

*IP(20)09\_UK – England and Wales*

*November 2020 Evaluation of the Revised Implementation Plan under the Third Reporting Cycle (2019 – 2024) from the Review Group to UK – England and Wales*

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 UK – England and Wales 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 UK – England and Wales’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	
UK - England and Wales											

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 UK – England and Wales' Implementation Plan requires some further work to achieve a satisfactory rating across all sections / areas of the Plan. A general comment on the Plan is that many of the answers contain a lot of links to other documents. Answers should be self-contained and not refer to other documents, or other sections of the Plan. Additionally, it would help the Review Group in its review if the answers were clear and succinct, and in line with the word counts given.

The Review Group considered the response to question 1.7 to be a very clearly described and comprehensive process. It considered that the answer given in response to question 4.7 was very clear and commended UK – England and Wales on its clarity. Additionally, the Review Group considered the response to question 4.9 to be a very succinct way of referring to all of 11 recommendations in the 'Road Map'. Action H3 was considered by the Review Group this to be a clear action, addressing the SMART descriptors well.

**Questions on Salmon Management:** the Review Group considered that the responses to the questions asked in two of the four sections were satisfactory. However, clear improvements are required in some responses to the questions on salmon management in the other two sections to enable all of the sections to be considered as satisfactory. The response to question 4.5 was considered to be satisfactory, following the provision of a revised response. However, the responses to questions 2.3(b), 4.1 and 4.3(b) were no longer considered to be satisfactory. The Review Group has provided detailed feedback to each response that is considered to be unsatisfactory in addition to the more general comments about adhering to word count and giving self-contained answers.

**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:** overall, while the actions in all sections are SMART and ambitious, they are all very long and complicated. The Review Group considered that they will be very difficult to review during the Annual Progress Report review process. For example, there are 31 separate sub-actions in the habitat section alone, all of which will have to be reported against and reviewed each year. All of the 'Management of Salmon Fisheries' and 'Habitat Protection and Restoration' actions within the Plan were considered to be both SMART and satisfactory, i.e. the Review Group considered that those actions move UK – England and Wales clearly towards the implementation of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. Three of the four actions on 'Aquaculture, Introductions & Transfers & Transgenics' were considered to be both SMART and satisfactory; the fourth, action A4, was considered to be SMART yet unsatisfactory.

**Mandatory Actions:** the Review Group considered this section to be satisfactory.

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: United Kingdom**

**Jurisdiction/Region: England and Wales**

**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?
<b>1. Introduction</b>				
1.1	What are the objectives for the management of wild salmon?	1	The Review Group sought clarification on the present applicability of the EU legislation in the context of the withdrawal of the UK from the EU.	
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	The Review Group sought clarification on the present applicability of the EU legislation in the context of the withdrawal of the UK from the EU.	
1.3	What is the current status of stocks under the new classification system outlined in CNL(16)11?	1	The Review Group sought clarification on the status of stocks for secondary rivers.	
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	The Review Group sought clarification on how habitat classification is conducted for secondary rivers.  The Review Group considered again that it would be helpful to have a timeline.	
1.6	What is the current extent of freshwater and marine salmonid aquaculture? <i>Append one or more maps showing the location of aquaculture facilities and aquaculture free zones in rivers and the sea.</i>	1		
1.7	Please describe the process used to consult NGOs and other stakeholders and industries in the development of this Implementation Plan.	1		
<b>Overall score by Review Group for 1. Introduction</b>			<b>Satisfactory</b>	

<b>2. Management of Salmon Fisheries:</b> <i>In this section please review the management approach to each of the fisheries in your jurisdiction (i.e. commercial, recreational and other fisheries) in line with the relevant NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. For Parties / jurisdictions that prosecute mixed-stock fisheries, there should be at least one action related to their management.</i>				
<b>2.1</b>	What are the objectives for the management of the fisheries for wild salmon?	1	Each answer should be self-contained and not rely on any other document for explanation.	
<b>2.2</b>	What is the decision-making process for the management of salmon fisheries, including predetermined decisions taken under different stock conditions (e.g. the stock level at which regulations are triggered)?	1	The Review Group has reviewed the Annex and considered it satisfactory. However, each answer should be self-contained and not rely on any other document, or any other section of the IP, for explanation.  The word count has not been adhered to in the Annex; it would help the Review Group if this is taken into account in future IP revisions.	
<b>2.3</b>	(a) Are fisheries permitted to operate on salmon stocks that are below their reference point (e.g. Conservation Limits)? If so, (b) how many such fisheries are there and (c) what approach is taken to managing them that still promotes stock rebuilding?	a)1 b)2 c)1	b) The Review Group could not ascertain how many fisheries were permitted on stocks below CLs.  c) Each answer should be self-contained and not rely on any other section of the IP for explanation.	
<b>2.4</b>	(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	The word count has not been adhered to; it would help the Review Group if this is taken into account in future IP revisions. Additionally, consideration should be given to providing additional clarity to the answers.	
<b>2.5</b>	How are socio-economic factors taken into account in making decisions on management of salmon fisheries?	1		
<b>2.6</b>	What is the current level of unreported catch and what measures are being taken to reduce this?	1		
<b>2.7</b>	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	1		

	monitoring and control of the fishery? (c) If the six tenets have not been applied, what is the timescale for doing so?			
<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>				
<b>3.1</b>	How are risks to productive capacity identified and options for restoring degraded or lost salmon habitat prioritised, taking into account the principle of ‘no net loss’ and the need for inventories to provide baseline data?	1	The Review Group sought clarification on the present applicability of the EU legislation in the context of the withdrawal of the UK from the EU.	Yes
<b>3.2</b>	How are socio-economic factors taken into account in making decisions on salmon habitat management?	1	The Review Group sought clarification on the present applicability of the EU legislation in the context of the withdrawal of the UK from the EU.	
<b>3.3</b>	What management measures are planned to protect wild Atlantic salmon and its habitats from (a) climate change and (b) invasive aquatic species?	1	The Review Group sought clarification on the present applicability of the EU legislation in the context of the withdrawal of the UK from the EU.  The word count has not been adhered to; it would help the Review Group if this is taken into account in future IP revisions.	
<b>Overall score by Review Group for 3. Protection and Restoration of Salmon Habitat</b>			<b>Satisfactory</b>	

<p><b>4. Management of Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers and Transgenics</b></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?	2	While the Review Group understood that there is no marine salmonid aquaculture, it requested clarification on whether EU – UK (England and Wales) has an aquaculture policy, especially on containment in freshwater, 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?	1	
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) 1 a) (ii) 1 b) 2 c) 1	b) The Review Group was unclear how reporting and tracking, as outlined in SLG(09)5, is conducted and reported, particularly in relation to freshwater containment.  c) The Review Group seeks clarity on whether there is any monitoring of ingress of farmed salmon from other jurisdictions.
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	The Review Group sought clarification on whether the potential impact of sea lice on

			wild salmonids is considered in the estuary and marine authorisation process.	
<b>4.6</b>	What progress has been made to implement NASCO's guidance on introductions, transfers and stocking?	1		
<b>4.7</b>	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		
<b>4.8</b>	What is the policy / strategy on use of transgenic salmon?	1	The Review Group sought clarification on the present applicability of the EU legislation in the context of the withdrawal of the UK from the EU.	
<b>4.9</b>	<i>For Members of the North-East Atlantic Commission only:</i> What measures are in place, or are planned, to implement the eleven recommendations contained in the 'Road Map' to enhance information exchange and co-operation on monitoring, research and measures to prevent the spread of <i>Gyrodactylus salaris</i> and eradicate it if introduced, including the development and testing of contingency plans?	1		
<b>Overall score by Review Group for 4. Management of Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers and Transgenics</b>			<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	

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

<b>2.8 Threats identified to wild salmon and challenges for management associated with their exploitation in fisheries, including bycatch of salmon in fisheries targeting other species</b>	<b>Initial Assessment (yes / no)</b>	<b>Draft feedback on any improvements required</b>	<b>Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?</b>
Threat / challenge F1	Yes		
Threat / challenge F2	Yes		
Threat / challenge F3	Yes		
Threat / challenge F4	Yes		
Threat / challenge F5	Yes		
Threat / challenge F6	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>Initial Assessment (yes / no)</b>	<b>Draft feedback on any improvements required</b>	<b>Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?</b>
Threat / challenge H1	Yes		
Threat / challenge H2	Yes		
Threat / challenge H3	Yes		
Threat / challenge H4	Yes		
Threat / challenge H5	Yes		
Threat / challenge H6	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>Initial 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		
Threat / challenge A4	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>	Assessments of salmon stocks	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(09)43, section 2.5.	Satisfactory	
<b>F2</b>	Improved stock assessment methodology	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(09)43, section 2.4.	Satisfactory	
<b>F3</b>	New restrictions on net and rod fisheries	Yes	Yes. However, the Review Group			Yes. The Review Group considered	Satisfactory	

			considered that EU – UK (England and Wales) could give consideration to a more succinct description of the action.			that this is in line with CNL(09)43, section 2.7.		
<b>F4</b>	Mixed-stock fisheries	Yes	Yes. The Review Group requested that the quantifiable information is reported directly in relation to this action.			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(09)43, section 2.7 and 2.10.	Satisfactory	
<b>F5</b>	Promote Catch & Release	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(09)43, section 2.7.	Satisfactory	
<b>F6</b>	Ensure that unregulated (illegal) fishing and by-catch in other fisheries does not threaten conservation of stocks (F6)	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(09)43, section 2.3.	Satisfactory	
<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>Satisfactory</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>	Increase salmon’s climate change resilience	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(10)51, section 3.2 and 3.5.	Satisfactory	
<b>H2</b>	Improve the survival of salmon in estuaries and inshore waters	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(10)51.	Satisfactory	
<b>H3</b>	Improve fish passage and salmon habitat through implementing River Basin Management Plans	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(10)51, section 3.5e.	Satisfactory	
<b>H4</b>	Sustainable abstraction	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(10)51, 3.5g.	Satisfactory	

<b>H5</b>	Improving healthy smolt production by improving water quality	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(10)51, 3.5h.	Satisfactory	
<b>H6</b>	Addressing the threat of Predation	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(10)51, 3.8.	Satisfactory	
<b>Overall score by Review Group for 3.5: SMART actions to implement NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines and demonstrate progress towards achievement of its goals and objectives for the Protection, Restoration and Enhancement of Atlantic Salmon Habitat</b>							<b>Satisfactory</b>	

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

<b>4.11 What SMART actions are planned during the period covered by this Implementation Plan (2019 – 2024) to address each of the threats and challenges identified in section 4.10 to implement NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines and demonstrate progress towards achievement of its goals and objectives for aquaculture, introductions and transfers, and transgenics?</b>								
<b>#</b>	<b>Action in IP Template</b>	<b>Is the action clearly related to 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>	Controlling salmon stocking	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(06)48, Annex 4.	Satisfactory	
<b>A2</b>	Prevent the introduction and	Yes	Yes			Yes.	Satisfactory	

	spread of non-native fish, invertebrate species, parasites and diseases, excluding <i>G. salaris</i>		The Review Group seeks clarification on the present applicability of the EU legislation in the context of the withdrawal of the UK from the EU.			The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(06)48, article 6 and annex 2.		
<b>A3</b>	Prevent the introduction and spread of the non-native parasite <i>G. salaris</i>	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with NEA(18)08.	Satisfactory	
<b>A4</b>	To prevent adverse environmental impacts of aquaculture on adjacent water bodies and ecosystems	Yes	Yes		Yes	No. The Review Group struggled to understand how this action will demonstrate measurable benefits to wild salmonids.	Unsatisfactory	
<b>Overall score by Review Group for 4.11: SMART actions to implement NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines and demonstrate progress towards achievement of its goals and objectives for aquaculture, introductions and transfers, and transgenics</b>							<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	

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

Mandatory action check	Is such a mandatory action required for this Party / jurisdiction?	Is such an action contained in the Implementation Plan?
For Parties / jurisdictions that prosecute mixed-stock fisheries, there should be at least one action related to their management.	Yes	Yes
Each Party / jurisdiction with salmon farming should include at least one action relating to sea lice management.	No	Not applicable
Each Party / jurisdiction with salmon farming should include at least one action relating to containment.	No	Not applicable
<b>Overall score by Review Group</b>		<b>Satisfactory</b>