

IP(21)12_EU – Spain (Galicia)

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

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 – Spain (Galicia) for revising and submitting its Implementation Plan following previous evaluations from the Review Group. 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 – Spain (Galicia)’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 – Spain (Galicia)	71	50	25	35				50			67

The Review Group considered that EU – Spain (Galicia)’s revised Implementation Plan requires further work to achieve a satisfactory rating across all sections / areas of the Plan.

Positive Feedback from the Review Group: the Review Group noted the effort that EU – Spain (Galicia) has put into improving its Implementation Plan.

Questions on Salmon Management: clear improvements are still required in several responses to the questions on salmon management to enable each of these sections to be considered as satisfactory. In its re-assessment, the Review Group considered that the revised responses to the following questions were satisfactory: 2.4, 2.7, .4.1 and 4.2. The Review Group has provided detailed feedback to each response that was considered to be unsatisfactory.

Threats / Challenges to Wild Salmon: the Review Group considered that there should be threats and / or challenges to the management of wild Atlantic salmon provided in relation to the theme area of ‘Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers, and Transgenics’. This section was, therefore, considered to be unsatisfactory.

SMART Actions: in the area ‘Management of Salmon Fisheries’ the section was considered as unsatisfactory because there are four threats identified but only two actions are included. 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’*. Each action should, therefore, be related to a specific threat / challenge. In the area ‘Habitat Protection and Restoration’, although the Review Group considered the actions to be satisfactory, as with the area ‘Management of Salmon Fisheries’, each threat / challenge needs an accompanying action. The actions as identified do not, therefore, align with the threats / challenges identified in the Implementation Plan. In the area ‘Aquaculture, Disease, Transfers & Transgenics’ there were no actions and the Review Group felt that consideration should be given to a threat / challenge related to the potential impact of the freshwater stocking programme on wild salmon stocks and an associated action.

Mandatory Actions: the Review Group considered that there should be action related to the freshwater stocking programme present in EU – Spain (Galicia). This section was, therefore, considered to be unsatisfactory.

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

Evaluation in 2021 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 has 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: European Union Jurisdiction/Region: Spain (Galicia)

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	The Review Group recommended the development of a joint Spanish – Portuguese management plan for the Miño River.	No
1.2	What reference points (e.g. conservation limits, management targets or other measures of abundance) are used to assess the status of stocks?	2	Whilst parr are monitored it would be necessary to see the development of reference points e.g. Conservation Limits to meet NASCO’s Guidelines for the Management of Salmon Fisheries, CNL(09)43 – see sections 2.4 and 2.5.	No
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		Yes
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		Yes
1.7	Please describe the process used to consult NGOs and other stakeholders and industries in the development of this Implementation Plan.	2	An IP should be prepared in consultation with NGOs and other relevant stakeholders and industries (reference the Guidelines document CNL(18)49).	No
Overall score by Review Group for 1. Introduction			Unsatisfactory	

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	The Review Group noted that the high level objective requested in the previous review has not been provided.	No
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		Text expanded
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	It is still unclear what measures are in place to rebuild wild self-sustaining salmon stocks with the fishery being dependant on stocking.	No
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		Yes
2.5	How are socio-economic factors taken into account in making decisions on management of salmon fisheries?	2	In the response the question 2.3, information is provided that suggests socio-economic considerations influence management decisions. Some consideration about how those pressures are balanced in light of section 2.9 of NASCO's Fisheries Management Guidelines CNL(09)43 should be provided here.	No clear additional information provided
2.6	What is the current level of unreported catch and what measures are being taken to reduce this?	2	The Review Group required clarity on the level of unreported catch and what measures will be taken to reduce the current level of unreported catch.	No
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		Yes

Overall score by Review Group for 2. Management of Salmon Fisheries	Unsatisfactory
--	-----------------------

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?	2	How the risks to productive capacity are identified are still not addressed in the response to this question.	No
3.2	How are socio-economic factors taken into account in making decisions on salmon habitat management?	2	The answer describes the consultation process but not how the information resulting from these consultations, and other socio-economic factors, are taken into consideration during decision making on salmon habitat management (see section 3.9 of the Habitat Guidelines (CNL(10)51).	No
3.3	What management measures are planned to protect wild Atlantic salmon and its habitats from (a) climate change and (b) invasive aquatic species?	a) 1 b) 2	b) little new information is provided on what management measures are planned to protect salmon from invasive aquatic species.	No
Overall score by Review Group for 3. Protection and Restoration of Salmon Habitat			Unsatisfactory	

4. Management of Aquaculture, Introductions and Transfers and Transgenics			
<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>			
<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. 			
<i>In this section please provide information on all types of aquaculture, introductions and transfers, and transgenics (including freshwater hatcheries, smolt-rearing etc.</i>			
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	Yes. The Review Group noted the update on the status of the experimental fish farm and agreed that no threat was therefore needed in section 4.10.
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	Each answer should be self-contained and not rely on any other section of the IP for explanation.
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?	2	The Review Group seeks further clarification on infrastructure to prevent escapes from freshwater hatcheries. Additionally, each answer should be self-contained and not rely on any other section of the IP for explanation.
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?	2	The Review Group seeks to understand why 'no information available' is given as an answer. An experimental facility is alluded to that could impact wild salmon stocks so the Review Group considered that these questions should be answered.

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?	(a)1 (b)2	Please provide an answer for (b) The Review Group recommended that a risk-based site selection is developed as outlined in SLG(09)5.	No
4.6	What progress has been made to implement NASCO's guidance on introductions, transfers and stocking?	2	Whilst fish of local origin are used for the stocking programme, it is unclear what measures are in place to ensure that the stocking programme is for conservation purposes (class III rivers). Consideration should be given to the Williamsburg Resolution, CNL(06)48.	No
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?	2	The Review Group noted that the answers do not demonstrate a precautionary approach. Are there measures in place to differentiate stocked fish from wild fish and to protect wild stocks? While the questions are answered it is not clear that consideration has been given to the Williamsburg Resolution, CNL(06)48.	No
4.8	What is the policy / strategy on use of transgenic salmon?	2	The Review Group seeks clarification on whether EU Policy is followed in relation to this.	No
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	<i>G. salaris</i> is potentially a threat to all wild Atlantic salmon stocks. The Review Group recommended that consideration be given to the development of a plan in line with the 11 recommendations contained in the Road Map.	No
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		
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		Threats concerning the potential impact of the stocking programme on wild salmon stocks could be outlined.	No

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			Unsatisfactory

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?
F3	Progressive limitation of “conflictive” sea-trout fisheries (14 rivers), closing the season together for both species	Yes	Yes. The Review Group requested that the ‘funding secured’ section is answered.			Yes The Review Group considered that it moves towards CNL(9)43, section 2.7 on management actions to control harvest.	Satisfactory	The Review Group expected to see that resources are available for both of these actions.
F4	Stocking Miño’s tributaries in Portugal and Spain presently not used by salmon with parr of local origin (river Tea).	Yes	Yes. The Review Group requested that the ‘funding			Yes. However, the Review Group considered that this relates more to the Williamsburg	Satisfactory	

			secured' section is answered.			Resolution, CNL(06)48, than the Fisheries Guidelines, CNL(09)43.		
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 There are four threats identified but only two actions are included.	

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	Design and testing of new passage facilities for some tributaries of the Miño river.	No	Yes. The Review Group has re-evaluated this action and agrees it is connected to several threats.			Yes. The Review Group considered that it moves towards CNL(10)51, section 2, on salmon habitat requirements	Satisfactory	No
H2	Permeabilization or demolition of barriers in the Miño system	No	Yes. The Review Group has re-evaluated this action			Yes. The Review Group considered that it moves towards CNL(10)51, section	Satisfactory	No

			and agrees it is connected to several threats.			2, on salmon habitat requirements		
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 However, each threat needs an action. The actions as identified do not align with the threat identified above.	

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	None outlined							
A2								
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							Unsatisfactory No actions outlined. Consideration should be given to a threat / challenge related to the freshwater stocking programme and an associated action.	

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.	No	Not applicable
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.	Yes	No action is outlined.
Overall score by Review Group for Mandatory Actions		Unsatisfactory

Positive Feedback

<p>Are there any aspects of the IP, <i>in particular</i>, that move the Party / jurisdiction clearly towards the achievement of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines? (<i>please state below</i>)</p>
<p>The Review Group considered that the following actions, in particular, move EU – Spain (Galicia) clearly towards the achievement of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management of Salmon Fisheries: F3 and F4; • Protection, Restoration and Enhancement of Atlantic Salmon Habitat: H1 and H2. <p>In Galicia, new fish passage facilities are being tested to improve connectivity and accessibility allowing salmon to reach upper river reaches. Improvement of fish passage at barriers and removal of barriers is also being undertaken.</p>

<p>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>)</p>
<p></p>

