

CNL(26)30

Review of Draft Conservation Commitments Report

Date	Party / jurisdiction	Draft CCR – February 2026
February 2026	Russian Federation	Russian Federation - Draft CCR submitted February 2026

Overview of Conservation Commitments Report

Overall Comments / Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Review Group noted that most of the actions in the CCR are ongoing actions previously reported on during the last reporting cycle and that no new initiatives are being proposed. The Review Group noted that for the first two stressors that there are not clear starting points and milestones established for the actions. These are intended to provide a means for the review group to evaluate progress towards achievement of the tangible outcome. For several of the actions in this CCR, the goals and milestones are the same as the tangible outcome which makes it difficult for the Review Group to assess progress.

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?	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)?	Yes. The action aims to reduce fishing effort for the two coastal mixed-stock fisheries impacting Russian stocks.		
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. Although the units are identified "the length of the fishing season, the number of fishing sites and fishing gear", the starting point is identified as 0.		
S.1.1.e. S.1.2.e. S.1.3.e.	Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?	No. Goals are provided, but the starting point is 0 and 0 is provided for each milestone year.		

		It is unclear what these 0's refers to.		
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?	<p>In part.</p> <p>Reducing fishing effort, and hence exploitation, on Russian stocks will enable progress towards the achievement of the Strategic Goal</p> <p>However, it is unclear what the baseline and milestones represent</p>		
Comments / Recommendations				
<p>It is recommended that a clear baseline metric be developed to allow for tracking progress</p> <p>It is unclear what effort(s) will be undertaken to reduce the impact of this stressor</p>				

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)?	<p>In part.</p> <p>Increased patrols should result in decreased illegal fishing, but it isn't clear if this will result in decreased unreported catch</p> <p>Also, the Party has not provided estimates of unreported catch</p>		

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. The starting point is 0 (estimated unreported catch) and it is not possible to decrease this		
S.2.1.e. S.2.2.e. S.2.3.e.	Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?	No. The starting point is 0 (estimated unreported catch) and the milestones remain at 0. Also, the Party has not provided estimates of unreported catch.		
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. A quantitative baseline is referenced (estimated unreported catch), but: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it is not clear how this will be affected by increased patrols; and estimates of unreported catch have not been provided. 		

Comments / Recommendations

Further explaining the dynamic of how increased patrols will result in a decrease of unreported catch would be beneficial.
It is recommended that a clear baseline metric (e.g., estimated unreported catch) be developed to allow for tracking progress.

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. The tangible outcome was to prevent the spread of <i>G. salaris</i> to any additional rivers. It was noted that the action did not include the eradication of <i>G. salaris</i> from any rivers currently infected.		
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. The starting point is the 3 rivers that are currently infected with <i>G. salaris</i> and the expected outcome is that no new rivers become infected.		
S.3.1.e. S.3.2.e. S.3.3.e.	Are clear interim goals / milestones identified for this action?	Yes. The goals/milestones are to keep the number of infected rivers at three throughout the entire reporting cycle.		
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. The outcome is no newly infected rivers.		
Comments / Recommendations				
This is a continuation of existing efforts as no new actions are proposed.				