

IP(21)12_EU – Sweden

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

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 EU – Sweden 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 EU – Sweden’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
EU – Sweden				94				90			

The Review Group considered that EU – Sweden’s revised Implementation Plan now requires further work to achieve a satisfactory rating across each section / area of the Plan. In addition, the Review Group noted that some of the revisions made in 2021, especially to the ‘Management of Salmon Fisheries’ actions, resulted in actions that were weakened and no longer SMART.

Positive Feedback from the Review Group: The Review Group considered that the response to question 2.2 describes, both clearly and succinctly, a very inclusive decision-making process. The Review Group considered that the response to Question 3.2 is thorough. It described the process taken to incorporate socio-economic factors into account very well.

Questions on Salmon Management: improvement is required to one of the responses to the questions on salmon management to enable all of these sections to be considered as satisfactory. On re-assessment of the ‘Aquaculture, Introductions & Transfers & Transgenics’ section of the Plan, the Review Group considered that the response to question 4.9 was no longer satisfactory. The Review Group has provided detailed feedback on this response.

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: the Review Group considered that the revisions to the actions in the ‘Management of Salmon Fisheries’ section have resulted in actions that are no longer SMART. The Review Group considered, therefore, that changes to reflect / reinstate the earlier actions would be a considerable improvement. Of the 10 actions, only one could be considered to be SMART. The reference to the relevant threat / challenge was no longer provided in any of the 10 actions. The IP Guidelines specify that *‘actions should be clear and concise and planned to address the threats / challenges identified in the Implementation Plan in a targeted fashion in order to improve implementation of NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.’* It needs to be clear, therefore, which threat / challenge each action is addressing. Additionally, the text noting the quantitative goals was removed in several cases, thus weakening the actions. In addition, the Review Group considered that the addition of a new action with a project that was completed in 2019 was not a helpful addition, given that the action cannot be reviewed as part of the annual reporting on progress. Nine of the ten actions were, however, considered to be satisfactory. The actions in the revised ‘Habitat Protection & Restoration’ and ‘Aquaculture, Introductions & Transfers & Transgenics’ sections were all considered to be both SMART and satisfactory. The Review Group considered that the satisfactory actions move EU – Sweden clearly towards the implementation of NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.

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

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

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

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

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

2.3	(a) Are fisheries permitted to operate on salmon stocks that are below their reference point (e.g. Conservation Limits)? If so, (b) how many such fisheries are there and (c) what approach is taken to managing them that still promotes stock rebuilding?	1		
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		
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	The NASCO Council has asked that Parties undertake this assessment. Jurisdictions of the EU have been requested to undertake the assessment.	
Overall score by Review Group for 2. Management of Salmon Fisheries			Satisfactory	

3. Protection and Restoration of Salmon Habitat:				
<i>In this section please review the management approach to the protection and restoration of habitat in your jurisdiction in line with the relevant NASCO Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.</i>				
3.1	How are risks to productive capacity identified and options for restoring degraded or lost salmon habitat prioritised, taking into account the principle of 'no net loss' and the need for inventories to provide baseline data?	1		
3.2	How are socio-economic factors taken into account in making decisions on salmon habitat management?	1		
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		Yes
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	(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	The Review Group understood that the freshwater aquaculture is land based and, therefore, is consistent with SLG(09)5.
4.2	(a) What quantifiable progress can be demonstrated towards the achievement of the international goals for 100% of farms to have effective sea lice management such that there is no increase in sea lice loads, or lice-induced mortality of wild salmonids attributable to sea lice? (b) How is this progress monitored, including monitoring of wild fish? (c) If progress cannot be demonstrated, what additional measures are proposed and in what timescale?	1	
4.3	(a) What quantifiable progress can be demonstrated towards the achievement of the international goals for achieving 100% containment in all (i) freshwater and (ii) marine aquaculture production facilities? (b) How is this progress monitored, including monitoring of wild fish (genetic introgression) and proportion of escaped farmed salmon in the spawning populations? (c) If progress cannot be demonstrated, what additional measures (e.g. use of sterile salmon in fish farming) are proposed and in what timescale?	1	
4.4	What adaptive management and / or scientific research is underway that could facilitate better achievement of NASCO's international goals for sea lice and containment such that the environmental impact on wild salmonids can be minimised?	1	
4.5	What is the approach for determining the location of aquaculture facilities in (a) freshwater and (b) marine environments to minimise the risks to wild salmonid stocks?	1	
4.6	What progress has been made to implement NASCO's guidance on introductions, transfers and stocking?	1	The Review Group noted there is information presented in this response that adds limited insight into implementation of

			NASCO's guidance on introductions, transfers and stocking, CNL(06)48.	
4.7	Is there (a) a requirement to evaluate thoroughly risks and benefits before undertaking any stocking programme and (b) a presumption against stocking for purely socio-political / economic reasons?	1		
4.8	What is the policy / strategy on use of transgenic salmon?	1		
4.9	<i>For Members of the North-East Atlantic Commission only:</i> What measures are in place, or are planned, to implement the eleven recommendations contained in the 'Road Map' to enhance information exchange and co-operation on monitoring, research and measures to prevent the spread of <i>Gyrodactylus salaris</i> and eradicate it if introduced, including the development and testing of contingency plans?	2	The Review Group recognised the development of a contingency plan for <i>G. salaris</i> , but noted that the previous IP version contained more relevant information and the information contained therein should be reinstated.	
Overall score by Review Group for 4. Management of Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers and Transgenics			Unsatisfactory	

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

2.8 Threats identified to wild salmon and challenges for management associated with their exploitation in fisheries, including bycatch of salmon in fisheries targeting other species	Initial Assessment (yes / no)	Draft feedback on any improvements required	Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?
Threat / challenge F1	Yes		
Threat / challenge F2	Yes		
Threat / challenge F3	Yes		
Threat / challenge F4	Yes		
Threat / challenge F5	Yes		
Overall score by Review Group for 2.8: threats / challenges associated with exploitation in fisheries, including bycatch of salmon in fisheries targeting other species			Satisfactory

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

3.4 Threats identified to wild salmon and challenges for management in relation to estuarine and freshwater habitat.	Initial Assessment (yes / no)	Draft feedback on any improvements required	Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?
Threat / challenge H1	Yes		
Threat / challenge H2	Yes		
Threat / challenge H3	Yes		
Threat / challenge H4	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.	Initial 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		
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	New fishing rules	No	No, not Relevant. Actions must relate clearly to the main threats and / or challenges identified in the Implementation Plan in a timely fashion, taking into account the provisions in NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(09)43, section 2.3.	Satisfactory	The Review Group considered that the action in the previous version of the IP was stronger and SMARTer.

F2	Fin-clipping smolts	No	No, not Relevant. Actions must relate clearly to the main threats and / or challenges identified in the Implementation Plan in a timely fashion, taking into account the provisions in NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(09)43, section 2.7 and CNL(06)48, Article 5.	Satisfactory	The Review Group considered that the action in the previous version of the IP was stronger and SMARTer.
F3	Coastal MSF	No	No, not Relevant. Actions must relate clearly to the main threats and / or challenges identified in the Implementation Plan in a timely fashion, taking into account the provisions in NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(09)43, section 2.8.	Satisfactory	The Review Group considered that the action in the previous version of the IP was stronger and SMARTer.
F4	Riverine MSF	No	No, not Relevant. Actions must relate clearly to the main			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with	Satisfactory	The Review Group considered that the action in the previous version of the IP

			threats and / or challenges identified in the Implementation Plan in a timely fashion, taking into account the provisions in NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.			CNL(09)43, section 2.7.		was stronger and SMARTer.
F5	Genetic diversity	Yes	Yes. However, the Review Group would like to see the quantitative goal provided in the previous version of the IP reinstated.			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(09)43, section 2.5.	Satisfactory	The Review Group considered that the action in the previous version of the IP was stronger and SMARTer.
F6	Continued monitoring in the designated (index) river	No	No, not Relevant. Actions must relate clearly to the main threats and / or challenges identified in the Implementation Plan in a timely fashion, taking into account the provisions in NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(09)43, section 2.2.	Satisfactory	

F7	Stock status	No	No, not Relevant. Actions must relate clearly to the main threats and / or challenges identified in the Implementation Plan in a timely fashion, taking into account the provisions in NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. The quantitative goal provided in the previous version of the IP should be reinstated.			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(09)43, section 2.2.	Satisfactory	The Review Group considered that the action in the previous version of the IP was stronger and SMARTer.
F8	Exploitation in rivers	No	No, not Relevant. Actions must relate clearly to the main threats and / or challenges identified in the Implementation Plan in a timely fashion, taking into account the provisions in NASCO's Resolutions,			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(09)43, section 2.2.	Satisfactory	The Review Group considered that the action in the previous version of the IP was stronger and SMARTer.

			Agreements and Guidelines. The quantitative goal provided in the previous version of the IP should be reinstated.					
F9	Improve catch statistics	No	No, not Relevant. Actions must relate clearly to the main threats and / or challenges identified in the Implementation Plan in a timely fashion, taking into account the provisions in NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. The quantitative goal provided in the previous version of the IP should be reinstated.			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(09)43, section 2.2.	Satisfactory	The Review Group considered that the action in the previous version of the IP was stronger and SMARTer.
F10	Fish management units in salmon rivers	No	No, not Relevant. Actions must relate clearly to the main threats and / or			No	Unsatisfactory The action was received in the IP update in 2021. The action was completed in 2019 and therefore	

			challenges identified in the Implementation Plan in a timely fashion, taking into account the provisions in NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.				would not be able to be reviewed as part of the APR process	
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							Unsatisfactory	

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	Liming	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(10)51, sections 3.5h and 3.6a.	Satisfactory	The Review Group considered that the action in the previous version of the IP was stronger and SMARTer.

H2	Impact of hydropower production	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(10)51, sections 3.5 and 3.6.	Satisfactory	
H3	Continued improvement of habitat in salmon rivers.	Yes	No	Measurable needs to be reflected more clearly. The Review Group expects to see this SMART descriptor adequately addressed		Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(10)51, section 3.6	Satisfactory	
H4	Alien species	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with CNL(10)51, section 3.3	Satisfactory	
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 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-	Does the action move the Party / jurisdiction clearly towards the achievement of NASCO's	Given the previous question, is the action considered satisfactory or unsatisfactory overall?	Comments relating to previous review round: changed as

					quantitative alternative for monitoring progress acceptable?	Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines?		requested by IP RG?
A1	<i>Gyrodactylus salaris</i>	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with NEA(18)08.	Satisfactory	
A2	Develop the national ability to genetically identify alien Atlantic salmon	Yes	Yes			Yes. The Review Group considered that this is in line with SLG(09)5.	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							Satisfactory	

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

Mandatory action check	Is such a mandatory action required for this Party / jurisdiction?	Is such an action contained in the Implementation Plan?
For Parties / jurisdictions that prosecute mixed-stock fisheries, there should be at least one action related to their management.	Yes	Yes
Each Party / jurisdiction with salmon farming should include at least one action relating to sea lice management.	No	Not Applicable
Each Party / jurisdiction with salmon farming should include at least one action relating to containment.	No	Not Applicable The Review Group agrees because the freshwater site is land based.
Overall Score by Review Group		Satisfactory

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 EU – Sweden clearly towards the achievement of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines:

- Management of Salmon Fisheries: F1, F2, F3, F4, F5, F6, F7, F8 and F9;
- Protection, Restoration and Enhancement of Atlantic Salmon Habitat: H1, H2, H3 and H4; and
- Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers and Transgenics: A1 and A2.

Sweden is proposing new national legislation that all large multi sea winter salmon caught will have to be released in river fisheries. An increase in egg deposition of at least 25% is expected from this management action. It is also noted that the practice of catch and release is increasing, with ca 30% of the catch is released currently.

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