CNL(26)29

Review of Draft Conservation Commitments Report

Date	Party / jurisdiction	Draft CCR – April 2026
April 2026	Norway	Norway – Updated Draft CCR submitted April 2026

Overview of Conservation Commitments Report

Overall Comments / Recommendations
• At the level of the stressors, the outcomes are clear. The Review Group is aware that the details for the actions remain under development and anticipates more details in the final CCR. • The Review Group is unclear if/how stakeholders were/will be engaged during development of the CCR. • The Review Group understands the difficulty of explaining the substitution of climate change as one of the top three stressors, given character limits. However, a more thorough rationale would be beneficial.

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. Stakeholders will not be included in the delivery of CCR as all stressors are to be addressed through regulatory changes.

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.
	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.		
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. Norway's stressor analysis allows for quantitative assessment of outcome; a measured decrease on one or both of the 'affect' and 'development' axis of their analysis.		
Comments / Recommendations At the level of the stressor, the outcome is clear. For the action, the details are still under development.				

Please provide a qualitative assessment of what a three-point slide would mean in terms of impacts for salmon (i.e. how impactful this is).

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)?**	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.		
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?**	Yes. Escaped farmed salmon currently scores 15 on the effect axis and to 7 on the development axis. The outcome will be a reduction in the effect and/or development axis of Norway's stressor analysis.		

Comments / Recommendations
At the level of the stressor, the outcome is clear. For the action, the details remain under development (i.e. the fee for escaped salmon). Please explain how confident Norway is that this system will create change and provide evidence to support this. Please also describe how this action is significant, i.e. the extent to which the change will benefit salmon.

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)?**	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.
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.	Yes.	Yes.
S.3.1.e. S.3.2.e. S.3.3.e.	**Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?**	Yes	Yes	Yes

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. Hydropower is ranked six on the effect axis and nine on the development axis in SACAS overall scoring system. The overall score will be reduced by 2 units.
Comments / Recommendations For Action 1, revising conditions for older hydropower plants will raise the environmental standards at these facilities. Norway will reduce the overall SACAS score by 2 units. For Action 2, reviewing hydropower facilities that operate without a license will ensure incorporation of environmental assessments and future measures, enabling targeted action to reduce impacts on salmon For Action 3, new regulation on standard terms will enable authorities to mandate environmental improvements directly, without first initiating a revision or convening a licensing procedure.		