

IP(23)12_EU – Spain (Galicia)

November 2023 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 2023, 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	86	50	82					75		67

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

Positive Feedback from the Review Group: the Review Group welcomed the considerable improvement to EU – Spain (Galicia)'s Implementation Plan across several sections / areas of the Plan with its revisions in 2023 and acknowledged the effort taken to do this.

Questions on Salmon Management: clear improvements are still required in some responses to the questions on salmon management to enable each of these sections to be considered as satisfactory. However, in its 2023 assessment, the Review Group considered that the revised responses to the following questions were satisfactory: 2.3 (a) & (b); 2.5; 3.3 (b); 4.3 (a)(ii), (b) & (c); 4.4; 4.5 (b); 4.6 and 4.7. The Review Group has provided detailed feedback to each response that was still considered to be unsatisfactory.

Threats / Challenges to Wild Salmon: in its last review in 2021, 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. No changes were made to this section in 2023.

SMART Actions: in 2023, five actions were added, three in the 'Management of Salmon Fisheries' section and two in the 'Habitat Protection and Restoration' section. Following the 2023 review, all five 'Management of Salmon Fisheries' actions were considered to be satisfactory. However new Action F5 was not considered to be SMART because it was not clearly related to a threat / challenge. 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', one of the new actions, Action H4, was considered to be both SMART and satisfactory. However, the new Action H3 was considered neither as SMART nor satisfactory. Additionally, as with the area 'Management of Salmon Fisheries', each action needs to be related to a specific threat / challenge. Some of the actions identified do not align with the threats / challenges identified in the Implementation Plan. No changes were made in 2023 in the area 'Aquaculture, Disease, Transfers & Transgenics'. In 2021 there were no actions and the Review Group felt then 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: in its last review in 2021, 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 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 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)	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.	
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	<p>The Review Group welcomed the new information on monitoring and the new Action F1 for the development of Conservation Limits in the Ulla River.</p> <p>The Review Group acknowledged the work done in relation to parr density studies and looked forward to the development of more comprehensive reference points across all relevant catchments in line with NASCO’s Guidelines for the Management of Salmon Fisheries, CNL(09)43 – see sections 2.4 and 2.5.</p>	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		
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		

1.7	Please describe the process used to consult NGOs and other stakeholders and industries in the development of this Implementation Plan.	2	The Review Group acknowledged the consultations taking place each year prior to the publication of fishing regulations. However, the Review Group again noted that the IP itself 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 welcomed the addition of the requested high-level objective for the management of the fisheries for wild salmon.	Yes
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		Yes
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?	(a) 1 (b) 1 (c) 2	The Review Group considered that it is still unclear what measures are in place to rebuild wild self-sustaining salmon stocks with the fishery being dependent 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?	1		Yes

2.6	What is the current level of unreported catch and what measures are being taken to reduce this?	2	The Review Group recognised the efforts being made to reduce unreported catch. However, the Review Group still required clarity on the 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	The Review Group considered that 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 Review Group again considered that 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?	1		Yes
Overall score by Review Group for 3. Protection and Restoration of Salmon Habitat			Unsatisfactory	

<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?	1	
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	
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?	(a)(i)2 (a)(ii)1 (b)1 (c)1	The Review Group still sought further clarification on infrastructure to prevent escapes from freshwater hatcheries. Partially
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?	1	The Review Group noted that EU – Spain (Galicia) has no marine salmon farms.
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?	1	Yes

4.6	What progress has been made to implement NASCO's guidance on introductions, transfers and stocking?	1		Yes
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?	1		Yes
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.	
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	The Review Group noted that the development and implementation of a plan for <i>G. salaris</i> , as detailed in the 'Road Map', is an agreed requirement for each member of the North-East Atlantic Commission.	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)	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		
Threat / challenge F5			
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)	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)	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?
F1	Development of CLs for the Ulla river	Yes	Yes			Yes The Review Group considered that it moves towards CNL(9)43, section 2.4 on reference points.	Satisfactory	New Action
F2	Better management criteria for the Ulla fishery	Yes	Yes			Yes The Review Group considered that it is consistent with section 2.1 of NASCO’s fisheries management	Satisfactory	New Action

						guidelines, CNL(9)43. The Review Group understood that the 'IP' referred to in this action is a management plan for the shared Miño / Minho catchment. The Group noted that this is a new action that should be delivered by 2024.		
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 secured' section is answered.			Yes. However, the Review Group considered that this relates more to the Williamsburg Resolution, CNL(06)48, than the Fisheries Guidelines, CNL(09)43.	Satisfactory	
F5	Installation of monitoring devices in the lower Ulla river	No. The Review Group noted that there is no threat /	No	'Relevant' needs to be reflected more clearly. NASCO's IP / APR Guidelines, CNL(18)49, state		Yes. The Review Group considered that it moves towards CNL(9)43, section	Satisfactory	New Action

		challenge for this action. However, the Review Group considered that this action may be related to threat / challenge F1.		that 'actions must relate clearly to the main threats and / or challenges identified in the Implementation Plan in a timely fashion, taking into account the provisions in NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines'.		2.7 on management actions to control harvest.		
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							Satisfactory However, four threats are identified but five actions are included. Each threat needs an action.	

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			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		
H2	Permeabilization or demolition of barriers in the Miño system	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
H3	Eradication of invasive alien species in 6 salmon rivers	No. The Review Group noted that this action is not related to threat / challenge H3.	No	‘Specific’ and ‘Achievable’ need to be reflected more clearly. The Review Group expects to see these SMART descriptors adequately addressed.		No. The Review Group considered that the information provided was much too limited to evaluate how this moves EU – Spain (Galicia) clearly towards alignment with CNL(10)51.	Unsatisfactory	New Action
H4	Improved accessibility for 14 barriers in 6 rivers	Yes	Yes. However, the Review Group considered this to be a very ambitious action to be completed in a single year.			Yes. The Review Group considered that it moves towards CNL(10)51, section 2 (c), on salmon habitat requirements, specifically on juvenile and adult migration.	Satisfactory	New Action

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	<p style="text-align: center;">Unsatisfactory</p> Each threat needs an action. The actions as identified do not align with the threats 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							<p style="text-align: center;">Unsatisfactory</p> 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: F1, F2, F3 and F4; • Protection, Restoration and Enhancement of Atlantic Salmon Habitat: H1 and H2. <p>In EU – Spain (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>