G.salaris 'Road map' Update (Tabled by the United Kingdom – England and Wales)

## G.salaris 'Road map' Update (Tabled by the United Kingdom – England and Wales)

<ul> <li>1. Preventive measures and contingency planning.</li> <li>a) Appropriate steps should be taken to prevent the spread of <i>G. salaris</i> on fishing equipment, boats, etc. by use of approved disinfection methods.</li> <li>b) All movements of live fish should be recorded so that movements can be traced in the event of an outbreak of <i>G. salaris</i>.</li> <li>c) The risk of <i>G. salaris</i> introduction through the processing of fish carcasses should be assessed and, where appropriate, mitigated through control of processing.</li> <li>d) Physical barriers to fish migration should be considered as a measure to prevent the spread of <i>G. salaris</i> within a catchment and to uninfected catchments.</li> <li>e) Where possible, routine breaks in production and disinfection on rainbow trout and salmon freshwater aquaculture sites should be implemented as part of a control programme in</li> </ul>
planning.the spread of G. salaris on fishing equipment, boats, etc. by use of approved disinfection methods.b) All movements of live fish should be recorded so that movements can be traced in the event of an outbreak of G. salaris.c) The risk of G. salaris introduction through the processing of fish carcasses should be assessed and, where appropriate, mitigated through control of processing.d) Physical barriers to fish migration should be considered as a measure to prevent the spread of G. salaris within a catchment and to uninfected catchments.e) Where possible, routine breaks in production and disinfection on rainbow trout and salmon freshwater aquaculture sites should be implemented as part of a control programme in
<ul> <li>boats, etc. by use of approved disinfection methods.</li> <li>b) All movements of live fish should be recorded so that movements can be traced in the event of an outbreak of <i>G. salaris</i>.</li> <li>c) The risk of <i>G. salaris</i> introduction through the processing of fish carcasses should be assessed and, where appropriate, mitigated through control of processing.</li> <li>d) Physical barriers to fish migration should be considered as a measure to prevent the spread of <i>G. salaris</i> within a catchment and to uninfected catchments.</li> <li>e) Where possible, routine breaks in production and disinfection on rainbow trout and salmon freshwater aquaculture sites should be implemented as part of a control programme in</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>methods.</li> <li>b) All movements of live fish should be recorded so that movements can be traced in the event of an outbreak of <i>G. salaris</i>.</li> <li>c) The risk of <i>G. salaris</i> introduction through the processing of fish carcasses should be assessed and, where appropriate, mitigated through control of processing.</li> <li>d) Physical barriers to fish migration should be considered as a measure to prevent the spread of <i>G. salaris</i> within a catchment and to uninfected catchments.</li> <li>e) Where possible, routine breaks in production and disinfection on rainbow trout and salmon freshwater aquaculture sites should be implemented as part of a control programme in</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>b) All movements of live fish should be recorded so that movements can be traced in the event of an outbreak of <i>G. salaris</i>.</li> <li>c) The risk of <i>G. salaris</i> introduction through the processing of fish carcasses should be assessed and, where appropriate, mitigated through control of processing.</li> <li>d) Physical barriers to fish migration should be considered as a measure to prevent the spread of <i>G. salaris</i> within a catchment and to uninfected catchments.</li> <li>e) Where possible, routine breaks in production and disinfection on rainbow trout and salmon freshwater aquaculture sites should be implemented as part of a control programme in</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>recorded so that movements can be traced in the event of an outbreak of <i>G. salaris</i>.</li> <li>c) The risk of <i>G. salaris</i> introduction through the processing of fish carcasses should be assessed and, where appropriate, mitigated through control of processing.</li> <li>d) Physical barriers to fish migration should be considered as a measure to prevent the spread of <i>G. salaris</i> within a catchment and to uninfected catchments.</li> <li>e) Where possible, routine breaks in production and disinfection on rainbow trout and salmon freshwater aquaculture sites should be implemented as part of a control programme in</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>the event of an outbreak of <i>G. salaris</i>.</li> <li>c) The risk of <i>G. salaris</i> introduction through the processing of fish carcasses should be assessed and, where appropriate, mitigated through control of processing.</li> <li>d) Physical barriers to fish migration should be considered as a measure to prevent the spread of <i>G. salaris</i> within a catchment and to uninfected catchments.</li> <li>e) Where possible, routine breaks in production and disinfection on rainbow trout and salmon freshwater aquaculture sites should be implemented as part of a control programme in</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>c) The risk of <i>G. salaris</i> introduction through the processing of fish carcasses should be assessed and, where appropriate, mitigated through control of processing.</li> <li>d) Physical barriers to fish migration should be considered as a measure to prevent the spread of <i>G. salaris</i> within a catchment and to uninfected catchments.</li> <li>e) Where possible, routine breaks in production and disinfection on rainbow trout and salmon freshwater aquaculture sites should be implemented as part of a control programme in</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>the processing of fish carcasses should be assessed and, where appropriate, mitigated through control of processing.</li> <li>d) Physical barriers to fish migration should be considered as a measure to prevent the spread of <i>G. salaris</i> within a catchment and to uninfected catchments.</li> <li>e) Where possible, routine breaks in production and disinfection on rainbow trout and salmon freshwater aquaculture sites should be implemented as part of a control programme in</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>assessed and, where appropriate, mitigated through control of processing.</li> <li>d) Physical barriers to fish migration should be considered as a measure to prevent the spread of <i>G. salaris</i> within a catchment and to uninfected catchments.</li> <li>e) Where possible, routine breaks in production and disinfection on rainbow trout and salmon freshwater aquaculture sites should be implemented as part of a control programme in</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>through control of processing.</li> <li>d) Physical barriers to fish migration should be considered as a measure to prevent the spread of <i>G. salaris</i> within a catchment and to uninfected catchments.</li> <li>e) Where possible, routine breaks in production and disinfection on rainbow trout and salmon freshwater aquaculture sites should be implemented as part of a control programme in</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>d) Physical barriers to fish migration should be considered as a measure to prevent the spread of <i>G. salaris</i> within a catchment and to uninfected catchments.</li> <li>e) Where possible, routine breaks in production and disinfection on rainbow trout and salmon freshwater aquaculture sites should be implemented as part of a control programme in</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>considered as a measure to prevent the spread of <i>G. salaris</i> within a catchment and to uninfected catchments.</li> <li>e) Where possible, routine breaks in production and disinfection on rainbow trout and salmon freshwater aquaculture sites should be implemented as part of a control programme in</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>of <i>G. salaris</i> within a catchment and to uninfected catchments.</li> <li>e) Where possible, routine breaks in production and disinfection on rainbow trout and salmon freshwater aquaculture sites should be implemented as part of a control programme in</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>uninfected catchments.</li> <li>e) Where possible, routine breaks in production and disinfection on rainbow trout and salmon freshwater aquaculture sites should be implemented as part of a control programme in</li> </ul>
e) Where possible, routine breaks in production and disinfection on rainbow trout and salmon freshwater aquaculture sites should be implemented as part of a control programme in
and disinfection on rainbow trout and salmon freshwater aquaculture sites should be implemented as part of a control programme in
freshwater aquaculture sites should be implemented as part of a control programme in
implemented as part of a control programme in
infected areas.
<b>f</b> ) Permission to stock fish into infected river
catchments should be based on an assessment
of the increased risk of transmission of the
parasite to non-infected rivers (e.g. through
migration and other routes).
g) NEAC Parties and their relevant
jurisdictions should have contingency plans in
place for treatment, containment or eradication.
I nese plans should be developed in
consultation with stakeholders. A legal base for
the use of rotenone of other treatments,
containment and eradication measures should be
be put in place. Contingency plans should be
tested periodically and updated as required.
in interactions should and any our to ansure that
Jurisdictions should endeavour to ensure that
implementation of measures to contain and
eradicate G salaris

	All measures still relevant – no update required 2022
UK (England and Wales) progress on	<b>a</b> ) The UK is free from <i>Gyrodactylus salaris</i> .
Recommendation 1	Efforts continue to ensure in-river operations
	comply with biosecurity protocols and to
	encourage anglers and other water users to
	remain vigilant to the risk of non-native
	species and pathogens, to report sightings and
	to take biosecurity measures (e.g. the 'Check,
	Clean, Dry' campaign; see:
	http://www.nonnativespecies.org/checkcleandr
	y/index.cfm). The GB non-native species
	secretariat, with the support of partners, are
	also developing a Priority Angling Pathway
	plan to reduce the risk of anglers spreading
	invasive non-native species and pathogens, as
	required under the Invasive Alien Species
	Regulation 1143/2014. Further requirements
	under this Regulation and the Aquatic Animal
	Health (England and Wales) Regulations 2009
	include training Border Force personnel, poster
	campaigns at ports and other points of entry,
	warning anglers to carry out biosecurity and
	liaison with other Member States to prevent
	aquatic pathogens such as G. salaris entering UK.
	<b>b</b> ) The Aquatic Animal Health (England and
	Wales) Regulations require all fish farms to be
	authorized by the Competent Authority,
	maintain movement records of fish on to and
	from the farm, and operate under an approved
	biosecurity measures plan. Farms are subject to
	annual statutory compliance inspections when
	farm movement records are validated. There
	are controls on the keeping and release of non-
	native species through the Wildlife $\alpha$
	Louintryside Act (1981), Keeping and Introduction of Fish Deculations (2015) and
	Orders made under the Import of Live Fish A at
	(1080) (II EA) will be maintained and continue
	to be enforced. The II FA will provide for the
	screening where necessary of fish movements
	to prevent the spread of non-native fish and
	diseases
	are controls on the keeping and release of non- native species through the Wildlife & Countryside Act (1981), Keeping and Introduction of Fish Regulations (2015), and Orders made under the Import of Live Fish Act (1980) (ILFA) will be maintained and continue to be enforced. The ILFA will provide for the screening, where necessary, of fish movements to prevent the spread of non-native fish and diseases

c) A risk assessment on routes of introduct	ion
of G. salaris into England and Wales	
concluded that the risk of introduction from	1
processing imported fish was considered to	be
negligible. The majority of fish processed	n
the LIK is derived from the marine	
environment and thus presents no risk of	
introducing G salaris In addition fish	
processors are subject to strict controls in	
processors are subject to strict controls in relation to the safe disposal of processing	
relation to the safe disposal of processing	
wastes. $(1)$ The UK is free from $C$ to $1$ in Hermony	
<b>a</b> ) The UK is free from G. salaris Howev	er,
the use of physical barriers is considered as	a
means to prevent the spread of infection in	the
England and Wales G. salaris contingency	
plan.	
e) The UK is free from G. salaris However	er,
breaks in production, fallowing and	
disinfection regimes are considered as goo	1
practice in the development of fish farm	
biosecurity measures plans.	
f) The UK is free from G. salaris. The Eng	land
and Wales G. salaris contingency plan	
includes provisions for the prevention of	
movements of live fish in a G. salaris	
outbreak, and for measures to mitigate the	
further spread of the parasite.	
<b>g</b> ) G. salaris contingency plans continue to	be
developed and tested. An exercise in 2019	
highlighted the needed to improve	
communications in the event of an outbrea	ς,
and further refinements to the plan to addre	SS
these issues have been made. An exercise	vith
the Environment Agency was conducted in	
2022 to assess the resources required to	
undertake sampling across E&W to	
demonstrate freedom at catchment level free	om
Gs following detection. The communication	ns
plan is scheduled to be tested in 2022 or	
2023. The plan would be implemented	
immediately there was a suspicion or	
confirmation of the presence of G. salaris	n
UK waters. The UK has legislative	
mechanisms for the approval of biocidal	

	<ul> <li>containment and eradication measures in the event of a disease outbreak.</li> <li>h) The England and Wales <i>G. salaris</i> contingency plan includes a facility to draw experienced resources from other government agencies and from the devolved administrations in order to assist in the</li> </ul>
	implementation of measures to control a disease outbreak.
2. Cooperation on management	<ul> <li>a) The North-East Atlantic Commission (NEAC) should retain an item on <i>G. salaris</i> on the agendas for its annual meetings. This would facilitate reports by its Parties and their relevant jurisdictions and by the Working Group on measures to prevent the further spread of the parasite and to eradicate it in areas where it has been introduced and on other aspects of this 'Road Map'.</li> <li>b) The Working Group on <i>G. salaris</i> in the North-East Atlantic Commission Area should meet again in 2018 and then every 3 years thereafter, or more frequently if circumstances require, to provide a forum for more detailed information exchange and review of progress in implementing this 'Road Map'.</li> <li>c) Contingency plans developed by NEAC Parties and their relevant jurisdictions should be made available to the Working Group at its next meeting with the view to sharing information on approaches and challenges. The plans should be made available on the websites of the Competent Authorities with links to them from the NASCO website.</li> </ul>
UK (England and Wales) progress on	a) This is a Recommendation for the NEAC
Recommendation 2	<ul> <li>and therefore not applicable to the UK</li> <li>(England and Wales) progress report.</li> <li>b) This is a Recommendation for the Working</li> <li>Group and therefore not applicable to the UK</li> <li>(England and Wales) progress report.</li> <li>c) The UK (England and Wales) Contingency</li> <li>plans for <i>G. salaris</i> have yet to be approved by</li> <li>Defra Ministers and so are not yet available for</li> <li>publication.</li> </ul>

3. Monitoring methods for use in	The Working Group should review new
watercourses, lakes and in aquaculture.	developments with regard to monitoring for,
	and detection of, G. salaris, and develop
	recommendations for their inclusion in
	international guidelines.
UK (England and Wales) progress on	This is an action for the Working Group and
Recommendation 3	therefore not directly applicable for UK
	(England and Wales) to report against this
	Recommendation. However, experts from UK
	(England and Wales) (Cefas) contribute to the
	Working Group, and therefore to delivering
	this Recommendation. Research undertaken by
	Cefas into the detection of <i>G. salaris</i> in wild
	fish populations includes the development of a
	non-destructive testing method for sampling
	gyrodactylids on fish. This method is currently
	in use for surveillance of Atlantic salmon
	populations in England and Wales. Cetas
	researchers have engaged with the Norwegian
	authorities to validate the testing methodology
	in infected water catchments.
4. Distribution of G. salaris in the NEAC area	a) Existing monitoring programmes on
and adjacent areas.	salmonids in the wild and in aquaculture
	their relevant jurisdictions should be retained
	and expended as passes w. They should
	provide genetic data for all <i>Curadactulus</i>
	species isolated during monitoring Reports on
	these programmes should be provided to the
	Working Group at their pext meeting
	<b>b</b> ) Information should be requested from all
	NFAC Parties and their relevant jurisdictions
	which have wild Atlantic salmon but which
	have not participated in the Working Group to
	date
	c) NEAC Parties and their relevant
	iurisdictions should identify $G$ salaris as an
	impact factor in the NASCO river database for
	those rivers infected by the parasite.
	<b>d</b> ) The NASCO Secretariat should make a
	request to the OIE reference laboratory for G.
	salaris seeking information on the distribution
	of G. salaris in countries that have wild and/or
	farmed susceptible species, but which do not
	have wild Atlantic salmon.

UK (England and Wales) progress on	a) The Cefas fish health inspectorate (FHI)
Recommendation 4	carries out sampling of species susceptible to
	G. salaris to maintain skills and experience in
	relevant techniques. Due to the low number of
	salmon farms in England and Wales, samples
	are obtained from wild salmonid populations.
	This work is carried out in conjunction with
	the Environment Agency's area fisheries teams
	during their annual wild fish population
	surveys. The Cefas FHI carries out monitoring
	for G. salaris in England and Wales through a
	rolling programme of sampling covering all
	river catchment's which contain salmon.
	Within England and Wales, there are seventy-
	eight rivers that support salmon, although not
	all currently host large populations. Each of the
	catchments is sampled approximately every
	five years where possible. The fish sampled are
	usually parr, of up to 15 cm in length, and a
	total of 30 fish are sampled where possible.
	Generally, a sample of 30 salmon are taken,
	but where the numbers of salmon are too low
	to obtain this sample size, trout and grayling
	may be taken as a substitute. The Cefas
	Weymouth laboratory has evaluated a G.
	salaris-specific real-time PCR 5 assay
	developed by Marine Scotland Science. The
	assay has been validated so that samples can be
	pooled with loss of sensitivity. This has made
	screening large numbers of parasites that
	would need to be tested when undertaking
	forward and backward tracing during a disease
	outbreak, quicker and cheaper. The haplotype
	of any positive samples would be confirmed by
	amplification and sequence analysis of the COI
	gene.
	<b>b</b> ) Not applicable to UK (England and wales)
	Crown a) As C and arise has not have formal in
	Group. c) As G. salaris has not been found in
	inversion UN (England and wales), it is not specified as an impact factor in the NASCO
	specified as an impact factor in the NASCO
	The database for those rivers.
	<b>u</b> ) This is a Kecommendation to the NASCO
	Secretariat and therefore not applicable for this
	response by UK (England and Wales)

5. Research to inform the effective	a) The NEAC Parties and their relevant
management of G. salaris.	jurisdictions should conduct applied research
	to inform the effective management of G.
	salaris, particularly the following:
	- the distribution and genetics of <i>G. salaris</i> ;
	- the effects of salmon genetics on
	susceptibility to G. salaris;
	- the effect of environmental factors on
	pathogenicity;
	- to clarify the classification of <i>G. salaris</i> and
	<i>G. thymalli</i> and then develop a reliable method
	to distinguish between pathogenic and non-
	pathogenic strains;
	- general biology and mechanisms of spread of
	the parasite;
	- effect of environmental parameters and
	ecology on the distribution of G salaris;
	- detection and diagnostic methods for $G$ .
	salaris;
	- new environmentally mendly treatment
	aluminum and chloride
	aluminum and chiorde.
	b) The working Group should keep research
	review and report regularly to the NEAC
LIK (England and Wales) progress on	a) As the LIK is free from infection with G
Recommendation 5	<i>a)</i> As the OK is free from infection with O.
	influencing $G$ salaris is not easily conducted
	The main emphasis of research conducted at
	the Cefas Weymouth laboratory is the
	development of refined molecular diagnostics
	to differentiate between <i>Gyrodactylus</i> salaris,
	and Gyrodactylus thymalli. This research
	programme is ongoing. Molecular analysis of
	G. thymalli present in E&W will allow more
	accurate and quicker discrimination of
	parasites collected during surveillance in the
	event of an outbreak. G. thymalli samples are
	shared with the OIE reference laboratory.
	<b>b</b> ) This Recommendation is to the Working
	Group and therefore is not applicable to this
	UK (England and Wales) progress report.
6. Classification of <i>Gyrodactylus</i> species	NEAC Parties and their relevant jurisdictions
	should only support any future proposal to
	synonomise G. salaris and G. thymalli if, in
	parallel, OIE standards and national legislation

	recognize the different pathogenicity and host
	predilection of these two species.
UK (England and Wales) progress on	The UK supports this position. Research
Recommendation 6	conducted at Cefas is analysing the genome of
	G. salaris and G. thymalli in order to
	differentiate the two species and attempting to
	identify genetic markers that differentiate the
	two species which could be used as targets in
	PCR assays.
7. Publicity, education, and awareness	a) NEAC Parties and their relevant
	jurisdictions should develop publicity material
	on the threat of the parasite to wild Atlantic
	salmon and specify measures to prevent its
	spread; strategies for the effective
	dissemination of this material should be
	developed particularly with regard to targeting
	high risk groups. Existing material should be
	reviewed and updated as appropriate in the
	light of current knowledge. The NASCO
	Secretariat should develop standard text as a
	basis for such publicity material. b) This
	material should be made available on the web
	sites and promoted on the social media
	platforms of the Competent Authorities and
	NASCO with a view to highlighting the serious
	risks posed by the spread of the parasite.
UK (England and Wales) progress on	a) The Cefas Fish Health Inspectorate publish
Recommendation 7	information on <i>G. salaris</i> , fish farm
	biosecurity, fishery biosecurity and best
	practice for anglers both as hard copy material
	and through electronic means. Efforts continue
	to ensure in-river operations comply with
	biosecurity protocols and to encourage anglers
	and other water users to remain vigilant to the
	risk of nonnative species and pathogens, to
	report signtings and to take biosecurity
	measures (e.g. the Check, Clean, Dry
	campaign; see:
	http://www.nonnativespecies.org/checkcleandr
	y/more.cm). The OD non-native species
	also developing a Priority Angling Dathway
	also developing a Hority Aligning Fallway
	pran to reduce the fisk of anglets spreading
	required under the Invasive Alian Species
	Pegulation 11/3/2014 Eurther requirements
	Regulation 1145/2014. Further requirements

	<ul> <li>under this Regulation and under the Aquatic Animal Health (England and Wales)</li> <li>Regulations 2009 include training Border</li> <li>Force personnel, poster campaigns at ports</li> <li>warning anglers to carry out biosecurity and</li> <li>liaison with other Member States to prevent</li> <li>aquatic invasive species, such as <i>G. salaris</i></li> <li>entering UK. The last part of this sub-</li> <li>Recommendation is for the NASCO Secretariat</li> <li>and therefore not 7 applicable to this progress</li> <li>report.</li> <li>b) Information on biosecurity is published on</li> <li>the Cov UK wabsite, and on social media.</li> </ul>
	through the Fish Health Inspectorate Facebook page.
	No undate required (2022)
8. Continuity of current measures in the EU	Relevant NEAC Parties and their relevant
Animal Health Law	jurisdictions should seek to ensure continuity
	in the provisions related to G. salaris in current
	EU animal health legislation (Regulation
	2016/429) which should be retained, in
LIK (England and Wales) progress on	<i>G</i> salaris is not on the list of diseases subject
Recommendation 8	to control at EU level. Individual Member
	States that wish to seek freedom for this
	disease and place restrictions on trade in
	susceptible species from infected countries
	must do so using the National Measures
	provisions in Article 226 of EC Regulation
	2016/429. These are effectively the same as the
	current national measures that UK uses to
	Animal Health Regulations in order to
	maintain freedom from this disease throughout
	the UK
9. Criteria for diagnosis and establishing <i>G</i> .	NEAC Parties and their relevant jurisdictions
salaris-free zones	should implement the diagnostic standards in
	the OIE Manual of Diagnostic Tests for
	Aquatic Animals.
UK (England and Wales) progress on	UK (England and Wales) continues to apply
Recommendation 9	Use of aDNA methods recently published by
	the OIE for Gs
10. Trade in live susceptible fish species	a) Trade in disinfected eggs is preferable to
······································	trade in live susceptible fish species. However,

	where movements of live susceptible fish
	species are approved. NEAC Parties and their
	relevant jurisdictions should ensure that trade
	in live susceptible fish species only takes place
	between areas of equal G. salaris status or
	from a higher to lower status area
	<b>b</b> ) NEAC Parties and their relevant
	jurisdictions should ensure the health status of
	the traded live susceptible fish species and/or
	their eggs and the competence of the
	certifying Authority
LIK (England and Wales) progress on	a) At present the UK is recognised as being
Recommendation 10	free from $G$ salaris and as such the parasite is
	considered evotic to the country. The LIK is
	one of the few areas within the EU that is
	recognised free from the parasite along with
	the Republic of Ireland and two river
	catchments in Finland. Due to recognised
	freedom from <i>G</i> , salaris, under Council
	Directive 2006/88/EC Article 42 the United
	Kingdom is able to restrict imports of live
	salmonids to countries that have an equivalent
	health status i.e. demonstrated freedom from
	$C_{\rm explanis}$ and are approved as such by that
	G. salaris and are approved as such by that
	countries competent authority. The National
	controls implemented under the 8 Aquatic
	Animal Health (England and wales)
	Regulations 2009 mean that any suspicion of
	infection or mortality resulting from infection
	must be reported to the Fish Health
	Inspectorate. Failure to inform the FHI of any
	suspicion of G. salaris is an offence under the
	regulations.
	<b>b</b> ) The UK applies strict controls on the import
	of susceptible species of live fish and ova in
	order to protect the high aquatic animal health
	status. In addition to the requirement for health
	attestations for imports of live aquatic animals
	England and Wales also implements a post
	import disease surveillance programme for all
	imports of susceptible species.
11. Shared catchments	NEAC Parties and their relevant jurisdictions
	with shared catchments or having catchments
	in close proximity should implement
	appropriate mechanisms for cooperation,
	including the establishment and strengthening

	of inter-country working groups and the
	development of common contingency plans to
	control and eradicate G. salaris.
UK (England and Wales) progress on	UK (England and Wales) shares catchments
Recommendation 11	with UK (Scotland). There is a clear legal basis
	attributing statutory responsibilities across the
	two shared catchments with responsibility for
	the River Tweed catchment falling to Scottish
	Government, with the River Esk catchment
	being the responsibility of England. There is
	regular engagement between the Competent
	Authorities and the Official Services on
	aquatic animal health across the
	administrations, including participation in joint
	contingency exercises.
	All measures still relevant – no update required
	2022