

CNL(26)25

Review of Draft Conservation Commitments Report

Date	Party / jurisdiction	Draft CCR – February 2026
February 2026	EU-Spain (Galicia)	EU_Spain_Galicia - Draft CCR submitted February 2026

Overview of Conservation Commitments Report

Overall Comments / Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the stressor analysis presented at the 2025 Annual meeting, climate change, predators and physical barriers were identified as the top three stressors in Galicia. The Review Group requests that you provide a justification for why these were not selected to form the basis for the CCR. The Review Group requests that you provide clarity on what the index represents for each action.

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. The stressors identified in the CCR (pollution, habitat degradation and invasives) do not align with the stressors presented at the 2025 NASCO Annual Meeting.
	If not, are the justifications provided for the substitutions adequate?	In part. A justification was provided for climate change but not for water regulation or barriers.

--	--	--

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)?	No. This action describes a human co-ordinating activity associated with salmon conservation, but the benefit to salmon from this specific action is not being measured.		
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?	In part. Understanding of the index could be further enhanced by defining the specific steps involved and relating that to the		

		index. This can be described in section S.1.1.f (e.g. .25 co-ordination .5 finalise plan .75 implement plan 1. Monitor outcomes)		
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?	<p>In part.</p> <p>The baseline proposed for the stressor is qualitative, not quantitative, but the outcome of the improvement in water quality in targeted salmon rivers is tangible.</p>		
Comments / Recommendations:				
Consider using nutrient concentration reported in your routine monitoring programmes as a means to measure progress in this action				

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>In part.</p> <p>This action will promote and support targeted habitat restoration measures but the descriptions of the actions and the outcomes are not clear.</p>		

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?	In part. Understanding of the index could be further enhanced by defining the specific steps involved and relating that to the index. This can be described in section S.2.1.f (e.g. .25 co-ordination .5 finalise plan .75 implement plan 1. Monitor outcomes)		
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. The baseline proposed for the stressor is qualitative not quantitative, but the outcome of the improvement in habitat suitability in targeted river sections is tangible.		
Comments / Recommendations Please provide a clearer description of the action and outcomes.				

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)?	In part. This action will reduce the risk of future impacts on habitat conditions and food web integrity, helping to safeguard Atlantic salmon populations and maintain favourable ecological conditions in salmon rivers, but the descriptions of the actions and the outcomes are not clear.		
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. However, a more direct starting point could have been the number of salmon rivers where invasive species presently occur.		
S.3.1.e. S.3.2.e. S.3.3.e.	Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?	In part. Understanding of the index could be further enhanced by defining the specific steps involved and relating those to the index. This can be described in section S.3.1.f (e.g. 0.25 co-ordination, 0.5 finalise plan, 0.75 implement plan, and 1. Monitor outcomes)		
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?	In part. The baseline proposed for the stressor is qualitative, not quantitative, in that the distribution and status of invasive species are monitored through surveillance but not quantified, even though they are recognised in the CCR as a potential reference point. Maintaining the current limited occurrence of invasive species, thereby safeguarding habitat and reducing the risk of future		

		impacts is a tangible outcome, but it isn't clear how this will be achieved through supporting surveillance activities, information exchange and coordination.
--	--	--

Comments / Recommendations

This is a continuation of existing efforts as no new actions are proposed.