

	<p>Council</p> <p><i>Sixth 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)</i></p>	<p>CNL(24)17</p> <p>Agenda item: 7b)</p>
---	---	---

Sixth 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

20, 21 and 23 November 2023

Note: *This Report covers the work of the Review Group at its November 2023 meeting only. It does not repeat background information included in previous Interim Reports:*

- *the Interim Report of the Review Group, [CNL\(19\)14](#);*
- *the Second Interim Report of the Review, [CNL\(20\)17](#);*
- *the Third Interim Report of the Review Group, [CNL\(21\)07](#);*
- *the Fourth Interim Report of the Review Group, [CNL\(22\)15](#); and*
- *the Fifth Interim Report of the Review Group, [CNL\(23\)21](#).*

1. Opening of the Meeting

- 1.1 The Chair, Cathal Gallagher (European Union), opened the meeting.
- 1.2 The Chair informed the Group that since their meeting in November 2022, there had been no change to the Implementation Plan process. The overall task to review and evaluate the revised Implementation Plans (IPs) remained the same. The areas of assessment and guidance also remained the same, as detailed in document [CNL\(22\)15](#), section 1. The Chair noted that during this Meeting, only revised sections of the resubmitted IPs would be considered. For all unrevised sections, the IP Review Group’s previous assessment would stand.
- 1.3 The Chair reminded the members of the Review Group that they had been appointed specifically to represent NASCO and not their Party / jurisdiction or organization. He also reminded them that they would not be included in any review relating to their home jurisdiction. He noted that the Secretary’s role was to co-ordinate the work and she would not serve as a reviewer.
- 1.4 A list of participants is contained in Annex 1.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

- 2.1 The Review Group adopted its Agenda, IP(23)09 (Annex 2).

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

- 3.1 The Review Group noted that it continued to work to the Terms of Reference and Working Methods detailed in document [CNL\(22\)15](#), section 3.

4. Evaluation of the Implementation Plans

4.1 Parties / jurisdictions were asked to submit their revised Implementation Plans by 1 November 2023 for re-assessment.

4.2 The following six Implementation Plans were received and reviewed.

Party / jurisdiction	Document number	Date received
European Union		
Portugal	IP(19)06rev3	27/10/2023
Spain (Asturias)	IP(19)20rev4	29/03/2023
Spain (Cantabria)	IP(19)22rev3	29/03/2023
Spain (Galicia)	IP(19)19rev3	29/03/2023
Spain (Gipuzkoa)	IP(20)04rev2	29/03/2023
Norway	IP(19)18rev5	31/10/2023

4.3 The interpretation of assessments made by the Review Group remained the same as in 2021 and 2022. This is detailed in paragraphs 4.3 – 4.5 in [CNL\(22\)15](#).

Overview of Evaluations

4.4 The Review Group welcomed and appreciated the continued effort by the Parties / jurisdictions to revise and update Implementation Plans. However, it would like to remind Parties / jurisdictions that, to be in line with the ‘Guidelines for the Preparation and Evaluation of NASCO Implementation Plans and for Reporting on Progress’, [CNL\(18\)49](#), sections deemed satisfactory in any review do not need to be updated unless there is significant / new information to report. CNL(18)49 states, ‘In subsequent years, Parties / jurisdictions may wish to modify their Implementation Plans if circumstances change significantly’.

4.5 *European Union – Portugal*

EU – Portugal revised some answers in Sections 1 and 2 in response to the Review Group’s previous review in 2021. It added two new actions, Action H3 and Action H4. No related threats / challenges H3 and H4 were added. The Review Group welcomed these updates and the changes to salmon management in EU – Portugal that the new actions, in particular, may support the future conservation of salmon. Given this, the Review Group considered that some work will need to be done to enable the two new actions to be considered as satisfactory and has provided feedback on this to EU – Portugal. Additionally, the Review Group noted EU – Portugal’s response to question 1.6, relating to its experimental marine farm, that stated, ‘The project has not yet passed the implementation stage and has suffered serious delays which the pandemic has aggravated, so we have no data.’ The Group sought to understand when the experimental marine farm might be up and running. Therefore, after this round of the review, EU – Portugal has seven sections in its IP that still require further work and four sections which are considered satisfactory by the Review Group.

4.6 *European Union – Spain (Asturias)*

EU – Spain (Asturias) revised some answers in Section 4 in response to the Review Group’s previous review in 2021 and the sole action in section 4.11 of the IP on the Management of Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers, and Transgenics. The Review Group welcomed the continued effort to revise and update EU – Spain (Asturias)’s Implementation Plan. Therefore, after this round of the review, EU – Spain

(Asturias) has one section in its IP that still requires further work and ten sections which are considered satisfactory by the Review Group.

4.7 *European Union – Spain (Cantabria)*

EU – Spain (Cantabria) revised some answers in Section 4 in response to the Review Group’s previous review in 2021. The Review Group welcomed the continued effort to revise and update EU – Spain (Cantabria)’s Implementation Plan. Therefore, after this round of the review, EU – Spain (Cantabria) has two sections in its IP that still require some further work and nine sections which are considered satisfactory by the Review Group.

4.8 *European Union – Spain (Galicia)*

EU – Spain (Galicia) revised some answers in all four sections in response to the Review Group’s previous review in 2021. It added five new actions, Action F1, Action F2, Action F5, Action H3 and Action H4. There is no new threat / challenge F5. The Review Group welcomed the extensive updates and the changes in all sections of EU – Spain (Galicia)’s IP, including the five new actions, four of which were considered to move EU – Spain (Galicia) towards the achievement of NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. The Review Group is hopeful that this revised IP will improve the conservation status of salmon in this jurisdiction. Therefore, after this round of the review, EU – Spain (Galicia) has eight sections in its IP that still require further work and three sections which are considered satisfactory by the Review Group.

4.9 *European Union – Spain (Gipuzkoa)*

EU – Spain (Gipuzkoa) revised some text in Action F2 in response to the Review Group’s previous review in 2021. The Review Group welcomed the update to Action F2 which, following the review, has been deemed to be satisfactory. Therefore, after this round of the review, all sections of EU – Spain (Gipuzkoa)’s IP are considered satisfactory by the Review Group.

4.10 *Norway*

Norway revised some answers in Section 4 in response to the Review Group’s last review, in 2022, and added some text to Action A1-2 section 4.11 of the IP on the Management of Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers, and Transgenics. The Review Group welcomed the continued effort to revise and update Norway’s Implementation Plan, especially with the provision of the results of some long-term monitoring. However, after this round of review, Norway’s IP still has four sections that require further work and seven sections which are considered satisfactory by the Review Group.

4.11 The Review Group agreed to provide feedback to Parties / jurisdiction in a similar format as in 2021, [CNL\(22\)15](#), section 4, using the template developed by the Secretariat (CNL40.2181, Annex 3). The summary table / infographic of all IPs including the outcome of the latest evaluation of each section / area of each Implementation Plan is presented in Annex 4.

4.12 Of the six IPs evaluated, the Review Group considered that one was satisfactory in each section / area. This is:

Party / jurisdiction	Document number
European Union	
<i>Spain (Gipuzkoa)</i>	CNL(23)92

5. Development of Feedback to the Parties / jurisdictions

5.1 The six reviews each comprise a summary sheet and the detailed evaluation. The Review Group agreed that, as in 2020, 2021 and 2022, the full reviews should be published on the NASCO website, in the interests of transparency.

5.2 The Review Group again noted the procedure set out in the Enhanced Guidance, [CNL\(20\)55](#), in providing feedback to the Parties / jurisdictions.

'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, which are essential for ensuring that the objectives of the NASCO Convention to conserve, restore, enhance and rationally manage Atlantic salmon can be met, and enquire about their plans to make and report on progress towards that aim.'

6. Arrangements for Presenting the Group's Report to the Council

6.1 The Review Group agreed that the Chair would present its report to the Council during the Special Session at the 2024 Annual Meeting.

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 and closed the meeting.

List of Participants

Cathal Gallagher	Inland Fisheries Ireland (Chair)
Livia Goodbrand	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Daniel Kircheis	NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, USA
Michael Millane	Inland Fisheries Ireland
Steve Sutton	Atlantic Salmon Federation, Canada
Lawrence Talks	Environment Agency, UK
Emma Hatfield	NASCO Secretary
Apologies received from:	
Nils Olav Gjonne	Norske Lakseelver, Norway
Katrine Kærgaard	Ministry of Fisheries, Hunting and Agriculture, Greenland

IP(23)09

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

By Video Conference

20, 21 & 23 November 2023

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 Council
7. Report of the Meeting
8. Other Business
9. Close of the Meeting

Evaluation in 2023 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 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:

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 (<i>delete as appropriate</i>)	

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>)	

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>)	

<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?		
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

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, 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			
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							<i>Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory (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:

		threat / challenge?		clearly in the action?	the reason and proposed non-quantitative alternative for monitoring progress acceptable?	the achievement of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines?	satisfactory or unsatisfactory overall?	changed as requested by IP RG?
H1								
H2								
H3								
H4								
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 / Unsatisfactory (<i>delete as appropriate</i>)	

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

4.11 What SMART actions are planned during the period covered by this Implementation Plan (2019 – 2024) to address each of the threats and challenges identified in section 4.10 to implement NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines and demonstrate progress towards achievement of its goals and objectives for aquaculture, introductions and transfers, and transgenics?								
#	Action in IP Template	Is the action clearly related to stated threat / challenge?	Is it 'SMART'? (yes / no)	If 'no', which descriptor needs to be reflected more clearly in the action?	If the proposed monitoring is qualitative (as allowed in the Guidelines), is the reason and proposed non-quantitative alternative for monitoring progress acceptable?	Does the action move the Party / jurisdiction clearly towards the achievement of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines?	Given the previous question, is the action considered satisfactory or unsatisfactory overall?	Comments relating to previous review round: changed as requested by IP RG?
A1								
A2								
A3								
A4								

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>)

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? (<i>please state below</i>)

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

Review Infographic for all Implementation Plans as of November 2023

	Key										
	Section / area 'satisfactory'										
	50 Section / area partly 'satisfactory'; % satisfactory denoted										
	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				59						33	33
DFG - Faroe Islands			50	33					Not applicable	50	50
DFG - Greenland											
EU - Denmark		86		82							
EU - France		93		59				67			
EU - Finland											
EU - Germany											
EU - Ireland				59						33	
EU - Portugal*	57	50	50	76				67			
EU - Spain (Asturias)*				82							
EU - Spain (Cantabria)*				94							67
EU - Spain (Galicia)*	71	86	50	82					75		67
EU - Spain (Gipuzkoa)*											
EU - Spain (Navarra)											
EU - Sweden				94				90			
Norway*				65					50	86	67
Russian Federation				83					50		
UK - England and Wales											
UK - Northern Ireland				89						83	67
UK - Scotland				56						80	33
United States				88						75	67

* revised and reviewed in November 2023