demonstrated in recent years towards the international goals for containment. The Review Group seeks to understand how the large increase in escapes in both the freshwater and marine environments is consistent with Norway's vision of 100% containment. (c) The Review Group was unclear as to what measures are included in Norway's revised regulations. See BMP Guidance, SLG(09)5.	b) The Review Group considered the revised text to be in keeping with the original evaluation. c) 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?	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 recognised that the original IP contained more relevant information and this should be reinstated. While the Review Group recognised the significant efforts made on the eradication and prevention of spread of <i>Gyrodactylus salaris</i> , sufficient information is not provided to show how each of the 11 recommendations detailed in the 'Road Map' is being dealt with.	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		
Threat / challenge F5	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		
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,	Initial Assessment (yes / no)	Draft feedback on any improvements required	Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?
---	--------------------------------------	--	---

introductions and transfers, and transgenics.			
Threat / challenge A1	Yes		
Threat / challenge A2	Yes		
Threat / challenge A3	Yes		
Threat / challenge A4	Yes		
Overall score by Review Group for 4.10: threats / challenges in relation to aquaculture, introductions and transfers, and transgenics			Satisfactory

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

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

As a reminder, the ‘SMART’ approach includes reporting on both quantitative and qualitative information. Quantitative information is expected wherever possible and should be presented to demonstrate progress made over the period of the plan towards NASCO’s goals. This should be clear and concise. Where a deviation must be made from a quantitative metric, the reason for the deviation should be explained.

2.9 What SMART actions are planned during the period covered by this Implementation Plan (2019 – 2024) to address each of the threats and challenges identified in section 2.8 to implement NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines and demonstrate progress towards achievement of its goals and objectives for the management of salmon fisheries?								
#	Action in IP Template	Is the action clearly related to stated threat / challenge?	Is it ‘SMART’? (yes / no)	If ‘no’, which descriptor needs to be reflected more clearly in the action?	If the proposed monitoring is qualitative (as allowed in the Guidelines), is the reason and proposed non-quantitative alternative for monitoring progress acceptable?	Does the action move the Party / jurisdiction clearly towards the achievement of NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines?	Given the previous question, is the action considered satisfactory or unsatisfactory overall?	Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?
F1	Development, testing and evaluation of an expanded sea survival surveillance program	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this programme may relate to CNL(09)43, sections 2.5 b and c.	Satisfactory	Yes
F2	(a) Increased effort to reveal and sanction illegal fisheries. (b) Revision of salmon and inland fisheries act to introduce stricter reactions to	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(09)43, sections 2.3a and 2.3c.	Satisfactory	

	violation of legislation							
F3	Revision of regulatory measures	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(09)43.	Satisfactory	
F4	Development of an electronic system to make reporting of catches in the sea by recreational anglers possible.	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(09)43, section 2.2a.	Satisfactory	
F5	Second generation Spawning Targets	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered this relates to CNL(09)43, section 2.4.	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							Satisfactory	

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

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

H1	Long-term liming of 23 acidified rivers	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with the Habitat Guidelines, CNL(10)51, section 3.5h.	Satisfactory		
H2	Mitigation measures for improved salmon habitat in regulated rivers	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with the Habitat Guidelines, CNL(10)51.	Satisfactory	Yes. Development of five habitat plans in regulated rivers each year from 2021-2024.	
H2-2	Revision of terms for hydropower production licenses and address of rules of operation, in several rivers.	Yes	Yes. However, the Review Group wished to see how the revision of the licences would be directed towards the protection / restoration of wild salmon and their habitat.			No. It was difficult for the Review Group to assess this action in relation to the Habitat Guidelines , CNL(10)51, without the additional information requested.	Unsatisfactory	No	
H3	Improving salmon habitat in rivers altered to improve security during flood	Yes	No	Measurable' – the action needs to be monitored to make it SMART. 'Timely' – can milestones be added within the period of the IP?	No. It is not clear how the effectiveness of the action would be evaluated qualitatively.	No	Unsatisfactory	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							Unsatisfactory		

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

4.11 What SMART actions are planned during the period covered by this Implementation Plan (2019 – 2024) to address each of the threats and challenges identified in section 4.10 to implement NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines and demonstrate progress towards achievement of its goals and objectives for aquaculture, introductions and transfers, and transgenics?								
#	Action in IP Template	Is the action clearly related to stated threat / challenge?	Is it ‘SMART’? (yes / no)	If ‘no’, which descriptor needs to be reflected more clearly in the action?	If the proposed monitoring is qualitative (as allowed in the Guidelines), is the reason and proposed non-quantitative alternative for monitoring progress acceptable?	Does the action move the Party / jurisdiction clearly towards the achievement of NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines?	Given the previous question, is the action considered satisfactory or unsatisfactory overall?	Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?
A1-1	Genetic interaction and escaped farmed fish are a threat to wild salmon. Increased effort is necessary to reduce the effects and find ways to avoid the influence from farmed salmon.	Yes	Yes. However, the Review Group suggested that in order to support future reviews, it may be useful for Norway to consider how the ‘expected outcome’ could be related more specifically to the action and demonstrate progress over the term of the IP.		Yes	Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with the BMP Guidance, SLG(09)5.	Satisfactory	
A1-2	Further improvement of precautionary measures	Yes	Yes. However, the Review Group suggested that in order to support		Yes	Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with the BMP Guidance, SLG(09)5.	Satisfactory	

			future reviews, it may be useful for Norway to consider how the 'expected outcome' could be related more specifically to the action and demonstrate progress over the term of the IP.					
A1-3	Establish more experience with farming sterile fish In commercial fish farms	Yes	Yes. However, the Review Group suggested that in order to support future reviews, it may be useful for Norway to consider how the 'expected outcome' could be related more specifically to the action and demonstrate progress over the term of the IP.		Yes	Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with the BMP Guidance, SLG(09)5.	Satisfactory	
A1-4	Further developing and improving the National monitoring program of escaped salmon in the rivers	Yes	Yes. However, the Review Group suggested that in order to support future reviews, it may be useful for Norway to consider how the 'expected		Yes	Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with the BMP Guidance, SLG(09)5.	Satisfactory	

			outcome' could be related more specifically to the action and demonstrate progress over the term of the IP.					
A1-5	removal of escaped fish in rivers	Yes	Yes. However, the Review Group suggested that in order to support future reviews, it may be useful for Norway to consider how the 'expected outcome' could be related more specifically to the action and demonstrate progress over the term of the IP.		Yes	Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with the BMP Guidance, SLG(09)5.	Satisfactory	
A1-6	monitoring project on genetical integrity in wild Atlantic Salmon populations	Yes	Yes. However, the Review Group suggested that in order to support future reviews, it may be useful for Norway to consider how the 'expected outcome' could be related more specifically to the action and demonstrate		Yes	Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with the BMP Guidance, SLG(09)5.	Satisfactory	

			progress over the term of the IP.					
A2	Continuous implementation of the traffic light system.	Yes	Yes			No. The Review Group recognised Norway's efforts to understand the levels and impacts of sea lice loads on wild salmonids. However, the Review Group considered that the implementation of the traffic light system used to manage aquaculture production is not demonstrating Norway's movement towards the goal of no increase in sea lice loads or lice-induced mortality of wild salmonids attributable to the farms (SLG(09)5).	Unsatisfactory	
A3-1	Eradication of <i>Gyrodactylus salaris</i> in the Driva (4 rivers) and Drammen (3 river) region.	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to NEA(18)08.	Satisfactory	
A3-2	Surveillance of GS	Yes	Yes		The Review Group considered that this action is more suited to qualitative reporting.	Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to NEA(18)08.	Satisfactory	

A3-3	Contingency plan for GS	Yes	Yes. The Review Group assumed that monitoring will be provided by Action A3-2		The Review Group considered that this action is more suited to qualitative reporting.	Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to NEA(18)08.	Satisfactory	
A3-4	Information campaign	Yes	Yes		The Review Group considered that this action is more suited to qualitative reporting.	Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to NEA(18)08.	Satisfactory	
A4-1	Threat posed by Pink Salmon	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(10)51.	Satisfactory	
A4-2	Catch register for Pink salmon	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(10)51.	Satisfactory	
Overall score by Review Group for 4.11: SMART actions to implement NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines and demonstrate progress towards achievement of its goals and objectives for aquaculture, introductions and transfers, and transgenics							Unsatisfactory	

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

Mandatory action check	Is such a mandatory action required for this Party / jurisdiction?	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.	Yes	Yes
Each Party / jurisdiction with salmon farming should include at least one action relating to sea lice management.	Yes	Yes, but it requires substantial revision
Each Party / jurisdiction with salmon farming should include at least one action relating to containment.	Yes	Yes
Overall score by Review Group		Unsatisfactory