

CNL(26)20

Review of Draft Conservation Commitments Report

Date	Party / jurisdiction	Draft CCR – February 2026
February 2026	EU-Germany	EU_Germany - Draft CCR submitted February 2026

Overview of Conservation Commitments Report

Overall Comments / Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Review Group recognizes that the milestones and tangible outcomes for the actions are still being developed. The tangible outcome provides context as to whether the action is significant and will result in improved conditions for salmon through the removal or diminishment of the identified stressor, whereas as the goals / milestones will enable the review group to evaluate progress towards the achievement of the tangible outcome. The identified actions and their descriptions identify robust measures that are appropriate to address the identified stressors, although, currently, absent an identified tangible outcome, the significance of the proposed action is unclear.

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.

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. Climate change as one of the top three stressors was replaced with habitat degradation.
	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?	Yes.		
	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. Reduction of excess predation in inland waters through adoption of measures to reduce predation but not clearly defined.		
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. As state measures taken to reduce predation. Alternatively, the number of predators reduced would be measurable with assumed positive impacts to salmon populations.		
S.1.1.e. S.1.2.e. S.1.3.e.	Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?	No. Recommendation: Select measures that offer a starting point and clear progress for		

		future evaluations. If more species are selected, they should be a separate 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?			
Comments / Recommendations				
Recommended revision: An incomplete CCR resulted in a lack of clearly defined and tangible outcomes. Following the interview, it became clear that input was necessary before completing the CCR.				

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?	Yes.		
	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)?	<p>No.</p> <p>Combined barrier removal with reducing mortality at HPP through improved passage (u/s and d/s)</p> <p>Recommendation: Separate barrier removal and add improved passage at</p>		

		hydropower plants as Action 2 with baseline and goals.		
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?	In part. The number of structures impassable but did not provide the number of barriers or fish passages created or modified that exist as the baseline. Recommendation: Add a quantitative baseline such as the number of barriers.		
S.2.1.e. S.2.2.e. S.2.3.e.	Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?	No. Recommendation: Add measurable milestones such as the number of barriers removed.		
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?			
Comments / Recommendations				
Recommended revision: The quantitative milestones are needed to complete the CCR. Separating improving passage and barrier removal will simplify identification of baseline and improving fish passage at hydropower plants so they are clear and measurable.				

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)?	<p>No.</p> <p>It does not specify what action will be undertaken.</p> <p>Recommendation: Clarify specific actions that will be undertaken such as, as an example, the number of moderately altered habitats and the number of altered habitats restored.</p>		
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?	<p>No.</p> <p>A database exists, and it is proposed to use the percentage of measuring points, but the relevance is uncertain.</p> <p>Recommendation: Clarify the action intended to restore habitat with a quantitative baseline for which to measure progress.</p>		
S.3.1.e. S.3.2.e. S.3.3.e.	Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?	<p>No.</p> <p>Recommendation: Provide quantitative goals and milestones to measure progress.</p>		
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?			

Comments / Recommendations

Recommended revision: Specific actions related to reducing habitat degradation/restoring degraded habitat require identification with quantifiable baselines, milestones, and goals.