Report of the Meeting of the Conservation Commitments Reports (CCR) Review Group for the Review of Draft CCRs

NASCO, Edinburgh

23 – 27 February 2026

1. Opening of the Meeting

1.1 The Chair of the Review Group, Dan Kircheis (USA), opened the meeting and welcomed members of the Review Group. He noted that Guðni Magnús Eiríksson (Iceland) sent apologies and was unable to attend. He reminded the Review Group that NASCO's fourth reporting cycle is intended to enable Parties / jurisdictions to demonstrate that they are implementing NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. He added that the Parties / jurisdictions have all agreed to NASCO's Strategic Goal, Mission and Vision as outlined in its Ten-Year Strategy, CNL(24)71rev, and the fourth reporting cycle will provide the platform to show how they are achieving this. He noted that establishing the Conservation Commitments Reports (CCRs) was the first step in the process with reporting against them due to begin in 2028. He further noted that the Performance Indicators would be the second part in the process, with reporting starting in 2027. He highlighted that the focus of the CCRs would be NASCO's Strategic Goal, with the Review Group tasked to assess whether the actions included are priority actions and whether the CCRs have been completed correctly.

1.2 The Chair reminded the Review Group that this meeting is an initial step in the process, during which the Parties / jurisdictions will receive confidential feedback and have the opportunity to revise their Draft CCRs before the documents become available on NASCO's website. He added that the Special Session at the 2026 Annual Meeting would provide the Parties / jurisdictions, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Indigenous Peoples representatives and institutions (IPRIs) with the opportunity to review and provide feedback to the Parties / jurisdictions on the Draft CCRs.

1.3 Documents relevant to the fourth reporting cycle (2026 – 2032) can be found on the NASCO website.

1.4 A list of the meeting participants is contained in Annex 1.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

2.1 The Review Group adopted its Agenda, CCR(26)03 (Annex 2).

3. Review and Agree Working Methods

3.1 The Review Group noted that Terms of Reference (ToRs), CNL(25)56, had been provided by the Council. The Chair reminded the Group that the ToRs address both the Performance Indicators and the Conservation Commitments Reports (CCRs). The Performance Indicators are intended to be the tangible and quantifiable metrics, with the CCRs identifying high priority actions which will move the needle for salmon.

3.2 The Review Group acknowledged that it would, in line with the Schedule for Fourth Reporting Cycle, CNL(25)57, agreed by Council in 2025, provide written feedback on

all Draft CCRs submitted. Prior to the meeting, an evaluation template was developed by the Secretariat (Annex 3) and the Review Group met to review the template and discuss how to approach the reviews and interviews. The template was used to record the evaluations using the questions as written in 'I. Review of the Conservation Commitments Reports, 1.a – 1.i.' in the Review Group's ToRs. Once the evaluations were completed, the form was duplicated and an extra box added to each stressor, for overall comments and feedback on that stressor. The main points raised on each stressor were then combined into a single section at the start of the document, now a 'feedback' form (Annex 4). The Review Group agreed, in line with the schedule, to provide confidential written feedback to each Party / jurisdiction following their interview with the Review Group. This will enable the Parties / jurisdictions to make any modifications or revisions to their Draft CCRs to bring them in line with the CCR reporting requirements before they are made publicly available on NASCO's website.

3.3 The Chair outlined the process for interviewing each of the Parties / jurisdictions that had submitted Draft CCRs, to take place during the three central days of the Review Group's Meeting. A one-hour slot was allocated for each Party / jurisdiction, to allow the Review Group to have a 15-minute preparatory discussion, followed by a 30-minute interview during which the Party / jurisdiction could give a presentation of a maximum length of 10 minutes. A period of 15 minutes following each interview would be used by the Review Group to firm up initial comments.

3.4 The Review Group discussed the need to be clear and consistent with the language used in its feedback and noted that it would develop some standard language to use for its reviews, where appropriate. The Review Group also discussed the risks of 'over standardizing' the language; i.e. at the cost of clarity of meaning.

3.5 Members of the Review Group noted that some of the Draft CCRs were incomplete. The Chair reminded the Review Group that the final CCRs were not due to be submitted until the end of November 2026 and the Parties / jurisdictions did not, therefore, need to have complete CCRs until then. The Assistant Secretary informed the Group that Parties / jurisdictions had been encouraged to submit CCRs even if incomplete, to enable them to have an interview and receive feedback.

4. Evaluation of the 2026 Draft Conservation Commitments Reports Including a Virtual Presentation by Each Party / Jurisdiction

Overview of the Conservation Commitments Reports Evaluations

4.1 In February 2026, the Review Group welcomed the submission of 18 of the expected 22 Draft CCRs. Of these, 12 were received by the original submission deadline and the remaining six by the Review Group meeting date. Draft CCRs were not submitted by four Parties / jurisdictions (EU – Denmark, EU – France, EU – Ireland and UK – Scotland) before the Review Group met, with the result that the Review Group would be unable to review those documents when received.

4.2 No Draft CCR is expected from Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) – Faroe Islands, due to 1) the lack of natural wild salmon spawning stocks in Faroese rivers, estuaries or lakes, 2) no fisheries' licenses for wild salmon having been issued by the Government of the Faroe Islands as advised by ICES, and 3) the total catches in the Faroes having been 0 for the past many years. At the 2024 NASCO Annual Meeting, CNL(24)88rev paragraph 6.10, the submission of a CCR by Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) was taken to be relevant only for Greenland.

4.3 The Secretary informed the Review Group that Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) had communicated that the Faroe Islands would not be submitting a CCR, by prior agreement, having not undertaken a stressor analysis, also by prior agreement.

4.4 The Review Group made several overall observations on the Draft CCRs received and the review process, as follows:

- some Parties / jurisdictions stated that the character limits in the submission form made it challenging in some cases to provide the wider context. The Group noted this was a deliberate choice to ensure that the CCRs were kept short and concise recognizing the considerable amount of time it takes for the Review Group to conduct a thorough review of the reports;

- the interviews with the Parties / jurisdictions supplemented the submitted Draft CCRs well, providing additional information and further clarity. This part of the review process was deemed valuable to the Review Group in gaining a better understanding of the wider context and the majority of Parties / jurisdictions made good use of this and thanked the Review Group for the opportunity;

- it was evident to the Review Group that a lot of effort had been taken by some of the Parties / jurisdictions in engaging across governmental departments, agencies, NGOs, stakeholders and Indigenous Peoples;

- some high-ranking stressors were identified but not pursued. In these cases, justifications were provided, consistent with the CCR template, for reasons including: the source of the stressor was another Party (e.g. aquaculture); the scope of the stressor extended beyond the jurisdictional authority of the Party (e.g. climate change), or the stressor would continue to be managed through existing activities (e.g. fisheries);

- several Parties / jurisdictions noted that climate change was one of their three top stressors but opted not to address this because it was deemed too challenging or was being addressed via national measures. However, other Parties / jurisdictions proposed actions that would mitigate the effects of climate change in their own Party / jurisdiction, for example through tree planting or water connectivity. As such, parties could address climate change issues on a local rather than global scale;

- while aquaculture continues to be a stressor, there anywhere not any major transformative actions to address the challenges of sea lice transmission and escapes;

- a number of Parties / jurisdictions acknowledged the value of NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines in supporting their actions. The Review Group was pleasantly surprised at the number and importance placed by Parties / jurisdictions on the use of the Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines. Examples included management of fisheries with conservation limits, management of aquaculture with respect to sea lice, stocking and habitat protection and restoration;

- a variety of approaches to riverine restoration activities were identified in the CCRs. Noting that the revised NASCO Guidelines on habitat will be published after the Annual Meeting in June, it may be useful for all Parties / jurisdictions to give these guidelines due consideration when finalizing their CCRs;
- the Review Group noted that a lot of actions seem to be a continuation of existing efforts, recognising fiscal limits. Related to this, there were some actions that were preventative. In some cases, the Review Group felt that the standard of 'transformative' could still be achieved through the sum of actions, while in other cases, the Review Group felt that Parties / jurisdictions could make small but impactful revisions to improve the likelihood of positive outcomes; and
- the Review Group raised that it is difficult to define what constitutes transformative action to achieve NASCO's Strategic Goal, due to the lack of a definition of 'transformative' and how the Strategic Goal can be defined and placed within a Party context.

Conservation Commitments Reports Evaluations February 2026

4.5 A template of the CCR submission form, CNL(25)55rev, was made available to Parties / jurisdictions following the NASCO Annual Meeting in June 2025, with the agreed Schedule of the Fourth Reporting Cycle, CNL(25)57, and the ToRs for the Review Group, CNL(25)56. The online templates for CCRs were opened to the Parties / jurisdictions for completion in January 2026.

4.6 The following Draft CCRs were submitted prior to the Review Group meeting:

	Party / jurisdiction
1	Canada
2	Denmark (in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland) – Greenland
3	EU – Finland
4	EU – Germany
5	EU – Portugal
6	EU – Spain (Asturias)
7	EU – Spain (Cantabria)
8	EU – Spain (Galicia)
9	EU – Spain (Gipuzkoa)
10	EU – Spain (Navarra)
11	EU – Sweden
12	Iceland
13	Norway
14	Russian Federation
15	UK – England
16	UK – Northern Ireland

17	UK – Wales
18	United States

4.7 The Review Group completed written evaluations for all the above Draft CCRs and held 30-minute interviews from 24-26 February 2026 with all the Parties / jurisdictions that had submitted Draft CCRs. Following the interview, the Review Group agreed written feedback for each of the Draft CCRs, using standard language where appropriate, that had been agreed by the Group.

4.8 The Review Group used criteria as agreed in its Terms of Reference, CNL(25)56, in completing its initial evaluations and written feedback. To evaluate the quality of the information contained in each Draft CCR and determine whether it provides a fair and equitable basis for assessing the progress that the Party / jurisdiction will make towards the achievement of NASCO's Strategic Goal, the following questions were used:

a. Are the questions in the 'Consultation and Engagement' section of the CCRs answered fully?

b. Are the top three stressors identified in the Party's / jurisdiction's stressor analysis used as the basis for the CCRs?

   i. If not, are the justifications provided for the substitutions adequate?

c. Are NASCO's theme areas identified for each stressor?

d. Is the impact of each stressor on wild Atlantic salmon described clearly?

e. Are there no more than three actions per stressor?

f. Does each action have a clear and measurable tangible outcome to improve conditions for salmon survival through the removal or diminishment of the identified stressor (i.e. in line with NASCO's Strategic Goal)?

g. Does each action have a clear starting point (baseline) against which progress towards the outcome can be measured?

h. Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for each action? and

i. Does each stressor include a quantitative baseline and tangible outcome to enable progress towards the achievement of the Strategic Goal to be measured?

4.9 A member of the Review Group raised that it would be constructive, when giving feedback to the Parties / jurisdictions, to highlight the need for the Draft CCRs to include the details of quantitative measures rather than processes. They further raised that Parties / jurisdictions will be able to modify their Draft CCRs before publication on the NASCO website on 30 April 2026 and the final CCRs before publication on 30 November 2026, and can, therefore, take this into consideration.

4.10 To guide and organize the review process, the Review Group noted that there appeared to be a hierarchy of three levels in the actions being included by Parties / jurisdictions in the CCRS. The hierarchy consisted of (1) actions with a direct impact on salmon, for example directly resulting in an increase in salmon numbers, (2) actions that impact salmon's environment / habitat, with the assumption the environment / habitat will be improved and will result in an increase in salmon numbers and (3) actions that impact human activity, such as making a list of priorities, developing best practice, surveying / monitoring human behaviour, with the assumption that actions which impact human activity will in turn have an impact on salmon.

4.11 The Review Group agreed that its role was not to accept or not accept the actions of a Party / jurisdiction, but rather to provide constructive feedback as to whether the actions were in line with the goals of the CCR and consistent with the reporting requirements.

4.12 Acknowledging that it was not the Review Group's role to be accepting / not accepting of actions, the Review Group did acknowledge that there was a need for Parties / jurisdictions to illustrate how their action(s) would have an impact on salmon that is consistent with NASCO's Strategic Goal. For example, if actions constitute policies / plans they would need to have measurable outcomes and milestones associated with them that relate to salmon.

5. Development of Feedback to the Parties / jurisdictions

5.1 The Review Group completed a written evaluation for each of the Draft CCRs before the corresponding interview with the relevant Party / jurisdiction. Every Party / jurisdiction that had submitted a Draft CCR met virtually with the Review Group for a 30-minute interview.

5.2 The Review Group worked together to develop the written feedback for two CCRs to develop a consistent approach for the feedback to the Parties, including identifying standardized language to be used in developing the responses to the Parties / jurisdictions.

5.3 The evaluations were updated in the form of written feedback following the interviews. The Review Group noted that the metrics used by Parties / jurisdictions needed careful consideration, as they would be used to review progress on the actions of the CCRs throughout the remainder of the reporting cycle. The initial written feedback would be confidential and could include recommendations to bring the actions in the CCRs closer towards direct improvements for salmon.

6. Consideration of Follow-up Virtual 'Interviews' in April 2026 with Individual Parties / Jurisdictions for the Review of Each Draft CCR

6.1 The Review Group discussed the need for follow-up virtual interviews in April, as included in the Schedule of the Fourth Reporting Cycle, CNL(25)57. The first round of interviews were deemed very informative in terms of understanding the Draft CCRs that had been submitted.

6.2 The Group felt it was unlikely to require follow up interviews with any of the Parties / jurisdictions, rather it would use the time scheduled for the interviews in April to review, agree and finalise the written feedback to Parties / jurisdictions that would then be published on the NASCO website.

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

7.1 The Review Group discussed the new process of the fourth reporting cycle and agreed that it had many strengths relative to the third reporting cycle. The Chair noted that the new process gave Parties / jurisdictions the opportunity to reflect on the actions they were taking for the conservation of salmon. He also noted that several Parties / jurisdictions had referenced NASCO's Resolutions, Agreements and Guidelines as good resources.

7.2 The Secretary noted that completing the evaluations, compiling the feedback and holding interviews with the Parties / jurisdiction in a single week had been extremely productive, and the Secretariate is optimistic that the significant investment of the Review Group's time and energy upfront will result in positive outcomes to be realized

over the duration of the fourth reporting cycle, including more efficient progress reporting and higher likelihood of achieving the NASCO's Strategic Goal. He raised that the interviews had given the opportunity for the Group to ask a number of questions for clarity, which helped with the analyses of the Draft CCRs.

7.3 The Review Group considered how to compile the feedback to give an overview of the CCRs and report to the Council. The Secretary reminded the Group that their ToRs gave clear guidance on the review process. The Review Group agreed to compile a matrix with actions of Parties / jurisdictions rated by how closely they adhered to the review categories in the ToRs, especially whether the actions are urgent and transformative.

8. Report of the Meeting

8.1 The Review Group agreed a report of its meeting by correspondence.

9. Other Business

9.1 There was no other business.

10. Close of the Meeting

10.1 The Chair thanked the members of the Review Group for their hard work during and prior to the meeting and the Secretariat for their support. He closed the meeting.

Annex 1

List of Participants - Conservation Commitment Reports Review Group Meeting February 2026

Shelley Denny	Unama'ki Institute of Natural Resources, Canada
Guðni Magnús Eiríksson	Directorate of Fisheries, Iceland
Livia Goodbrand	Fisheries and Oceans, Canada
Wendy Kenyon	Atlantic Salmon Trust, UK
Dan Kircheis (Chair)	NOAA Fisheries Service, USA
Michael Millane	Inland Fisheries Ireland, EU – Ireland
Tim Sheehan	NOAA Fisheries Service, USA
Alan Walker	CEFAS, UK
Cathal Gallagher	Secretary, NASCO
Clare Cavers	Assistant Secretary, NASCO

Annex 2

CCR(26)03

Meeting of the Conservation Commitments Reports (CCRs) Review Group for the Review of Draft CCRs

NASCO, Edinburgh

23 – 27 February 2026

Agenda

1. Opening of the Meeting
2. Adoption of the Agenda
3. Review and Agree Working Methods
4. Evaluation of the 2026 Draft Conservation Commitments Reports Including a Virtual Presentation by Each Party / Jurisdiction
5. Development of Feedback to the Parties / jurisdictions
6. Consideration of Follow-up Virtual 'Interviews' in April 2026 with Individual Parties / Jurisdictions for the Review of Each Draft CCR
7. Arrangements for Presenting the Group's Report to the Council
8. Report of the Meeting
9. Other Business
10. Close of the Meeting

Annex 3

Review of Conservation Commitment Report: Evaluation Template

Date	Party / jurisdiction	Draft CCR – February 2026
		Link

Consultation and Engagement

CCR reference	Review Question	Comments / Recommendations
E.1. E.2.	**Are the questions in the 'Consultation and Engagement' section of the CCRs answered fully?**	

Stressors

CCR reference	Review Question	Comments / Recommendations
Stressor Justification	**Are the top three stressors identified in the Party's / jurisdiction's stressor analysis used as the basis for the CCRs?**	
	If not, are the justifications provided for the substitutions adequate?	

Stressor 1

CCR reference	Review Question	Comments / Recommendations		
S.1.a.	**Are NASCO's theme areas identified?**			
S.1.b. S.1.c. S.1.d.	**Is the impact of the stressor on wild Atlantic salmon described clearly?**			
	Are there no more than three actions for this stressor?			
		Action 1	**Action 2**	**Action 3**
S.1.1.d S.1.2.d S.1.3.d.	**Does the action have a clear and measurable tangible outcome to improve conditions for salmon survival through the removal or diminishment of the identified stressor (i.e. in line with NASCO's Strategic Goal)?**			
S.1.1.c. S.1.2.c. S.1.3.c.	**Does the action have a clear starting point (baseline) against which progress towards the outcome can be measured?**			
S.1.1.e. S.1.2.e. S.1.3.e.	**Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?**			
S.1.4.	**Does this stressor include a quantitative baseline and tangible outcome to enable**			

	progress towards the achievement of the Strategic Goal to be measured?	

Stressor 2

CCR reference	**Review Question**	**Comments / Recommendations**		
S.2.a.	**Are NASCO's theme areas identified?**			
S.2.b. S.2.c. S.2.d.	**Is the impact of the stressor on wild Atlantic salmon described clearly?**			
	Are there no more than three actions for this stressor?			
		Action 1	**Action 2**	**Action 3**
S.2.1.d S.2.2.d S.2.3.d.	**Does the action have a clear and measurable tangible outcome to improve conditions for salmon survival through the removal or diminishment of the identified stressor (i.e. in line with NASCO's Strategic Goal)?**			
S.2.1.c. S.2.2.c. S.2.3.c.	**Does the action have a clear starting point (baseline) against which progress towards the outcome can be measured?**			
S.2.1.e. S.2.2.e.	**Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?**			

S.2.3.e.				
S.2.4.	**Does this stressor include a quantitative baseline and tangible outcome to enable progress towards the achievement of the Strategic Goal to be measured?**			

Stressor 3

CCR reference	**Review Question**	**Comments / Recommendations**		
S.3.a.	**Are NASCO's theme areas identified?**			
S.3.b. S.3.c. S.3.d.	**Is the impact of the stressor on wild Atlantic salmon described clearly?**			
	Are there no more than three actions for this stressor?			
		Action 1	**Action 2**	**Action 3**
S.3.1.d S.3.2.d S.3.3.d.	**Does the action have a clear and measurable tangible outcome to improve conditions for salmon survival through the removal or diminishment of the identified stressor (i.e. in line with NASCO's Strategic Goal)?**			
S.3.1.c. S.3.2.c.	**Does the action have a clear starting point (baseline) against which progress towards the outcome can be measured?**			

S.3.3.c.				
S.3.1.e. S.3.2.e. S.3.3.e.	**Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?**			
S.3.4.	**Does this stressor include a quantitative baseline and tangible outcome to enable progress towards the achievement of the Strategic Goal to be measured?**			

Annex 4

Review of Conservation Commitment Report: Feedback

Date	Party / jurisdiction	Draft CCR – February 2026

Overview of Conservation Commitment Report

Overall Comments / Recommendations
• *Comments from Review Group*

Consultation and Engagement

CCR reference	Review Question	Comments / Recommendations
E.1. E.2.	**Are the questions in the 'Consultation and Engagement' section of the CCRs answered fully?**	*Yes / No / In part*

Stressors

CCR reference	Review Question	Comments / Recommendations
Stressor Justification	**Are the top three stressors identified in the Party's / jurisdiction's stressor analysis used as the basis for the CCRs?**	*Yes / No / In part*
	If not, are the justifications provided for the substitutions adequate?	*Yes / No / In part*

Stressor 1

CCR reference	Review Question	Comments / Recommendations		
S.1.a.	**Are NASCO's theme areas identified?**	*Yes / No / In part*		
S.1.b. S.1.c. S.1.d.	**Is the impact of the stressor on wild Atlantic salmon described clearly?**	*Yes / No / In part*		
	Are there no more than three actions for this stressor?	*Yes / No*		
		Action 1	**Action 2**	**Action 3**
S.1.1.d S.1.2.d S.1.3.d.	**Does the action have a clear and measurable tangible outcome to improve conditions for salmon survival through the removal or diminishment of the identified stressor (i.e. in line with NASCO's Strategic Goal)?**	*Yes / No / In part*	*Yes / No / In part*	*Yes / No / In part*
S.1.1.c. S.1.2.c. S.1.3.c.	**Does the action have a clear starting point (baseline) against which progress towards the outcome can be measured?**	*Yes / No / In part*	*Yes / No / In part*	*Yes / No / In part*
S.1.1.e. S.1.2.e. S.1.3.e.	**Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?**	*Yes / No / In part*	*Yes / No / In part*	*Yes / No / In part*

S.1.4.	**Does this stressor include a quantitative baseline and tangible outcome to enable progress towards the achievement of the Strategic Goal to be measured?**	*Yes / No / In part*
Comments / Recommendations *Comments from Review Group*		

Stressor 2

CCR reference	**Review Question**	**Comments / Recommendations**		
S.2.a.	**Are NASCO's theme areas identified?**	*Yes / No / In part*		
S.2.b. S.2.c. S.2.d.	**Is the impact of the stressor on wild Atlantic salmon described clearly?**	*Yes / No / In part*		
	Are there no more than three actions for this stressor?	*Yes / No*		
		Action 1	**Action 2**	**Action 3**
S.2.1.d S.2.2.d S.2.3.d.	**Does the action have a clear and measurable tangible outcome to improve conditions for salmon survival through the removal or diminishment of the identified stressor (i.e. in line with NASCO's Strategic Goal)?**	*Yes / No / In part*	*Yes / No / In part*	*Yes / No / In part*

S.2.1.c. S.2.2.c. S.2.3.c.	**Does the action have a clear starting point (baseline) against which progress towards the outcome can be measured?**	*Yes / No / In part*	*Yes / No / In part*	*Yes / No / In part*
S.2.1.e. S.2.2.e. S.2.3.e.	**Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?**	*Yes / No / In part*	*Yes / No / In part*	*Yes / No / In part*
S.2.4.	**Does this stressor include a quantitative baseline and tangible outcome to enable progress towards the achievement of the Strategic Goal to be measured?**	*Yes / No / In part*		
Comments / Recommendations *Comments from Review Group*				

Stressor 3

CCR reference	Review Question	Comments / Recommendations
S.3.a.	**Are NASCO's theme areas identified?**	*Yes / No / In part*
S.3.b. S.3.c. S.3.d.	**Is the impact of the stressor on wild Atlantic salmon described clearly?**	*Yes / No / In part*
	Are there no more than three actions for this stressor?	*Yes / No*

		Action 1	Action 2	Action 3
S.3.1.d S.3.2.d S.3.3.d.	**Does the action have a clear and measurable tangible outcome to improve conditions for salmon survival through the removal or diminishment of the identified stressor (i.e. in line with NASCO's Strategic Goal)?**	*Yes / No / In part*	*Yes / No / In part*	*Yes / No / In part*
S.3.1.c. S.3.2.c. S.3.3.c.	**Does the action have a clear starting point (baseline) against which progress towards the outcome can be measured?**	*Yes / No / In part*	*Yes / No / In part*	*Yes / No / In part*
S.3.1.e. S.3.2.e. S.3.3.e.	**Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?**	*Yes / No / In part*	*Yes / No / In part*	*Yes / No / In part*
S.3.4.	**Does this stressor include a quantitative baseline and tangible outcome to enable progress towards the achievement of the Strategic Goal to be measured?**	*Yes / No / In part*		
Comments / Recommendations *Comments from Review Group*				