



FINAL PROJECT REPORT EVALUATION FORM

<u>Project Number:</u> SARF 098	<u>Completion Date:</u> 18 December 2015
<u>Project Title:</u> PAMP Refreshment Study	
<p>1. In your view have the scientific objectives been achieved. If not, does this need to be addressed by SARF?</p> <p>Yes, the original project “call” set out four objectives. The report demonstrates that these have been ably achieved and against what proved to be a difficult set of background data. In addition, as the work moved on, further work was requested of the contractor by SARF and this has also been delivered ie the analysis of impacts at Reference Stations.</p> <p>There is ongoing further work looking at the significance of the conclusions for commercial crustacean species but the current absence of this does not devalue nor hamper the fitness of the conclusions reached in the final draft of 18 December 2015. Nor should it be an impediment to publication of the report as delivered.</p>	
<p>2. Comment on the overall results of the project, including their significance for SARF.</p> <p>The report contains significant conclusions for the salmon farming sector and for SEPA. The analysis it contains is involved and statistical but the broad conclusion that Slice use is impacting upon crustacean populations at a distance of several hundred metres from fish farms and that effects of this type are seen at almost all sites where Slice has been used are clear. As are the implications for the regulatory framework used to control emissions of Slice and provide environmental protection. There is a potential for an international perspective to the report as the product is used in a number of countries and may therefore have implications for the licensing or regulatory regimes there.</p> <p>No direct implications for SARF although the publication of the report and its significance does show SARF to be a body not afraid to deal with challenging issues and questions and as discussed, the report may well have international resonances which will reflect favourably upon SARF as the commissioning body.</p>	
<p>3. Is there a need for further work? If so, explain.</p> <p>Additional workstreams were a part of the management of the project during its completion and the final piece of that jigsaw is being completed by the contractor. The report does raise challenging questions about the licensing of biocides in the fish farming industry and it is possible that further work might be required around this area in the future. There is not an immediate requirement in connection with this specific workstream relating to Slice as the conclusions in the report are clear.</p>	
<p>Overall marking 2 results significantly above expectation</p> <p>A discussed above the nature of the data made analysis challenging and therefore for the contractor to be able to find a way through what is a messy dataset to the clear conclusions is indicative of very good work.</p>	
Signature	Print Name REF06
Date 05/02/2016	
Please indicate whether you wish to receive payment (Yes/No) No _____	

Additional Comments: