

CNL(26)33

Review of Draft Conservation Commitments Report

Date	Party / jurisdiction	Draft CCR – April 2026
April 2026	UK-Wales	UK_Wales - Updated Draft CCR submitted April 2026

Overview of Conservation Commitments Report

Overall Comments / Recommendations

- The actions associated with Stressor 1 outline goals and tangible outcomes that will benefit Atlantic salmon through improvement of several habitat parameters.
- While the actions with water quantity and water quality under Stressor 2 will benefit salmon, quantifiable metrics that can be related directly to survival or productivity of salmon would be beneficial.
- The goals and milestones for some of the actions would benefit from greater clarity, to provide a metric with which the review group can evaluate progress towards and completion of the tangible outcome.

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. Top threat is climate change (marine environments), which will not be addressed in CCR.
	If not, are the justifications provided for the substitutions adequate?	Yes.

		Marine climate change falls outside the Party's jurisdiction.
--	--	---

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	Yes	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.	Yes.	Yes.
S.1.1.e. S.1.2.e. S.1.3.e.	Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?	Yes.	Yes.	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?	In part. There is no overall baseline/outcome for the stressor; one independent baseline/outcome for each respective action.
Comments / Recommendations		

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. Note – in the description can you clarify that the target is to prioritise 650 farm compliance visits per year . This will help the Review Group when they are reviewing the progress reports.	Yes.	
S.2.1.c. S.2.2.c.	Does the action have a clear starting point (baseline) against which progress towards the outcome can be measured?	Yes.	Yes.	

S.2.3.c.				
S.2.1.e. S.2.2.e. S.2.3.e.	Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?	Yes.	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?	<p>In part.</p> <p>A reduction in the number of farms that are non-compliant, of the 800 farms to be inspected.</p> <p>No quantitative outcome given (e.g. % increase in compliance)</p>		
Comments / Recommendations				

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	<p>In part.</p> <p>All farms on or adjacent to designated (protected) sites will be required to have Site Management Plans developed with NRW setting out actions</p>	

			to better protect and restore vulnerable habitats. (1,215). Comment: This action could be strengthened if the goal were to have all the farms implement management plans, rather than having management plans developed.	
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.	
S.3.1.e. S.3.2.e. S.3.3.e.	Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?	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?	In part. There is no overall baseline/outcome for the stressor; one independent baselines/outcome for each respective action.		
Comments / Recommendations				