

CNL(26)27

Review of Draft Conservation Commitments Report

Date	Party / jurisdiction	Draft CCR – February 2026
February 2026	EU-Spain (Navarra)	<a href="#">EU_Spain_Navarra - Draft CCR submitted February 2026</a>

Overview of Conservation Commitments Report

Overall Comments / Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commitment to maintain fisheries closures while abundances are below the CL’s as well as efforts to improve upstream and downstream fish passage through barrier removals, construction of fish passes, and downstream deterrent devices, are ambitious actions that improve conditions for salmon survival and move towards the diminishment of the relevant stressors.</li> <li>Although many of the actions will promote and support restoration of habitats important to salmon or minimize harm to salmon the direct benefits to salmon are not being measured. Measures of improved survival, productivity and/or distribution would enhance understanding of the benefits to salmon.</li> </ul>

Consultation and Engagement

CCR reference	Review Question	Comments / Recommendations
E.1. E.2.	<b>Are the questions in the ‘Consultation and Engagement’ section of the CCRs answered fully?</b>	Yes.

Stressors

CCR reference	Review Question	Comments / Recommendations
Stressor Justification	<b>Are the top three stressors identified in the Party’s / jurisdiction’s stressor analysis used as the basis for the CCRs?</b>	No.
	<b>If not, are the justifications provided for the substitutions adequate?</b>	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.		
		<b>Action 1</b>	<b>Action 2</b>	<b>Action 3</b>
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. Improvements of fish passes to facilitate the upstream passage of salmon and therefore access to the upper areas of the basin	Yes. Fish deterrents at canal entrances, tailored to each site, with the aim of improving the survival rate in downstream migration	
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. 10 barriers in the basin	Yes. 0 deterrents	
S.1.1.e. S.1.2.e. S.1.3.e.	Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?	Yes. The overall goal is to remove all barriers.	Yes. The aim is to prevent smolts and kelts from entering the canals in 2 HPPs.	
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**

The removal of barriers and prevention of smolts and kelts from entering HHPs will clearly benefit the Atlantic salmon. However, the actions does not include plans for direct measures on the upstream passage success or downstream survival. Such measures would enable assessment of the success of the 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?	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.  It might be considered a weakness that linking progress for this action to direct effects on salmon might not be realistic.	Yes.	
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 vegetation	In part.  The baseline is presented as the number of weirs removed. It might be more logical to set the baseline as the number of weirs present (3?), and the progress being the reduced number of weirs.	

S.2.1.e. S.2.2.e. S.2.3.e.	<b>Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?</b>	Yes.	Yes.	
S.2.4.	<b>Does this stressor include a quantitative baseline and tangible outcome to enable progress towards the achievement of the Strategic Goal to be measured?</b>	Yes.		
<b>Comments / Recommendations</b>				
The potential for improvement is assessed to be moderate, and the impact on the water temperature will only be seen in the long term.				

### Stressor 3

CCR reference	Review Question	Comments / Recommendations		
S.3.a.	<b>Are NASCO's theme areas identified?</b>	Yes.		
S.3.b. S.3.c. S.3.d.	<b>Is the impact of the stressor on wild Atlantic salmon described clearly?</b>	Yes.		
	<b>Are there no more than three actions for this stressor?</b>	Yes.		
		<b>Action 1</b>	<b>Action 2</b>	<b>Action 3</b>
S.3.1.d S.3.2.d S.3.3.d.	<b>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)?</b>	Yes.  Salmon fishing ban.		

S.3.1.c. S.3.2.c. S.3.3.c.	<b>Does the action have a clear starting point (baseline) against which progress towards the outcome can be measured?</b>	Yes. The starting point is clear. No fishing will be allowed by this action. Reporting of reproductive success might be of interest.		
S.3.1.e. S.3.2.e. S.3.3.e.	<b>Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?</b>	Yes. There is no interim goal as such, as fishing ban is expected to last for the whole of the reporting cycle.		
S.3.4.	<b>Does this stressor include a quantitative baseline and tangible outcome to enable progress towards the achievement of the Strategic Goal to be measured?</b>	Yes.		
<b>Comments / Recommendations</b>				
<p>This is a continuation of existing efforts, as no new actions are proposed.</p> <p>There might be interest in reporting on reproductive success during the reporting cycle, as monitoring is ongoing. This might be a second action for this stressor.</p>				