

***Third Interim Report of the Implementation Plan / Annual Progress
Report Review Group for the Review of Implementation Plans under the
Third Cycle of Reporting (2019 – 2024)***

By Video Conference

16 – 27 November, 4, 11, 16 & 17 December 2020

Note: The Interim Report of the Review Group is available as document [CNL\(19\)14](#). The Second Interim Report of the Review Group is available as document [CNL\(20\)17](#). This Report covers the work of the Review Group at its November / December 2020 meeting only. It does not repeat background information included in those reports.

1. Opening of the Meeting

- 1.1 The Chair, Cathal Gallagher (European Union), opened the meeting and welcomed members of the Review Group, and noted the two new members, Dan Kircheis (USA) and Michael Millane (EU). He thanked them all for agreeing to undertake the important work assigned to them. Two of the Group's members were unable to participate during 16 to 27 November, one due to prior work commitments and the other because the United Kingdom only acceded to the NASCO Convention on 27 November. This meant that the Review Group comprised six people to conduct most of its work, including the NGO Co-Chairs, instead of the eight people expected to participate. Once the UK had acceded, Lawrence Talks was able to rejoin the Group and he was also welcomed at that point.
- 1.2 The Chair reminded the Group of the decisions made at the Inter-Sessional Meeting of the NASCO Council in September 2020. At that meeting, Parties confirmed their commitment to the Implementation Plan (IP) process, noting its benefits. They acknowledged that some revision was needed to enable the process to work better. The Council also provided some further interpretation of the Guidelines for the Preparation and Evaluation of NASCO Implementation Plans and for Reporting on Progress, CNL(18)49, (the IP Guidelines) to strengthen the reviews by the Review Group, through the provision of some enhanced guidance (the Enhanced Guidance, CNL(20)55).
- 1.3 The Chair also reminded the Group that Council agreed, as noted in the Enhanced Guidance, that the most recent revision of a Party's / jurisdiction's IP would form the basis for the review. Further, that all Parties' / jurisdictions' IPs would be considered in light of the Enhanced Guidance. Full details are provided in paragraph 4.2.
- 1.4 He reminded the Group that it had been tasked to evaluate the Implementation Plans in line with the IP Guidelines, in four key areas of assessment, by:
 1. Identifying whether the answers by each Party / jurisdiction to the questions posed 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;

3. Determining that each action:

- addresses the main (relevant) threats and challenges identified for that Party / jurisdiction,
- adheres to the 'SMART' descriptors, and
- moves the Party / jurisdiction clearly towards the implementation of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.

4. Where applicable, that each Party / jurisdiction presented a satisfactory mandatory action that demonstrated movement towards the achievement of NASCO's goals in the management of mixed stock fisheries, effective sea lice management and containment of farmed fish in all production facilities.

1.5 Additionally, the Group would need to assess whether the improvements requested in the previous rounds of review had been addressed in the revised Implementation Plans.

1.6 The Chair emphasised that the members of the Review Group had been appointed specifically to represent NASCO and not their Party, jurisdiction or organization. He noted that the Secretariat's role was to co-ordinate the work and they would not serve as reviewers.

1.7 A list of the members of the Review Group is contained in Annex 1.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

2.1 The Review Group adopted its Agenda, IP(20)08 (Annex 2).

3. Review of the Terms of Reference and Consideration of Working Methods

3.1 The Review Group noted that while no Terms of Reference had been provided by the Council, the Group's assessments would rely upon instructions for evaluation given in the IP Guidelines, [CNL\(18\)49](#) and the Enhanced Guidance document, [CNL\(20\)55](#).

3.2 In accordance with the IP Guidelines, an initial assessment of each revised Implementation Plan had been conducted by the Secretariat prior to the Group's meeting. The aim of this assessment was to ensure that time was not spent on a full critical review of Implementation Plans that contained significant omissions. This assessment also highlighted changes from previous versions of the IPs.

3.3 Prior to the meeting, a template was developed by the Secretariat (CNL40.2166, Annex 3) which was used to record the evaluations.

3.4 The Review Group agreed to follow the same working methods and 'ground rules' as for previous meetings. These are described in paragraphs 3.4 and 3.5 of the Review Group's interim report (document [CNL\(19\)14](#)).

3.6 In line with the Enhanced Guidelines, the most recent version of each IP was made available on the [NASCO website](#) prior to the meeting.

4. Evaluation of the Implementation Plans

4.1 Parties / jurisdictions were asked to submit their revised Implementation Plans by 1 November 2020 for reassessment.

- 4.2 The following 21 Implementation Plans were reviewed (see the table below for details): these comprised one new IP; twelve IPs revised following their review in November 2019; two IPs previously considered to be fully satisfactory; and seven IPs that were not revised following their review in November 2019.

Party / jurisdiction	Document number	Version of the IP	Date received
Canada	IP(19)17rev2	Second revision	November 2020
Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland)			
<i>Faroe Islands</i>	IP(19)23rev	First revision	November 2019
<i>Greenland</i>	CNL(19)81	Previously accepted	February 2019
European Union			
<i>Denmark</i>	IP(19)09rev	First revision	October 2019
<i>Finland</i>	IP(19)12rev	First revision	October 2019
<i>France</i>	IP(19)16rev2	Second revision	October 2020
<i>Germany</i>	IP(19)11rev2	Second revision	March 2020
<i>Ireland</i>	IP(19)5rev	First revision	October 2019
<i>Portugal</i>	IP(19)06rev	First revision	October 2019
<i>Spain (Asturias)</i>	IP(19)20rev2	Second revision	October 2020
<i>Spain (Cantabria)</i>	IP(19)22rev	First revision	October 2020
<i>Spain (Galicia)</i>	IP(19)19rev	First revision	October 2020
<i>Spain (Gipuzkoa)</i>	IP(20)04	First IP received	October 2020
<i>Spain (Navarra)</i>	IP(19)14rev	First revision	October 2020
<i>Sweden</i>	CNL(19)82	Previously accepted	October 2019
United Kingdom			
<i>England and Wales</i>	IP(19)13rev2	Second revision	April 2020
<i>Northern Ireland</i>	IP(19)15rev	First revision	May 2020
<i>Scotland</i>	IP(19)10rev	First revision	November 2019
Norway	IP(19)18rev2	Second revision	November 2020
Russian Federation	IP(19)05rev	First revision	November 2019
United States of America	IP(19)25rev	First revision	October 2019

Interpretation of Assessments

- 4.3 As with previous reviews, a score of ‘1’ (satisfactory answers / information) for an answer meant that a satisfactory answer had been provided. It did not indicate that the Party / jurisdiction was necessarily meeting NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.
- 4.4 As set out in the Enhanced Guidance, CNL(20)55, the Review Group took the following approach:
- section (1), and each area of sections (2), (3) and (4), were categorised as either ‘satisfactory’ or ‘unsatisfactory’;
 - where a section / area was deemed to be unsatisfactory, the Review Group provided a clear explanation of its decision to the Party / jurisdiction and, where feasible and appropriate, offered suggestions / recommendations for how it could be improved;
 - where the Review Group considered that an action moved the Party / jurisdiction clearly towards the implementation of NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines even if the action was not entirely in line with the SMART criteria, the Review Group considered such an action as satisfactory; and

- where the action adhered to the SMART criteria, but the action was considered not to move the Party / jurisdiction towards the implementation of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines, it was deemed unsatisfactory. The Review Group gave a clear explanation of their assessment in their feedback.

4.5 The IP Guidelines, CNL(18)49, state that the Review Group should provide examples of good practice within the Implementation Plans. Good examples of responses to the questions and of SMART actions have been compiled previously and are contained in document [CNL\(20\)17](#) (Annex 6). Those that the Review Group felt still applied, and any new examples, have been indicated to Parties / jurisdictions in their review feedback.

Overview of Evaluations

4.6 The summary table / infographic showing the outcome of the evaluation of each section / area of each Implementation Plan following this third review is presented in Annex 4.

4.7 Of the 21 IPs evaluated, one was considered to be satisfactory in each section / area. However, for the other 20, the Review Group considered that further work is still needed for them to be in line with the IP Guidelines, CNL(18)49, and the Enhanced Guidance, CNL(20)55, and to demonstrate progress towards the achievement of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.

4.8 The Review Group recommended that the Parties / jurisdictions with responsibility to regulate salmon farming industries need to adhere specifically to NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines directed at the protection of wild salmon.

5. Development of Feedback to the Parties / jurisdictions

5.1 The Review Group agreed to follow the procedure set out in the Enhanced Guidance document, CNL(20)55, in providing feedback to the Parties / jurisdictions.

'Following the November 2020 review of IPs, for those Parties / jurisdictions with IPs, or sections of IPs, that are still considered by the Review Group to be unsatisfactory, the President of NASCO will write again to the relevant Minister, or other nominated official.

The second letter will include the November review, and request a response to include how the Party / jurisdiction will demonstrate progress towards the attainment of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines in areas where deficiencies have been identified. The intention is to allow the response to be available prior to the IP Special Session webinar in spring 2021.

The letters from the President and the responses will be published on NASCO's website without delay after their receipt by the Secretariat...'

5.2 Each review comprises a summary sheet and the detailed evaluation. The Review Group agreed that, given that the letters from the President will include the full review, and be published on the NASCO website, that all full reviews should be published on the NASCO website, in the interests of transparency.

Feedback to the Council and Next Steps

5.3 Additionally, the Review Group discussed general feedback that it could give to the Council of NASCO rather than the individual Parties / jurisdictions.

5.4 The Review Group considered that there are a number of cross-jurisdictional issues that are important for Council to consider going forward.

- 5.5 The first relates to rivers that flow through more than one Party / jurisdiction. The Review Group requested that in future reporting cycles, jurisdictions provide information on co-operative approaches to the management of salmon catchments that are shared with other jurisdictions. This would include information on how fisheries are managed for the full catchment (e.g. quotas, Conservation Limits, catch returns, habitat plans, regulations). Discussion during the Review Group meeting focused on the following rivers: the Teno / Tena in EU – Finland and in Norway, for the Minho / Miño in EU – Portugal and in EU – Spain (Galicia), and for the Bidasoa in EU – France and in EU – Spain (Navarra).
- 5.6 The second issue relates to the impact on wild salmonids of sea lice and escapes from salmon farms in other jurisdictions. Here the Review Group requested that in future reporting cycles, the Council gives consideration to requesting jurisdictions to identify any potential threats to wild salmonids emanating from salmon aquaculture that may exist from outside their jurisdiction.
- 5.7 A separate issue relates to how conservation hatcheries should be considered in the part of the IP pertaining to management of aquaculture. Many Parties / jurisdictions did not acknowledge conservation hatcheries in the sections on containment, sea lice or *Gyrodactylus salaris*. Consideration by Council of whether this section should relate to conservation hatcheries as well as salmon farms and farming would be helpful in future reporting cycles.
- 5.8 In line with the Enhanced Guidance, the Review Group noted that, following the IP November / December review, the President of NASCO will write to the relevant Minister, or other nominated official of each Party / jurisdiction. The letter will include the November / December 2020 review, and request a response to include how the Party / jurisdiction will demonstrate progress towards the attainment of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines in areas where deficiencies have been identified. The intention is to allow the response to be available prior to the IP Special Session webinar in May 2021.
- 5.9 Any revised IPs should be submitted by 1 November (in 2021 and in subsequent years to 2023). The IP / APR Review Group will review any revised IPs during November 2021, considering only those elements that had been deemed unsatisfactory in the November 2020 review, and have been revised. The Review Group therefore requests the following:
- Council to agree that questions / actions etc. deemed as satisfactory in November 2020 are not revised (unless clarification is requested), and revised sections are highlighted clearly.
- 5.10 The Review Group again noted that the Enhanced Guidance states that in each year of the third reporting cycle, in November, if the Review Group still considers that any sections / areas of an IP are unsatisfactory, the President will write to the relevant Minister (or other official) of that Party / jurisdiction to bring to their attention the unsatisfactory nature of this part of the IP and the importance of implementing NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. The President will remind the Party / jurisdiction of their commitment to make progress on implementing NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines, and enquire about their plans to make and report on progress towards that aim.
- 5.11 As set out in the Enhanced Guidance, Parties / jurisdictions should submit their Annual Progress Report (APR) on the basis of their most recent IP submitted, even if the

Review Group considers it to contain unsatisfactory sections. The IP / APR Review Group will meet virtually to review the APRs in April 2021. The IP / APR Review Group considered that it is inappropriate to consider progress on ‘unsatisfactory’ actions. Therefore, during the APR Review Group meeting, only ‘satisfactory’ actions will be reviewed.

6. Arrangements for Presenting the Group’s Report to the IP Special Session Webinar

- 6.1 In June 2020, Council agreed that a webinar would be held following the November meeting of the IP Review Group, to discuss the 2019 – 2024 Implementation Plans fully. This webinar will be held as an inter-sessional Special Session, in which NASCO’s Parties and accredited NGOs will be able to participate. There will be a time limited period for inter-sessional correspondence prior to the Special Session to facilitate questions and answers, with the aim of making the webinar as efficient as possible. However, questions may still be raised during the webinar. The Chair of the IP / APR Review Group will present the report of the November IP / APR Review Group meeting at the inter-sessional IP Special Session. He will present the outcome of the webinar to the 2021 Annual Meeting of the Council.
- 6.2 The inter-sessional correspondence will take place from 12 to 23 April 2021. The webinar will be held on 5 May.

7. Report of the Meeting

- 7.1 The Review Group agreed a report of its meeting.

8. Other Business

- 8.1 There was no other business.

9. Close of the Meeting

- 9.1 The Chair thanked the members of the Review Group for their hard work during and prior to the meeting.

List of Participants

Cathal Gallagher	Inland Fisheries Ireland (Review Group Chair)
Paddy Gargan	Inland Fisheries Ireland
Katrine Kærsgaard**	Ministry of Fisheries, Hunting and Agriculture, Greenland
Dan Kircheis	NOAA Federal, USA
Paul Knight	Salmon and Trout Conservation UK
Michael Millane	Inland Fisheries Ireland
Steve Sutton	Atlantic Salmon Federation, Canada
Lawrence Talks*	Environment Agency, UK

* unable to participate in the meeting from 16 – 27 November.

** unable to participate in the meetings but provided preliminary lead reviews.

IP(20)08

***Meeting of the
Implementation Plan / Annual Progress Report Review Group***

By Video Conference

16-20, 23-27 November, 4, 11, 16 & 17 December 2020

Agenda

1. Opening of the Meeting
2. Adoption of the Agenda
3. Review of the Terms of Reference and Consideration of Working Methods
4. Evaluation of the Implementation Plans
5. Development of Feedback to the Parties / jurisdictions
6. Arrangements for Presenting the Group's Report to the IP Special Session Webinar
7. Report of the Meeting
8. Other Business
9. Close of the Meeting

Annex 3***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:

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?			
1.2	What reference points (e.g. conservation limits, management targets or other measures of abundance) are used to assess the status of stocks?			
1.3	What is the current status of stocks under the new classification system outlined in CNL(16)11?			
1.4	How is stock diversity (e.g. genetics, age composition, run-timing, etc.) taken into account in the management of salmon stocks?			
1.5	To provide a baseline for future comparison, what is the current and potential quantity of salmon habitat?			
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>			
1.7	Please describe the process used to consult NGOs and other stakeholders and industries in the development of this Implementation Plan.			
Overall score by Review Group for 1. Introduction			Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory (delete as appropriate)	

10

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?			
2.2	What is the decision-making process for the management of salmon fisheries, including predetermined decisions taken under different stock conditions (e.g. the stock level at which regulations are triggered)?			
2.3	(a) Are fisheries permitted to operate on salmon stocks that are below their reference point (e.g. Conservation Limits)? If so, (b) how many such fisheries			

	are there and (c) what approach is taken to managing them that still promotes stock rebuilding?			
2.4	(a) Are there any mixed-stock salmon fisheries? If so, (b) how are these defined, (c) what was the mean catch in these fisheries in the last five years and (d) how are they managed to ensure that all the contributing stocks are meeting their conservation objectives?			
2.5	How are socio-economic factors taken into account in making decisions on management of salmon fisheries?			
2.6	What is the current level of unreported catch and what measures are being taken to reduce this?			
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?			
Overall score by Review Group for 2. Management of Salmon Fisheries				Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory (<i>delete as appropriate</i>)

11

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?			
3.2	How are socio-economic factors taken into account in making decisions on 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?			
Overall score by Review Group for 3. Protection and Restoration of Salmon Habitat				Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory (<i>delete as appropriate</i>)

4. Management of Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers and Transgenics
--

<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	(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?		
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?		
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?		
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?		
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?		
4.6	What progress has been made to implement NASCO's guidance on introductions, transfers and stocking?		
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?		

4.8	What is the policy / strategy on use of transgenic salmon?			
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?			
Overall score by Review Group for 4. Management of Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers and Transgenics			Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory (<i>delete as appropriate</i>)	

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			
Threat / challenge F2			
Threat / challenge F3			
Threat / challenge F4			
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 / Unsatisfactory (<i>delete as appropriate</i>)

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

14

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			
Threat / challenge H2			
Threat / challenge H3			
Threat / challenge H4			
Overall score by Review Group for 3.4: threats / challenges in relation to estuarine and freshwater habitat			Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory (<i>delete as appropriate</i>)

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			
Threat / challenge A2			
Threat / challenge A3			
Threat / challenge A4			
Overall score by Review Group for 4.10: threats / challenges in relation to aquaculture, introductions and transfers, and transgenics			Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory (<i>delete as appropriate</i>)

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								
F2								
F3								
F4								
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 / Unsatisfactory <i>(delete as appropriate)</i>	

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	Is it ‘SMART’? (yes / no)	If ‘no’, which descriptor needs to be reflected more	If the proposed monitoring is qualitative (as allowed in the Guidelines), is	Does the action move the Party / jurisdiction clearly towards	Given the previous question, is the action considered	Comments relating to previous review round:

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	Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory <i>(delete as appropriate)</i>
---	--

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 / No <i>(delete as appropriate)</i>	Yes / No <i>(delete as appropriate)</i>
Each Party / jurisdiction with salmon farming should include at least one action relating to sea lice management.	Yes / No <i>(delete as appropriate)</i>	Yes / No <i>(delete as appropriate)</i>
Each Party / jurisdiction with salmon farming should include at least one action relating to containment.	Yes / No <i>(delete as appropriate)</i>	Yes / No <i>(delete as appropriate)</i>

Infographic to Show the Status of the Various Sections of the Implementation Plans After the Third Round of Review

Key											
		Section / area 'satisfactory'									
		Section / area 'unsatisfactory'									
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 & Transgenic	Management of Salmon Fisheries	Habitat Protection & Restoration	Aquaculture, Introductions & Transfers & Transgenics		
Canada											
DFG Faroe Islands								Not applicable			
DFG Greenland						Not applicable			Not applicable		
EU-Denmark											
EU-Finland											
EU-France											
EU-Germany											
EU-Ireland											
EU-Portugal											
EU-Spain (Asturias)											
EU-Spain (Cantabria)											
EU-Spain (Galicia)											
EU-Spain (Gipuzkoa)											
EU-Spain (Navarra)											
EU-Sweden											
UK - England and Wales											
UK - Northern Ireland											
UK - Scotland											
Norway											
Russian Federation											
United States											