

CNL(26)19

Review of Draft Conservation Commitments Report

Date	Party / jurisdiction	Draft CCR – February 2026
February 2026	EU-Finland	EU_Finland - Draft CCR submitted February 2026

Overview of Conservation Commitments Report

Overall Comments / Recommendations

- The Review Group appreciates the quantitative metrics on impacts to the female spawning stock for the action to address the exploitation stressor as it provides a clear means to assess benefits to salmon.
- The Review Group acknowledges the challenges of co-management of fisheries and control of pink salmon in the Teno and Näätamöjoki/Neiden rivers.

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. Stated for CCR development that the consultation process is still underway but as regards engagement in actions, it is stated that the answer will be delivered later.

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?	No. The top two stressors (climate change and aquaculture) were not chosen. The three stressors chosen were invasive species, exploitation and predators.
	If not, are the justifications provided for the substitutions adequate?	Yes.

Stressor 1

CCR reference	Review Question	Comments / Recommendations		
S.1.a.	Are NASCO's theme areas identified?	Yes.		
S.1.b. S.1.c. S.1.d.	Is the impact of the stressor on wild Atlantic salmon described clearly?	No.		
	Are there no more than three actions for this stressor?	Yes.		
		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.		
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.		
S.1.1.e. S.1.2.e. S.1.3.e.	Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?	Yes.		
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.		

Comments / Recommendations

It is recommended that the impact of the stressor is better described.

Stressor 2

CCR reference	Review Question	Comments / Recommendations		
S.2.a.	Are NASCO's theme areas identified?	Yes.		
S.2.b. S.2.c. S.2.d.	Is the impact of the stressor on wild Atlantic salmon described clearly?	In part. The impact of the stressor is not clearly described.		
	Are there no more than three actions for this stressor?	Yes		
		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)?	No. Although the units are identified, the 2032 target is stated as -20%, but the outcome is stated as 0%.		
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.		
S.2.1.e. S.2.2.e. S.2.3.e.	Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?	Yes.		

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?	In part. There is a discrepancy in the 2032 target (-20%) and the outcome (0%) that requires clarification.
--------	---	--

Comments / Recommendations
It is recommended that the discrepancy between the 2032 target (-20%) and the outcome (0%) is addressed.

Stressor 3

CCR reference	Review Question	Comments / Recommendations		
S.3.a.	Are NASCO's theme areas identified?	Yes.		
S.3.b. S.3.c. S.3.d.	Is the impact of the stressor on wild Atlantic salmon described clearly?	Yes.		
	Are there no more than three actions for this stressor?	Yes.		
		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)?	No. There is insufficient information provided to evaluate this.		
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?	No. There is insufficient information provided to evaluate this.		

<p>S.3.1.e. S.3.2.e. S.3.3.e.</p>	<p>Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?</p>	<p>No. There is insufficient information provided to evaluate this.</p>		
<p>S.3.4.</p>	<p>Does this stressor include a quantitative baseline and tangible outcome to enable progress towards the achievement of the Strategic Goal to be measured?</p>	<p>No. There is insufficient information provided to evaluate this.</p>		
<p>Comments / Recommendations Insufficient information was provided to evaluate this action. It is recommended that it is revised.</p>				