

IP(21)12_Canada

November 2021 Evaluation of the Revised Implementation Plan under the Third Reporting Cycle (2019 – 2024) from the Review Group to Canada

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 agreed, in June 2021, that Parties / jurisdictions may, on a voluntary basis, submit a revised Implementation Plan for review.

The Review Group thanks Canada for revising and submitting its Implementation Plan following previous evaluations from the Review Group. It also noted the accompanying information identifying what has been changed and why. The Review Group re-assessed the responses to questions changed from the previous Implementation Plan.

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 2021, of Canada’s Implementation Plan. Sections / areas considered to be ‘satisfactory’ are shown in green, those which are ‘partly satisfactory’ are shown in orange, together with the percentage of satisfactory responses, and those which are ‘unsatisfactory’ are in red.

	Questions on Salmon Management				Threats / Challenges to Wild Salmon			SMART 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	Mandatory Actions
Canada				59						33	33

The Review Group considered that Canada’s revised Implementation Plan requires further work to achieve a satisfactory rating across all the ‘Aquaculture, Introductions & Transfers & Transgenics’ areas of the Plan.

Positive Feedback from the Review Group: the Review Group considered that the responses to questions 2.1 and 3.3 were some of the best examples of answers to these questions across the various Implementation Plans. For question 2.2, the Review Group considered that Canada's response described the decision-making process well and how the management actions relate to the stock-reference limits. For question 3.1, the Review Group considered that Canada's revised response provided clear details on how risks to productive capacity are identified through the data collection, monitoring, juvenile indices and baseline information, relevant to Section 3 of the Habitat Guidelines.

Questions on Salmon Management: following the revisions to the Canadian Implementation Plan, the Review Group considered that the responses to questions in three of the four sections were now fully satisfactory. However, further revision is needed in the 'Aquaculture, Introductions & Transfers & Transgenics' section, with only 59 % of responses considered to be satisfactory by the Review Group. The Review Group has provided detailed feedback to each response that is considered to be unsatisfactory.

Threats / Challenges to Wild Salmon: the Review Group considered that the identified threats and challenges to the management of wild Atlantic salmon identified under each theme all related clearly to NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.

SMART Actions: all of the 'Management of Salmon Fisheries' actions within the Plan were considered to be both SMART and satisfactory, i.e. the Review Group considered that those actions move Canada clearly towards the implementation of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. Following the revision of the IP, all three of the 'Habitat Protection and Restoration' actions were also considered to be both SMART and satisfactory. However, of the three new actions on 'Aquaculture, Introductions & Transfers & Transgenics' only one was considered to be satisfactory. None were considered to be SMART and the remaining two were considered to be unsatisfactory.

Mandatory Actions: the section overall was considered to be unsatisfactory because the actions required on sea lice and containment, given the marine aquaculture present in Canada, were not provided. At least one of the actions on both sea lice and containment should relate to the management of these issues to be in line with NASCO's Best Management Practice, SLG(09)5.

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

Evaluation in 2021 of Revised Implementation Plans

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.

In 2021, Council made decisions which mean that 1) only the revised parts of any resubmitted IP need to be reviewed 2) aspects of the IP that are moving the Party / jurisdiction clearly towards the achievement of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines should be identified, and 3) significant improvements should be identified, to be communicated on the NASCO website and social media.

Party: Canada

Jurisdiction/Region:

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

#	Question in IP Template	Initial Assessment (1 or 2)	Draft feedback on any improvements required (for answers assessed as 2)	Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?
1. Introduction				
1.1	What are the objectives for the management of wild salmon?	1		
1.2	What reference points (e.g. conservation limits, management targets or other measures of abundance) are used to assess the status of stocks?	1		
1.3	What is the current status of stocks under the new classification system outlined in CNL(16)11?	1		
1.4	How is stock diversity (e.g. genetics, age composition, run-timing, etc.) taken into account in the management of salmon stocks?	1		Yes
1.5	To provide a baseline for future comparison, what is the current and potential quantity of salmon habitat?	1		
1.6	What is the current extent of freshwater and marine salmonid aquaculture? <i>Append one or more maps showing the location of aquaculture facilities and aquaculture free zones in rivers and the sea.</i>	1		
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	Changes noted to text in paragraph 2 contained mainly clarifications. The Review Group considered the answer to be in line with Sections 2.1 and 2.7 of the Fisheries Guidelines.	Yes

2.3	(a) Are fisheries permitted to operate on salmon stocks that are below their reference point (e.g. Conservation Limits)? If so, (b) how many such fisheries are there and (c) what approach is taken to managing them that still promotes stock rebuilding?	1	(c) The answer has been improved to provide, as requested, a general overview of the stock rebuilding of populations below their reference points. The Review Group requested clarification as to how these principles are applied to the large number of catchments defined as 'at risk' or 'unknown' in question 1.3	b) Yes
2.4	(a) Are there any mixed-stock salmon fisheries? If so, (b) how are these defined, (c) what was the mean catch in these fisheries in the last five years and (d) how are they managed to ensure that all the contributing stocks are meeting their conservation objectives?	1		Yes. The Review Group considered the revised text to be in keeping with the original evaluation.
2.5	How are socio-economic factors taken into account in making decisions on management of salmon fisheries?	1		
2.6	What is the current level of unreported catch and what measures are being taken to reduce this?	1		
2.7	Has an assessment under the Six Tenets for Effective Management of an Atlantic Salmon Fishery been conducted? If so, (a) has the assessment been made available to the Secretariat and (b) what actions are planned to improve the monitoring and control of the fishery? (c) If the six tenets have not been applied, what is the timescale for doing so?	1		
Overall score by Review Group for 2. Management of Salmon Fisheries			Satisfactory	

3. Protection and Restoration of Salmon Habitat:				
<i>In this section please review the management approach to the protection and restoration of habitat in your jurisdiction in line with the relevant NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.</i>				
3.1	How are risks to productive capacity identified and options for restoring degraded or lost salmon habitat prioritised, taking into account the principle of 'no net loss' and the need for inventories to provide baseline data?	1	The Review Group considered that this was a good answer. Canada provided clear details on how risks to productive capacity are identified through the data collection, monitoring, juvenile indices and baseline information, relevant to Section 3 of the Habitat Guidelines	Yes

3.2	How are socio-economic factors taken into account in making decisions on salmon habitat management?	1		
3.3	What management measures are planned to protect wild Atlantic salmon and its habitats from (a) climate change and (b) invasive aquatic species?	1		
Overall score by Review Group for 3. Protection and Restoration of Salmon Habitat			Satisfactory	

<p>4. Management of Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers and Transgenics <i>Council has requested that for Parties / jurisdictions with salmon farms, there should be a greater focus on actions to minimise impacts of salmon farming on wild salmonid stocks. Each Party / jurisdiction with salmon farming should therefore include at least one action relating to sea lice management and at least one action relating to containment, providing quantitative data in Annual Progress Reports to demonstrate progress towards the international goals agreed by NASCO and the International Salmon Farmers Association (ISFA):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% of farms to have effective sea lice management such that there is no increase in sea lice loads or lice-induced mortality of wild salmonids attributable to the farms; • 100% farmed fish to be retained in all production facilities. <p><i>In this section please provide information on all types of aquaculture, introductions and transfers, and transgenics (including freshwater hatcheries, smolt-rearing etc.</i></p>				
4.1	(a) Is the current policy concerning the protection of wild salmonids consistent with the international goals on sea lice and containment agreed by NASCO and ISFA? (b) If the current policy is not consistent with these international goals, when will current policy be adapted to ensure consistency with the international goals and what management measures are planned to ensure achievement of these goals and in what timescale?	1		Yes.
4.2	(a) What quantifiable progress can be demonstrated towards the achievement of the international goals for 100% of farms to have effective sea lice management such that there is no increase in sea lice loads, or lice-induced mortality of wild salmonids attributable to sea lice? (b) How is this progress monitored, including monitoring of wild fish? (c) If progress cannot be demonstrated, what additional measures are proposed and in what timescale?	2	<p>(a) Each answer should be self-contained and not rely on any other document for explanation.</p> <p>The Review Group noted the change of text but also that no information is presented to address the question in a).</p> <p>(b) Each answer should be self-contained and not rely on any other document, or any other section of the IP, for explanation.</p> <p>While some monitoring on sea farms takes place, it is unclear how progress is been</p>	No

			<p>documented. There is no information provided about monitoring of sea lice loads on wild salmonids, as outlined in SLG(09)5. Quantifiable progress could involve showing a decreasing trend in monitored lice loads in the farmed and wild salmonid populations.</p> <p>(c) Each answer should be self-contained and not rely on any other section of the IP for explanation.</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) Each answer should be self-contained and not rely on any other document for explanation.</p> <p>(a)(i) The quantitative information provided previously has been removed.</p> <p>(a)(ii) The Review Group recognised that Canada has implemented a number of actions from the BMP; however, no measurable quantifiable progress has been presented for containment. Quantifiable progress could involve showing a decreasing trend in, for example, the ‘number of incidents of escape events and standardised descriptions of the factors giving rise to escape events.’ SLG(09)5.</p> <p>(b) Each answer should be self-contained and not rely on any other document, or any other section of the IP, for explanation.</p> <p>The Review Group noted that some information is presented on the monitoring of escapes but no information on the monitoring of genetic introgression or impact on wild salmon.</p>	Yes, partly.

			(c) Each answer should be self-contained and not rely on any other section of the IP for explanation.	
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		The Review Group considered the revised text to be in keeping with the original evaluation.
4.5	What is the approach for determining the location of aquaculture facilities in (a) freshwater and (b) marine environments to minimise the risks to wild salmonid stocks?	1		
4.6	What progress has been made to implement NASCO's guidance on introductions, transfers and stocking?	1		
4.7	Is there (a) a requirement to evaluate thoroughly risks and benefits before undertaking any stocking programme and (b) a presumption against stocking for purely socio-political / economic reasons?	1		
4.8	What is the policy / strategy on use of transgenic salmon?	1		
4.9	<i>For Members of the North-East Atlantic Commission only:</i> What measures are in place, or are planned, to implement the eleven recommendations contained in the 'Road Map' to enhance information exchange and co-operation on monitoring, research and measures to prevent the spread of <i>Gyrodactylus salaris</i> and eradicate it if introduced, including the development and testing of contingency plans?	1	N/A	
Overall score by Review Group for 4. Management of Aquaculture, Introductions and Transgenics			Unsatisfactory	

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

2.8 Threats identified to wild salmon and challenges for management associated with their exploitation in fisheries, including bycatch of salmon in fisheries targeting other species	Initial Assessment (yes / no)	Draft feedback on any improvements required	Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?
Threat / challenge F1	Yes		
Threat / challenge F2	Yes		
Threat / challenge F3	Yes		
Threat / challenge F4	Yes		
Overall score by Review Group for 2.8: threats / challenges associated with exploitation in fisheries, including bycatch of salmon in fisheries targeting other species			Satisfactory

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

3.4 Threats identified to wild salmon and challenges for management in relation to estuarine and freshwater habitat.	Initial Assessment (yes / no)	Draft feedback on any improvements required	Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?
Threat / challenge H1	Yes		
Threat / challenge H2	Yes		
Threat / challenge H3	Yes		The Review Group noted the revision of text that provided additional clarity – improved the description of the threat.
Threat / challenge H4			
Overall score by Review Group for 3.4: threats / challenges in relation to estuarine and freshwater habitat			Satisfactory

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

4.10 Threats identified to wild salmon and challenges for management in relation to aquaculture,	Initial Assessment (yes / no)	Draft feedback on any improvements required	Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?

introductions and transfers, and transgenics.			
Threat / challenge A1	Yes	The language used to describe this threat should reflect information from NASCO's 2016 Theme-based Special Session which confirms that sea lice emanating from salmon aquaculture adversely impacts wild salmonids.	
Threat / challenge A2	Yes		
Threat / challenge A3	Yes	The Review Group recommended that the text should be confined to the identification of the threat / challenge to wild salmonids.	
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	Improve understanding of factors affecting survival at sea, to inform management	Yes	Yes. However, the Review Group would like to see further clarification on what range of management actions this research would be expected to support.			Yes. The Review Group considered that this research may relate to CNL(09)43, sections 2.5b and c.	Satisfactory	Yes
F2	Action against illegal fishing	Yes	Yes			Yes.	Satisfactory	

						The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(09)43, sections 2.2a and 2.3c.		
F3	Warm water protocols for adaptive management of recreational fisheries	Yes	Yes			The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(09)43, section 2.7a.	Satisfactory	
F4	Monitoring and management of Labrador mixed-stock fisheries	Yes	Yes			The Review Group considered that this relates to CNL(09)43, section 2.8.	Satisfactory	Yes
Overall score by Review Group for 2.9: SMART actions to implement NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines and demonstrate progress towards achievement of its goals and objectives for the management of salmon fisheries							Satisfactory	

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

3.5 What SMART actions are planned during the period covered by this Implementation Plan (2019 – 2024) to address each of the threats and challenges identified in section 3.4 to implement NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines and demonstrate progress towards achievement of its goals and objectives for the Protection, Restoration and Enhancement of Atlantic Salmon Habitat?								
#	Action in IP Template	Is the action clearly related to stated threat / challenge?	Is it 'SMART'? (yes / no)	If 'no', which descriptor needs to be reflected more clearly in the action?	If the proposed monitoring is qualitative (as allowed in the Guidelines), is the reason and proposed non-quantitative alternative for monitoring progress acceptable?	Does the action move the Party / jurisdiction clearly towards the achievement of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines?	Given the previous question, is the action considered satisfactory or unsatisfactory overall?	Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?
H1	Management of threats	Yes	Yes.			Yes.	Satisfactory	The suggestion on qualitative reporting

	related to industrial land-use activities		However, the Review Group considered that following the approach suggested might lend the action towards some level of qualitative reporting.			The Review Group considered that this is in line with the Habitat Guidelines, CNL(10)51.		has not been taken on board.
H2	Management of Acid Rain	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with the Habitat Guidelines, CNL(10)51, section 3.5h.	Satisfactory	
H3	Management of Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS)	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with the Habitat Guidelines, CNL(10)51, section 2 (b).	Satisfactory	Yes
Overall score by Review Group for 3.5: SMART actions to implement NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines and demonstrate progress towards achievement of its goals and objectives for the Protection, Restoration and Enhancement of Atlantic Salmon Habitat							Satisfactory	

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

		stated threat / challenge?		more clearly in the action?	the reason and proposed non-quantitative alternative for monitoring progress acceptable?	achievement of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines?	satisfactory or unsatisfactory overall?	as requested by IP RG?
A1	Research to support assessment of potential impacts of sea lice from farmed fish on wild Atlantic salmon stocks	Yes	No. Additionally, the Review Group noted that there is a body of research and evidence documented on the impact that sea lice emanating from salmon farms has on wild salmonids (TBSS 2021).	Needs to be specific, relevant, measurable and time bound. The Review Group expected to see these SMART descriptors adequately.		No. While it is evident that lice research is taking place, it is not clear that the proposed action will protect wild salmon, as outlined in SLG(09)5.	Unsatisfactory	
A2	Research to support assessment of genetic introgression and mitigation measures.	Yes	No.	Needs to be specific, measurable and time bound. The Review Group expected to see these SMART descriptors adequately.		No. While quantifying the impact of escaped salmon on wild fish could lead to management actions to support containment, this action is not clear in how this will be achieved. The lack of clarity in the action mean that the Review Group was unable to determine how the proposed action will	Unsatisfactory	

						move Canada towards the achievement of the international goal of 100% containment, SLG(09)5.		
A3	Research with respect to wild and farmed fish health and emerging diseases	Yes	No	Needs to be measurable and time bound. The Review Group expected to see these SMART descriptors adequately.		yes The Review Group considered this is in line with the Williamsburg Resolution, CNL(06)48, Article 11.	Satisfactory	
Overall score by Review Group for 4.11: SMART actions to implement NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines and demonstrate progress towards achievement of its goals and objectives for aquaculture, introductions and transfers, and transgenics							Unsatisfactory	

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

Mandatory action check	Is such a mandatory action required for this Party / jurisdiction? (yes / no)	Is such an action contained in the Implementation Plan (yes / no)
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
Each Party / jurisdiction with salmon farming should include at least one action relating to containment.	Yes	No
Overall score by Review Group		Unsatisfactory

Positive Feedback

Are there any aspects of the IP, *in particular*, that move the Party / jurisdiction clearly towards the achievement of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines? *(please state below)*

The Review Group considered that the following actions, in particular, move Canada clearly towards the achievement of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines:

- Management of Salmon Fisheries: F1, F2, F3 and F4;
- Protection, Restoration and Enhancement of Atlantic Salmon Habitat: H1, H2 and H3; and
- Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers and Transgenics: A3.

Are there any significant improvements by the Party / jurisdiction that could be communicated on the NASCO website and social media? *(please state below)*