

IP(20)09_UK – Scotland

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

NASCO considers that the provision of Implementation Plans, together with annual reporting of progress on actions contained within them, is one of the most valuable mechanisms that it has developed. It is a vitally important mechanism to strengthen implementation of NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. Parties to NASCO have committed to the conservation of wild Atlantic salmon. Parties’ / jurisdictions’ Implementation Plans set out their planned actions and these are reviewed by an expert Review Group. Reporting is carried out annually on these Plans (see <https://nasco.int/conservation/implementation-plans-and-reporting/>).

The Council of NASCO agreed, in September 2020, that all Implementation Plans would be reviewed again in November 2020, in line with the Enhanced Guidance from the Council, CNL(20)55. This meant, in each case, that the most recent version of each Implementation Plan was reviewed, whether updates had been provided in 2020 or not, even where the Review Group had previously found the Implementation Plans to be satisfactory.

The Review Group noted that UK – Scotland did not submit a revised Implementation Plan following the November 2019 evaluation from the Review Group.

In line with the ‘Guidelines for the Preparation and Evaluation of NASCO Implementation Plans and for Reporting on Progress’, [CNL\(18\)49](#), (the IP Guidelines) and the ‘Enhanced Guidance for the Review of Implementation Plans’, [CNL\(20\)55](#), the infographic below shows the overview of the Review Group’s evaluation, in November 2020, of UK – Scotland’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 - Scotland											

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

The Review Group considered that the response to question 1.2. was a welcome addition to UK – Scotland’s salmon management and a good description of the methods used to develop reference points in UK – Scotland. Additionally, the response to question 3.3(a) was one of the best examples of an answer to this question across the various Plans.

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 several responses to the questions on salmon management in the other two sections to enable all of the sections to be considered as satisfactory. The responses to questions 2.4 and 2.5 were 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 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: to assist the Review Group in their review of the Annual Progress Report it would be helpful if each action could be numbered individually e.g. Action F1-1, F2-2, F2-3 instead of Action F1, F1(cont.), F1(cont.) etc. 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 UK – Scotland clearly towards the implementation of NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. Six of the thirteen ‘Habitat Protection and Restoration’ actions were considered to be both SMART and satisfactory; six were considered to be satisfactory but not SMART and one was considered to be neither SMART nor satisfactory. Of the four actions on ‘Aquaculture, Introductions & Transfers & Transgenics’ only one was considered to be both SMART and satisfactory; two were considered to be SMART yet unsatisfactory and a fourth was considered to be neither SMART nor satisfactory.

Mandatory Actions: this section was considered to be unsatisfactory overall because the actions required on sea lice and containment, given the marine aquaculture present in UK – Scotland, were considered by the Review Group to be unsatisfactory. For the Review Group to be able to consider the mandatory actions on both sea lice and containment to be in line with, or moving towards the achievement of, NASCO’s Best Management Practice, SLG(09)5, they should relate to the management of these issues. To be considered as satisfactory, mandatory actions on effective sea lice management and the management of containment are required. Additionally, monitoring alone for the impacts of salmon farming on wild Atlantic salmon, where it is not clear how the outcome of the action will move UK – Scotland clearly towards the achievement of NASCO’s goals, is not satisfactory.

In the following Evaluation Form, the Review Group has provided guidance on its recommendations for improvements.

Think 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: Scotland

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

#	Question in IP Template	Assessment (1 or 2)	Draft feedback on any improvements required (for answers assessed as 2)	Comments relating to previous review round review: 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	<p>Given that the number of the salmon rivers in the stock classification table has changed please clarify whether this is also the case for the number of named rivers in 2.2.</p> <p>The Review Group considered it is important from a biodiversity perspective that all catchments should have a level of assessment, including catchments with small populations.</p>	
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	<p>a) The Review Group sought clarification on the inconsistency between the last paragraph of 2.2 and 2.3a</p> <p>b) Given that the number of the salmon rivers in the stock classification table has changed please clarify whether this is also the case for 2.3b</p>	
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?	<p>a) 1</p> <p>b) 1</p> <p>c) 2</p> <p>d) 2</p>	<p>a) The Review Group noted the definition of mixed-stock fisheries in section 2.8 CNL(09)43 and that a number of fisheries in UK - Scotland operate on mixed-stock fisheries (angling and commercial).</p> <p>b) The Review Group requested clarification on how rod and line angling fisheries (MSF) are operating below the outflow points at the river end.</p> <p>c) Rod catch (i) in MSFs is not specifically reported as requested. Please provide this information in relation to rod and line fisheries.</p> <p>d) Given that the number of the salmon rivers in the stock classification table has changed please clarify whether this is also the case for 2.4d.</p>	

			<p>The Review Group requested details on how mixed stock fisheries are managed with reference to CNL(09)43.</p> <p>Each answer should be self-contained and not rely on any other document, or any other section of the IP, for explanation.</p>	
2.5	How are socio-economic factors taken into account in making decisions on management of salmon fisheries?	2	<p>The Review Group requested how this answer aligns with the answer presented in section 2.1. ‘The Scottish Government wishes to maximise the socio-economic value from Scotland’s wild Atlantic salmon fisheries while protecting and enhancing stocks.’</p> <p>The Review Group requested clarification on how business and regulatory impact assessments relate to wild salmonids, see CNL(09)43, section 2.9.</p>	
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			Unsatisfactory	

<p>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></p>				
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 sought clarification on the present applicability of the EU WFD in	

			the context of the withdrawal of the UK from the EU.	
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</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"> • 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	<p>(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, (b)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?</p>	2	<p>a) The word count has not been adhered to; it would help the Review Group if this is taken into account in future IP revisions.</p> <p>It is unclear whether the current policy is consistent with the NASCO / ISFA 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 the farms, and for 100% of farmed fish to be retained in all production units, see SLG(09)5.</p> <p>b) It is not clear from the answer provided when changes in policy will clearly demonstrate progress consistent with the NASCO / ISFA 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 the farms, and for 100% of farmed fish to be retained in all production units, see SLG(09)5.</p>
4.2	<p>(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?</p>	2	<p>a) The Review Group could not determine from this answer whether or not there is quantifiable progress towards the International Goal of no increase in sea lice loads or lice-induced mortality of wild</p>

			<p>salmonids attributable to the farms, as outlined in SLG(09)5.</p> <p>b) When progress can be demonstrated, it should include a description of the monitoring of wild fish.</p> <p>c) Given that the Review Group considered that no apparent progress has been demonstrated, this section should be completed.</p>	
4.3	<p>(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?</p>	2	<p>(a)(i) and (ii) the Review Group welcomed the process towards improving the achievement of 100% containment in all production facilities. However, the Review Group considered that there is still no quantifiable progress demonstrated.</p> <p>The Review Group still awaits the promised table of notified escapes.</p> <p>b) When progress can be demonstrated, it should include a description of the monitoring of wild fish and proportion of escaped farmed salmon, as outlined in ‘Reporting and Tracking’ section of SLG(09)5.</p> <p>Each answer should be self-contained and not rely on any other section of the IP for explanation</p> <p>c) Given that the Review Group considered that no progress has been demonstrated, this section should be completed.</p>	
4.4	<p>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?</p>	1	<p>The word count has not been adhered to; it would help the Review Group if this is taken into account in future IP revisions.</p> <p>The following sentence needs to be rephrased as it does not read well, ‘<i>Inland</i></p>	

			<i>Fisheries Ireland and the Norwegian Institute of Marine Research to build a sea lice dispersal model which focuses, utilising Killary Harbour as a case study, on the potential impact of the dispersal on wild salmon, as opposed to the potential connectivity of sea lice between fish farms. The project aims to report in the summer of 2019.'</i>	
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?	2	a) & b) the Review Group welcomed the intention to develop a framework for adaptive management. However, it is unclear on the current approach as to how aquaculture facilities are located so as to minimise the risk to wild salmon stocks (SLG(09)5).	
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	The Review Group sought clarification on stocking policy outside SACs. The Review Group sought clarification on the present applicability of the EU legislation (SACs) in the context of the withdrawal of the UK from the EU.	
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?	1	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.	
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	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		
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.	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		
Threat / challenge H5	Yes		
Threat / challenge H6	Yes		
Threat / challenge H7	Yes	For H7, it would be more appropriate to have any activities related to fisheries management described in section 2.8.	
Threat / challenge H8	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.	Assessment (yes / no)	Draft feedback on any improvements required	Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?
Threat / challenge A1	Yes		
Threat / challenge A2	Yes		
Threat / challenge A3	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	Continued annual assessment of Scotland’s stocks using an adult based assessment method based on rod catch information and additional ancillary data.	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(09)43, sections 2.4 & 2.5.	Satisfactory	
F1 cont:	Development of a complementary juvenile assessment tool	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(09)43, sections 2.4 & 2.5.	Satisfactory	
F1 cont	Research study on C&R effect on fish	Yes	Yes			Yes.	Satisfactory	

						The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(09)43, sections 2.4 & 2.5.		
F2	Review of Scotland's inshore marine gill net legislation.	Yes	Yes However the Review Group considered that this action lends itself to qualitative reporting and recommend the introduction of some milestones.			Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(09)43, sections 2.3 & 2.8.	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	Does the action move the Party / jurisdiction clearly towards the achievement of NASCO's Resolutions,	Given the previous question, is the action considered satisfactory or unsatisfactory overall?	Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?

					alternative for monitoring progress acceptable?	Agreements and Guidelines?		
H1	Reductions in point source and diffuse pollution	Yes	No	Specific – the description of the action should still be more concise in relation to wild salmon conservation.		Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(10)51, section 3.5.	Satisfactory	
H1 cont:	Explore the benefit and feasibility of nutrient enrichment in upland oligotrophic parts of river systems.	Yes, clarity is required about how it relates directly to the water quality in oligotrophic river systems.	No	Measurable – there is no specific baseline or target described, the action needs this detail to make it SMART, and the Review Group recommends the introduction of milestones.	Yes	Yes. The Review Group sought further information on how this relates to CNL(10)51.	Satisfactory	
H2	River Basin Management Plans (RBMP) have identified that the main pressures on flows and levels in Scotland	Yes	Yes. The Review Group sought clarification on the applicability of the EU WFD in the context of the withdrawal of the UK from the EU.			Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(10)51, section 3.5.	Satisfactory	
H3	Implement Scotland’s Second Climate Change Adaptation Programme (SCCAP2).	Yes	No	Timely – can milestones be added within the period of the IP?		Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(10)51, section 3.2.	Satisfactory	

H4	Prevention of morphological impacts and passive recovery of watercourses will be achieved through the controlled activity regulations (CAR) and associated “General Binding Rules”	Yes	Yes. However, the Review Group sought clarification on the present applicability of the EU WFD in the context of the withdrawal of the UK from the EU. Additionally, the expected outcome should be more clearly related to wild salmon conservation.			Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(10)51, section 3.5.	Satisfactory	
H5	The UK Forestry Standard (UKFS) and its supporting Forests and Water Guidelines	Yes	No. The expected outcome should be more clearly related to wild salmon conservation.	Specific, Measurable and Timely need to be reflected more clearly. The Review Group expects to see these SMART descriptors adequately addressed. The Review Group refers to comments in the round 1 review.		Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(10)51, section 3.5.	Satisfactory	
H6	Scotland’s River Basin Management Plans (RBMPs)	Yes	Yes. However, the Review Group sought clarification on the present applicability of the EU WFD in			Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(10)51, section 3.5.	Satisfactory	

			the context of the withdrawal of the UK from the EU.					
H7	Continued implementation of monitoring/research strategy for potential marine renewable and salmonid interactions.	Yes	No	The Review Group expected to see all of the SMART descriptors adequately addressed. However, the Review Group noted that the description of the action involves implementation of a “monitoring/research strategy” for a broad suite of potential impacts of renewable energy (“salmonid interactions”). The monitoring approach only describes the outcome of one telemetry study. The description of the action would probably be more appropriate if it were something along these lines: ‘Support development of field studies and migration models to better understand the impacts of renewable energy		Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(10)51, section 2c. but recommends that milestones and outputs should be introduced to support future review.	Satisfactory	

				developments in Scotland.’				
H7 cont:	ATLANTIC SALMON AT SEA - factors affecting their growth and survival (SeaSalar). The Norwegian Institute for Nature Research (NINA) is the lead institution of the program. Marine Scotland is part of the expert consortium.	No	No			No. This is not relevant to the NASCO goals for habitat, therefore, this action should be removed.	Unsatisfactory	
H8	Research, review and experimentation to better understand and address, as appropriate, the impact of piscivorous birds on Atlantic salmon.	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(10)51, section 3.8.	Satisfactory	
H8 cont:	Pilot study to identify the degree of interaction and potential scale of impact of dolphins on returning adult Atlantic salmon in the Moray Firth.	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(10)51, section 3.8.	Satisfactory	
H8 cont:	The Seals and Salmon Interactions (SSI) work to identify the impact of seal predation on	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(10)51, section 3.8.	Satisfactory	

	wild Atlantic salmon.								
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	Marine Scotland has reviewed the policy permitting salmon introductions (stocking), and will also revisit options for a new licensing regime under that policy.	Yes	Yes. However, the Review Group considered that this action lends itself to qualitative reporting.			Yes. The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(06)48.	Satisfactory	
A2	Marine Scotland has initiated a national introgression project in July 2018 that seeks to	Yes	Yes			No. The Review Group sought information on how data derived from this action will move	Unsatisfactory	

	quantify levels of introgression of genetic material from farm escapees into wild Scottish Atlantic salmon populations.					UK – Scotland towards achieving the international goal for 100% containment.		
A3	Post-smolt, west coast sweep netting and a continued work programme at the Shieldaig site to provide data to investigate potential links between sea lice, farms and sea trout	Yes	No	While various projects related to sea lice research have been outlined, it is still unclear how the outcome of this action will result in better management of sea lice emanating from aquaculture.		No	Unsatisfactory	
A2 & A3	A new Salmon Interactions Workstream will provide advice on existing and potential future arrangements to mitigate the 12 high level pressures on wild salmon. As an initial task, a new, independently chaired Working Group was established in October 2018, to	Yes	Yes. However, the Review Group requested again that acronyms be defined.			No. This action was due to be completed in 2020, and the Review Group questioned whether it is still relevant to this plan. Please advise how the expected outcome of the action will move UK – Scotland clearly towards the	Unsatisfactory	

	examine and provide advice on the interactions between wild and farmed Atlantic salmon.					achievement of NASCO's goals.		
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	No The action relates only to monitoring
Each Party / jurisdiction with salmon farming should include at least one action relating to containment.	Yes	No The action relates only to monitoring
Overall score by Review Group		Unsatisfactory