



IP(19)19

NASCO Implementation Plan for the period 2019-2024

EU – Spain (Galicia)

NASCO Implementation Plan for the period 2019 – 2024

The main purpose of this Implementation Plan is to demonstrate what actions are being taken by the Parties / jurisdictions to implement NASCO’s Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines.

*In completing this Implementation Plan please refer to the **Guidelines for the Preparation and Evaluation of NASCO Implementation Plans and for Reporting on Progress**, CNL(18)49.*

Questions in the Implementation Plan are drawn from the following documents:

- *NASCO Guidelines for Management of Salmon Fisheries, CNL(09)43 (referred to as the ‘Fisheries Guidelines’);*
- *Report of the Working Group on Stock Classification, CNL(16)11;*
- *Minimum Standard for Catch Statistics, CNL(93)51 (referred to as the ‘Minimum Standard’);*
- *Revised matrix for the application of the six tenets for effective management of an Atlantic salmon fishery, WGCST(16)16¹;*
- *NASCO Plan of Action for the Application of the Precautionary Approach to the Protection and Restoration of Atlantic Salmon Habitat, CNL(01)51;*
- *NASCO Guidelines for Protection, Restoration and Enhancement of Atlantic Salmon Habitat, CNL(10)51 (referred to as the ‘Habitat Guidelines’);*
- *Williamsburg Resolution, CNL(06)48;*
- *Guidance on Best Management Practices to address impacts of sea lice and escaped farmed salmon on wild salmon stocks (SLG(09)5) (referred to as the ‘BMP Guidance’);*
- *Guidelines for Incorporating Social and Economic Factors in Decisions under the Precautionary Approach (CNL(04)57); and*
- *Road Map’ to enhance information exchange and co-operation on monitoring, research and measures to prevent the spread of G. salaris and eradicate it if introduced’, NEA(18)08.*

Party:	European Union
Jurisdiction / Region:	Spain – Xunta de Galicia

¹ This document can be obtained from the NASCO Secretariat; email hq@nasco.int

1. Introduction		
1.1 What are the objectives for the management of wild salmon? (Max 200 words)		
<i>The general objective is to promote and protect diversity and abundance of wild salmon stocks, maintaining where possible recreational exploitation under sustainable guidelines.</i>		
1.2 What reference points (e.g. conservation limits, management targets or other measures of abundance) are used to assess the status of stocks? (Max 200 words) (Reference: Sections 2.4 and 2.5 of the Fisheries Guidelines)		
<i>CLs have not been set for any salmon river in Galicia. From a very preliminary experience in upper river Eo a deposition rate of 8,02eggs/m² in optimal areas was estimated as SMAX while SMSY was determined to be 3,86 eggs/m². The last corresponds to a recruitment of 1,2 ind/m² in terms of summer parr density(0+) related again exclusively to optimal areas. Anyhow it is believed that the reach studied was a very productive one and best parr densities found in other rivers are quite far from this value (though biomass values maybe comparable). A 0+ summer parr density of 0,9 ind/m² in optimal areas is considered to be a very good one in galician rivers.</i>		
1.3 What is the current status of stocks under the new classification system outlined in CNL(16)11?		
Stock Classification Score	Salmon Classification Category	No. rivers
0	Not at Risk	
1	Low Risk	
2	Moderate Risk	
3	High Risk	
N/A	Artificially Sustained	3
N/A	Lost	5
N/A	Unknown	14
Additional comments:		
1.4 How is stock diversity (e.g. genetics, age composition, run-timing, etc.) taken into account in the management of salmon stocks? (Max 200 words)		
<i>Salmon populations in Galicia are comprised mainly of 2SW fish as 3SW fish are now very scarce; grilse were never a big part of the population though presently play an important role in spawning grounds. Anyhow 1SW fish are misrepresented in catch data, due to the early closure of the season (by the end of july) as flows use to be very low in mid summer. There is no autumn run in Galician rivers. A late opening date for fishing to 1st of may intends to protect larger MSW fish in the rivers of galician government full responsibility. In Miño river (Spanish-Portuguese administration) the opening date is about February, while in river Eo reaches in which asturian authorities are involved it has been impossible to apply this measure but a few years.</i>		
<i>No special management measures are applied to mixed-stock fisheries (but see 2.4)</i>		
<i>Up to this time stocking has been made up exclusively of fish of galician origin, trying to avoid translocations from the Cantabrian basin to the Atlantic one or even from a river to another in each basin. Future restoration programmes may encounter difficulties as availability of fish is limited for some rivers.</i>		
1.5 To provide a baseline for future comparison, what is the current and potential quantity of salmon habitat? (Max 200 words) (Reference: Section 3.1 of the Habitat Guidelines)		
<i>Historical habitat comprised more than 5.300 km of salmon rivers and tributaries but today just about 1.100 km of them are available to migrants. The main loss had place in the Miño river system</i>		

where more than 3.000 km have been definitely lost due to hydroelectric development. The current area occupied by salmon is about 410 km, less than 40% of the present potential habitat and about 8% of the historical one.

Restriction of populations to the lowermost parts of rivers means that the quality of habitat is not the best for the species in terms of water quality and water temperature.

1.6 What is the current extent of freshwater and marine salmonid aquaculture?

Number of marine farms	1 (experimental design)
------------------------	-------------------------

Marine production (tonnes)	50-100?
----------------------------	---------

Number of freshwater facilities	25
---------------------------------	----

Freshwater production (tonnes)	unknown
--------------------------------	---------

Append one or more maps showing the location of aquaculture facilities and aquaculture free zones in rivers and the sea.

1.7 Please describe the process used to consult NGOs and other stakeholders and industries in the development of this Implementation Plan. (Max 200 words)

None.

2. Management of Salmon Fisheries:

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 at least one action related to their management.

2.1 What are the objectives for the management of the fisheries for wild salmon? (Max. 200 words)

There are no commercial fisheries for salmon in galician waters -neither in the sea nor in freshwater- but in the Miño estuary, a joint responsibility of the governments of Spain and Portugal. Sport fisheries are severely restricted and the general aim is to preserve them where possible avoiding risks for salmon populations.

**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 levels at which regulations are triggered)? (Max. 200 words)
(This can be answered by providing a flow diagram if this is available.)
(Reference: Sections 2.1 and 2.7 of the Fisheries Guidelines)**

A TAC for each river is established prior to fishing season on the basis of the abundance information available of previous years (fish traps, counters, catches, parr densities and stocking).

**2.3 (a) Are any 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? (Max 200 words)
(Reference: Section 2.7 of the Fisheries Guidelines)**

(a) Angling for salmon is allowed just in 6 rivers; 5 of them would be clearly under any reference point that could be fixed but stocking practices are intense in most of them and the TAC is really low (just 5 fish in some rivers). Say fishing is allowed in these rivers only for the maintenance of the interest of people in the species and a certain level of protection for its habitat.

The case of river Miño is quite different as there is neither a real control of net catches nor a true knowledge of the stock. Stocking is intense in some of its galician tributaries and is supposed to play an important role on commercial catches but again there is a severe lack of information on this fishery and the salmon stock.

	(b)
	(c)
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? (Max. 300 words in total) <i>(Reference: Section 2.8 of the Fisheries Guidelines)</i>
	<i>(a) There are not truly mixed- stock fisheries in Galicia. The only one that could be considered to be so is the one operated in Miño river by nets, were an unknown proportion of fish from tributaries – which are managed by the regional government on a very strict basis- are caught in the main river fishery, managed by the government of Spain together with that of Portugal.</i>
	(b)
	<i>(c) Official catch for the last five years in river Miño was 12 salmon in average (just including data from Spain). It is known that unreported catches in nets may be very high in this fishery.</i>
	<i>(d)No conservation objectives have been adopted for this river. Stocking with fish of local origin is intense in spanish tributaries, whilst fishing for salmon is not allowed, but parr densities remain low.</i>
2.5	How are socio-economic factors taken into account in making decisions on management of salmon fisheries? (Max. 200 words) <i>(Reference: Section 2.9 of the Fisheries Guidelines)</i>
	<i>Fishermen and other stakeholders are heard in a “General Fishing Committee” meeting (there are four “Province Committees” too, prior to the general one) which takes place each year prior to the proposal of the yearly fishing regulations. Any relevant action on fish populations is stated and debated in these committees.</i>
2.6	What is the current level of unreported catch and what measures are being taken to reduce this? (Max. 200 words) <i>(Reference: Section 2.2 of the Fisheries Guidelines and the Minimum Standard)</i>
	<i>The level of unreported catches is unknown. In the Miño fishery declaration of catches is not mandatory and it is believed that the number of unreported salmon fished by nets may exceed largely the declared catch. In the rest of salmon rivers the unreported catch consists mainly in a few illegal fish and some by-catches in coastal waters not easy to evaluate as are in theory discarded -retention of salmonid fishes is illegal out of riverine waters- and even those fish may be misclassified as sea-trout or even trout. In relation to running waters poaching is believed to exist in every river in a bigger or smaller extent and with the exception of river Eo -were controls are intensive- or maybe river Ulla, the unreported (illegal) catch may equal the declared one, as the total allowed catch is small in most of the rest of the rivers. Sea-trout fisheries in salmon areas are a permanent source of conflict where/when fishing for salmon is banned.</i>
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? (Max. 200 words) <i>(Reference: Six Tenets for Effective Management of an Atlantic Salmon Fishery, WGCST(16)16)</i>

(a) <i>Yes</i>	
(b) <i>None</i>	
(c) <i>Unknown</i>	
2.8 Identify the threats to wild salmon and challenges for management associated with their exploitation in fisheries, including bycatch of salmon in fisheries targeting other species.	
Threat / challenge F1	<i>Development of CLs for galician rivers and better management criteria for fisheries.</i>
Threat / challenge F2	<i>Most facts on the salmon population of river Miño -and its relation with those of the tributaries- are still unknown and seems that there is no rationale for the management or control of present estuarine fisheries.</i>
Threat / challenge F3	<i>Sea-trout or even trout fisheries are in continued conflict with the conservation of salmon specially in rivers where the species is in poorer status.</i>
Threat / challenge F4	<i>Weakening of some populations is leading to the isolation of the southernmost populations (those in the Atlantic basin) from the Cantabrian ones which are into contact with those of asturian rivers.</i>

Copy and paste lines to add further challenges which should be labelled F5, F6, etc.

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 F1:	Description of action:	<i>Stocking with parr of local origin tributaries in Portugal and Spain presently not used by salmon.</i>
	Planned timescale (include milestones where appropriate):	<i>2019-2024</i>
	Expected outcome:	<i>Reinforcement and improvement of the Miño river stock</i>
	Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement:	<i>40.000 parr stocked in new tributaries.</i>
	Funding secured for both action and monitoring programme?	<i>Yes</i>
Action F2:	Description of action:	
	Planned timescale (include milestones where appropriate):	
	Expected outcome:	
	Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement:	

	Funding secured for both action and monitoring programme?	Choose an item.
Action F3:	Description of action:	
	Planned timescale (include milestones where appropriate):	
	Expected outcome:	
	Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement:	
	Funding secured for both action and monitoring programme?	Choose an item.
Action F4:	Description of action:	
	Planned timescale (include milestones where appropriate):	
	Expected outcome:	
	Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement:	
	Funding secured for both action and monitoring programme?	Choose an item.

Copy and paste lines to add further actions which should be labelled F5, F6, etc.

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? (Max. 200 words) (Reference: Section 3 of the Habitat Guidelines) <i>Parr surveys are carried out every summer for the main salmon rivers, showing productivity trends and changes in different reaches. There is as well a “general inventory of (juvenile)salmon habitat” which allows comparisons between reaches but also provides the reference baseline for evaluating the effects of any potential pressure on salmon habitat.</i>
3.2 How are socio-economic factors taken into account in making decisions on salmon habitat management? (Max. 200 words) (Reference: Section 3.9 of the Habitat Guidelines) <i>See 2.5 but river habitat management is a responsibility of water authorities, which operate under</i>

the guidelines of the WFD. Besides most salmon rivers in Galicia are (or will be) included in Natura 2000 network. All of these facts impose a strong public participation in any decision 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? (Max. 200 words each) <i>(Reference: Section 3.2 of the Habitat Guidelines)</i>	
(a)	
(b)	
3.4 Identify the main threats to wild salmon and challenges for management in relation to estuarine and freshwater habitat.	
Threat / challenge H1	<i>Temperature can be critical in rivers from this southernmost range for the species and this will be worse in the future as a result of climate change.</i>
Threat / challenge H2	<i>Quality of water is far away from the “good status” in some reaches of salmon rivers in Galicia.</i>
Threat / challenge H3	<i>Water diversion is a critical problem in some rivers reducing availability of habitat as well as bringing out problems of accessibility.</i>
Threat / challenge H4	<i>Populations are usually restricted to the lowermost reaches of rivers because of artificial obstacles, with limited or no access to cooler waters of good quality where the best spawning grounds or rearing habitat are located.</i>

Copy and paste lines to add further threats/challenges which should be labelled H5, H6, etc.

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 H1:	Description of action:	<i>Design and testing of new passage facilities for some tributaries of the Miño river.</i>
	Planned timescale (include milestones where appropriate):	<i>2019-2024</i>
	Expected outcome:	<i>Improvement of connectivity and accessibility in the Miño system.</i>
	Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement:	<i>Installation of 2 new devices in Galician or Portuguese tributaries.</i>
	Funding secured for both action and monitoring programme?	<i>Yes</i>
Action H2:	Description of action:	<i>Permeabilization or demolition of barriers in the Miño system</i>
	Planned timescale	

	(include milestones where appropriate):	2019-2024
	Expected outcome:	<i>Improvement of connectivity and accessibility in the Miño system.</i>
	Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement:	<i>Permeabilization or demolition of 8 barriers in Galician or Portuguese tributaries.</i>
	Funding secured for both action and monitoring programme?	Yes
Action H3:	Description of action:	
	Planned timescale (include milestones where appropriate):	
	Expected outcome:	
	Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement:	
	Funding secured for both action and monitoring programme?	Choose an item.
Action H4:	Description of action:	
	Planned timescale (include milestones where appropriate):	
	Expected outcome:	
	Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement:	
	Funding secured for both action and monitoring programme?	Choose an item.

Copy and paste lines to add further actions which should be labelled H5, H6, etc

4. Management of Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers, and Transgenics:
--

<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"> • <i>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;</i> • <i>100% farmed fish to be retained in all production facilities.</i> <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>	
<p>4.1</p>	<p>(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? (Max. 200 words for each) (Reference: BMP Guidance)</p>
	(a) <i>No information available.</i>
	(b)
<p>4.2</p>	<p>(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? (Max. 200 words each) (Reference: BMP Guidance)</p> <p><i>The measures by which these goals may be achieved, and against which the Review Group will be measuring the effectiveness of the Implementation Plan, are set out in the BMP Guidance SLG(09)5 (Best management practice; reporting and tracking; factors facilitating implementation) as agreed by NASCO and ISFA.</i></p>
	(a) <i>No information available.</i>
	(b)
	(c)
<p>4.3</p>	<p>(a) What quantifiable progress can be demonstrated towards the achievement of the international goals for achieving 100% containment in all (i) freshwater and (ii) marine aquaculture production facilities? (b) How is this progress monitored, including monitoring of wild fish (genetic introgression) and proportion of escaped farmed salmon in the spawning populations? (c) If progress cannot be demonstrated, what additional measures (e.g. use of sterile salmon in fish farming) are proposed and in what timescale? (Max. 200 words each) (Reference: BMP Guidance)</p> <p><i>The measures by which these goals may be achieved, and against which the Review Group will be measuring the effectiveness of the Implementation Plan, are set out in the BMP Guidance SLG(09)5 (Best management practice; reporting and tracking; factors facilitating implementation) as agreed by NASCO and ISFA.</i></p>
	(a)(i) <i>Regional authorities operate only with fish of local origin for stocking.</i>
	(a)(ii) <i>No information available from the only (experimental) salmon farm in Galician waters.</i>

(b)	
(c)	
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? (Max 200 words) (Reference: BMP Guidance and Article 11 of the Williamsburg Resolution)
	No information available
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? (Max. 200 words for each)
	(a) There are no general restrictions for this use; each case is evaluated individually. At the moment there are no salmon aquaculture facilities in freshwater in Galicia other than those (two) property of the regional government, devoted to stocking with fish of local origin.
	(b) No information available.
4.6	What progress has been made to implement NASCO’s guidance on introductions, transfers and stocking? (Max. 200 words) (Reference: Articles 5 and 6 and Annex 4 of the Williamsburg Resolution)
	Regional authorities operate only with fish of local origin for stocking. No information available from the only (experimental) salmon farm in Galician waters.
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? (Max. 200 words each) (Reference: Guidelines for incorporating social and economic factors in decisions under the Precautionary Approach and Annex 4 of the Williamsburg Resolution)
	(a) No.
	(b) No.
4.8	What is the policy / strategy on use of transgenic salmon? (Max. 200 words) (Reference: Article 7 and Annex 5 of the Williamsburg Resolution)
	Regional authorities operate only with fish of local origin for stocking. No information available from the only (experimental) salmon farm in Galician waters.
4.9	For Members of the North-East Atlantic Commission only: 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? (Max. 200 words) (Reference ‘Road Map’ to enhance information exchange and co-operation on monitoring, research and measures to prevent the spread of <i>G. salaris</i> and eradicate it if introduced, NEA(18)08)
4.10	Identify the main threats to wild salmon and challenges for management in relation to aquaculture, introductions and transfers, and transgenics.
Threat /	

Challenge A1	
Threat / challenge A2	
Threat / challenge A3	
Threat / challenge A4	

Copy and paste lines to add further threats/challenges which should be labelled A5, A6, etc.

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 A1:	Description of action:	<i>No information available.</i>
	Planned timescale (include milestones where appropriate):	
	Expected outcome:	
	Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement:	
	Funding secured for both action and monitoring programme?	Choose an item.
Action A2:	Description of action:	
	Planned timescale (include milestones where appropriate):	
	Expected outcome:	
	Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement:	
	Funding secured for both action and monitoring programme?	Choose an item.
Action A3:	Description of action:	
	Planned timescale (include milestones where appropriate):	
	Expected outcome:	
	Approach for monitoring effectiveness &	

	enforcement:	
	Funding secured for both action and monitoring programme?	Choose an item.
Action A4:	Description of action:	
	Planned timescale (include milestones where appropriate):	
	Expected outcome:	
	Approach for monitoring effectiveness & enforcement:	
	Funding secured for both action and monitoring programme?	Choose an item.

Copy and paste lines to add further actions which should be labelled A5, A6, etc