

CNL(26)28

Review of Draft Conservation Commitments Report

Date	Party / jurisdiction	Draft CCR – February 2026
February 2026	Iceland	Iceland - Draft CCR submitted February 2026

Overview of Conservation Commitments Report

Overall Comments / Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Review Group recognizes the proposed legislation aimed at reducing the number of escapes from salmon farms to 0 and Iceland’s goals of establishing river-specific conservation limits as ambitious actions that will improve conditions for salmon survival and move towards the removal or diminishment of the relevant stressors.

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. This is not clear in the CCR. Pink salmon is one as well but will not be addressed in the CCR. Clarification of the top three stressors is recommended.
	If not, are the justifications provided for the substitutions adequate?	No. This is not clear in the CCR.

		Clarification of the justification for not selecting pink salmon and why another stressor was selected, is recommended.
--	--	---

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>Yes.</p> <p>Reduction through legislation. New laws aim to reduce genetic impacts from escaped farmed salmon by prohibiting escapees and requiring the highest international standards in aquaculture. Incentives incorporated in legislation & allowing for time to meet the standards of closed containment & Incentives</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Number of rivers impacted.</p> <p>Alternatively, could be number of escapees reduced from X to 0 unless unknown.</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?	Yes. Number of rivers impacted. Alternatively, could be number of escapees reduced from X to 0 unless unknown.		
S.1.1.e. S.1.2.e. S.1.3.e.	Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?	Yes. Number of rivers impacted. Alternatively, could be number of escapees reduced from X to 0 unless unknown.		
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. A reduction of rivers impact is measurable and in line with NASCO's strategic goal.		
Comments / Recommendations Alternatively to the number of rivers impacted, the reduction in the number of escapees could be used unless the starting number of escapees is unknown.				

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. As it reads in the CCR, establish biological reference points (CL) for all rivers fisheries management did not include improved fisheries management, which is the action of impact. Recommendation: Clarify that the combination of CL and subsequent and immediate management of rivers is the action.		
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. 12% of rivers [currently] represents 40% of catch.		
S.2.1.e. S.2.2.e. S.2.3.e.	Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?	Yes. Goal of 100% by 2032.		
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.		
Comments / Recommendations				
The Review Group recommends a revision: goals are incremental with end goal of 100% of rivers with CL but the action is management implemented in conjunction with the CLs developed.				

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. Reduction of stocking activities via increased awareness (changing mindset).	Yes. Reduction of stocking activities via Enhanced legal framework	Yes. Reduction of stocking activities via Enhanced enforcement and surveillance.
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?	No. The jurisdiction was unsure how to develop metric and welcomed suggestions. Recommendation: Metrics must be measurable. As an example, the starting point could be 0, and targets of x interactions/meetings to explain the disadvantages of stocking.	No. The enhanced legal framework likely provides details such as incentives, penalties, expectation of stocking plans. Recommendation: Metrics must be measurable. As an example, the starting point could be 0 plans, and targets of X plans at intervals with end target of 100% of stocking with authorized stocking plans.	No. The metric should be related to the activity such as number of surveillance activities as baseline and how many will be undertaken over the course of the reporting period. Recommendation: Metrics must be measurable. As an example, the starting point could be X surveillance, and targets of Y activities at intervals with Z.
S.3.1.e. S.3.2.e. S.3.3.e.	Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?	No. Based on interview.	No. Based on interview.	No. Based on interview.

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.
Comments / Recommendations The Review Group recommends a revision: Comprehensive actions to address issues of stocking with overall goal to reduce stocking / authorized plans, via awareness, new legal framework, and enforcement and surveillance provided the metrics for all actions identified under stressor 3 are revised to reflect the actions rather than the rivers.		