

CNL(26)18

Review of Draft Conservation Commitments Report

Date	Party / jurisdiction	Draft CCR – February 2026
February 2026	DFG-Greenland	DFG_Greenland - Draft CCR submitted February 2026

Overview of Conservation Commitments Report

Overall Comments / Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This CCR address the stressors associated with the sole salmon river in this jurisdiction. The Review Group noted the limited data associated with this catchment, but would encourage additional information to be given to clarify and update the actions outlined.

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. However, no other stakeholders were consulted in developing the CCR.

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?	Yes.
	If not, are the justifications provided for the substitutions adequate?	Not applicable.

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)?	<p>No.</p> <p>This action describes a human co-ordinating activity associated with salmon conservation, but its intended application to salmon conservation is not clearly set out.</p> <p>It is unclear what the stated measurable units refer to [80% baseline; 90% tangible outcome.</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>This action describes a human co-ordinating activity associated with salmon conservation, but its intended application to salmon conservation is not clearly set out. Specific information on whether enforcement or other activities are envisaged or intended to be implemented would be valuable to provide.</p> <p>Clarity on what the 85 refers to is required (e.g. is it 85 per visit to the river or 85 in total?)</p>	

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?	No. It is unclear what the stated measurable units refer to [80% baseline; 90% tangible outcome.	Yes.	
S.1.1.e. S.1.2.e. S.1.3.e.	Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?	No. It is unclear what the stated measurable units refer to [80% baseline; 90% tangible outcome. In addition, for S.1.1.e <i>actual progress for year being reported on</i> is stated as <i>10</i> . This should be deleted as there is no reporting yet.	No. None provided.	
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?	No. It is unclear what the stated measurable units refer to.		

Comments / Recommendations

For Action 1:

- It is recommended that the intended application of increased knowledge on catches to salmon conservation and the sustainable management of the fishery is more clearly set out (i.e. provide more detail on how increased knowledge of catches are intended to translate to actual tangible benefits to salmon).
- Please clarify what the stated measurable units refer to.
- For S.1.1.e *actual progress for year being reported on* is stated as *10*. This should be deleted as there is no reporting yet.

For Action 2:

- It is recommended that more specific details of the control measures intended and the tangible outcomes for salmon conservation and the sustainable management of the fishery are more clearly set out. Specific information on regulatory activities are envisaged or intended to be implemented would be valuable to provide.
- Please clarify what the 85 refers to (e.g. is it 85 per visit to the river or 85 in total?)

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)?	No. Zero pink salmon is the stated outcome but also stated that numbers of pink salmon stated to be <i>kept down</i> . The intention is presumably to eradicate any pink salmon detected.		
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?	No. Recommendation: to amend to "number of pink salmon" rather than just "pink salmon".		
S.2.1.e. S.2.2.e. S.2.3.e.	Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?	In part. It is stated as zero for each reporting year. The intention is presumably to eradicate any pink salmon detected.		

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?	The action would benefit from some reframing to better reflect its intentions which are to monitor and control or eradicate pink salmon.
--------	---	--

Comments / Recommendations

The action would benefit from some reframing to better reflect its intentions which are to monitor and control or eradicate pink salmon. Provision of some specific details on the monitoring planned and mitigations intended is recommended.

The lead entity responsible for delivering the action is not stated in S.2.1.a. This information should be provided.

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?	No.		
	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)?	No. Information provided is very limited.		
S.3.1.c. S.3.2.c.	Does the action have a clear starting point (baseline) against which progress towards the outcome can be measured?	No. Not clear what the baseline is referring to (presumably the		

S.3.3.c.		baseline pristine state of the river).		
S.3.1.e. S.3.2.e. S.3.3.e.	Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?	No. Not clear what the interim goals / milestones are referring to.		
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?	No. Too succinct to evaluate [When the river is monitored, changes can be detected possibly mitigation measures can be established to Kapisillit salmon stock]. Is the intention to put climate monitoring infrastructure in the river to monitor any climate changes that may affect salmon and use this as a mechanism to inform any management response required.		
Comments / Recommendations				
It is recommended that more specific information be provided to better define its intentions, which are to monitor climate change and respond where necessary. This includes the provision of some specific details on the intended monitoring planned.				