



**SCREENING DECISION REPORT  
NIRB FILE No.: 26YN015**

NPC File No.: 26YN015

April 10, 2026

Following the Nunavut Impact Review Board’s (NIRB or Board) assessment of all materials provided, the NIRB is recommending that a review of California Institute of Technology’s, Jet Propulsion Lab’s “CRISTAL Airborne Survey” is not required pursuant to Article 12, Section 12.4.4(a) of the *Agreement between the Inuit of the Nunavut Settlement Area and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada (Nunavut Agreement)* and s. 92(1)(a) of the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act*, S.C. 2013, c. 14, s. 2 (*NuPPAA*).

Subject to the Proponent’s compliance with the terms and conditions as set out in below, issued in accordance with s. 92(2)(a) of *NuPPAA*, the NIRB is of the view that the project proposal is not likely to cause significant public concerns, and it is unlikely to result in significant adverse environmental and social impacts. The NIRB therefore recommends that the responsible Minister accepts this Screening Decision Report.

**OUTLINE OF SCREENING DECISION REPORT**

**REGULATORY FRAMEWORK..... 1**

**PROJECT OVERVIEW & THE NIRB ASSESSMENT PROCESS..... 2**

**ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT PROPOSAL IN ACCORDANCE WITH PART 3 OF *NUPPAA*..... 4**

**VIEWS OF THE BOARD ..... 6**

**RECOMMENDED PROJECT-SPECIFIC TERMS AND CONDITIONS ..... 8**

**OTHER NIRB CONCERNS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 9**

**CONCLUSION ..... 10**

**TABLES**

**TABLE 1: NIRB’S ASSESSMENT PROCESS.....2**

**TABLE 2: COMMENTS RECEIVED .....3**

**TABLE 3: SUMMARY OF THE BOARD’S ASSESSMENT OF FACTORS s. 90 *NUPPAA* .....4**

**APPENDICES**

**APPENDIX A: SPECIES AT RISK IN NUNAVUT .....10**

**REGULATORY FRAMEWORK**

The primary objectives of the NIRB are set out in Article 12, Section 12.2.5 of the *Nunavut Agreement* and are confirmed by s. 23 of the *NuPPAA*. The purpose of screening is provided for under Article 12, Section 12.4.1 of the *Nunavut Agreement* and s. 88 of the *NuPPAA*.

As set out under Article 12, Section 12.4.4 of the *Nunavut Agreement* and s. 92(1) of the *NuPPAA*, upon conclusion of the screening process, the Board must provide its written report the Minister indicating one of three options:

- (a) a review of the project is not required;
- (b) a review of the project is required; or
- (c) the project should be modified or abandoned.

## PROJECT OVERVIEW & THE NIRB ASSESSMENT PROCESS

On February 24, 2026 the NIRB received a referral to screen California Institute of Technology’s, Jet Propulsion Lab’s “CRISTAL Airborne Survey” project proposal (NIRB File No: 26YN015) from the Nunavut Planning Commission (Commission), with an accompanying positive conformity determination with the North Baffin Regional Land Use Plan. All documents received and pertaining to this project proposal can be accessed from the NIRB’s Public Registry by using any of the following search criteria or [www.nirb.ca/project/126354](http://www.nirb.ca/project/126354).

- Project Name: CRISTAL Airborne Survey
- NIRB File No.: 26YN015
- NIRB Application No.: 126354

**Table 1: NIRB’s Assessment Process**

Date	Stage
February 24, 2026	Receipt of project proposal and positive conformity determination (North Baffin Regional Land Use Plan) from the Commission
February 24, 2026	Pursuant to s. 144(1) of the <i>NuPPAA</i> the NIRB requested the Proponent complete an online application to address information required for Screening
March 4, 2026	Receipt of online application from Proponent
March 11, 2026	Scoping pursuant to s. 86(1) of the <i>NuPPAA</i>
March 12, 2026	NIRB conducted an inclusion or exclusion of scope
March 12, 2026	Public engagement and comment request (which included draft terms and conditions) was issued in English with translations provided once available
April 2, 2026	Receipt of public comments
April 10, 2026	Issuance of Screening Decision Report

### 1. Project Scope

<b>Location</b>	In and around Cambridge Bay, spanning across sea ice between the Kitikmeot Region, Qikiqtani Region and the Inuvialuit Region.
<b>Objective</b>	The Proponent intends to conduct aerial surveys to measure sea ice to help develop algorithms for accurately estimating sea ice thickness.
<b>Timeline</b>	April 9, 2026, to April 23, 2026; one-time project with an anticipated duration of approximately two weeks.

As required under s. 86(1) of the *NuPPAA*, the Board accepted the scope of the project as set out by California Institute of Technology, Jet Propulsion Lab’s in the proposal. The scope of the project proposal includes the following undertakings, works, or activities:

- **Undertakings, Works and Activities**
  - Proponent intends to conduct aerial surveys over the sea ice between the Inuvialuit Region spreading across the Kitikmeot region and North Qikiqtani region to measure sea ice thickness.
  - Proponent would operate up to two flights a day, departing from and landing at Cambridge Bay.
- **Fuel & Equipment**
  - Use of one Basler BT-67 would be used to carry a group of up to 10 people to conduct the aerial survey.
  - Up to 600L of fuel may be used per flight hour.
  - No fuel would be stored on site, refueling would be done prior to departure.
- **Waste**
  - Waste generation is not anticipated as all operations would occur within the aircraft

## 2. Inclusion or Exclusion to Scoping List

- The NIRB has identified no additional works or activities in relation to the project proposal; as a result, the NIRB will proceed with screening the project based on the scope as described above.

## 3. Public Comments and Concerns

As outlined in Table 1 above, notices regarding the NIRB’s screening of this project proposal were distributed to community organizations as well as to relevant federal and territorial government agencies, Inuit organizations and other parties with a request for interested parties to provide the Board with any comments or concerns regarding:

- Whether the project proposal is likely to arouse significant public concern; and if so, why;
- Whether the project proposal is likely to cause significant adverse eco-systemic or socio-economic effects; and if so, why;
- Whether the project proposal is likely to cause significant adverse impacts on wildlife habitat or Inuit harvest activities; and if so, why;
- Whether the project proposal is of a type where the potential adverse effects are highly predictable and mitigable with known technology, (and providing any recommended mitigation measures); and
- Any matter of importance to the Party related to the project proposal.

On or before April 2, 2026, the NIRB received comments from the following interested parties:

**Table 2: Comments Received**

Commenting Party	NIRB Doc ID No.
Transport Canada	360253
Government of Nunavut	360588
Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada	360626

**a. Summary of Comments and Concerns Received**

The following provides a summary of the comments and concerns received by the NIRB in relation to the CRISTAL Airborne Survey project proposal:

**Transport Canada**

No comments or concerns were raised.

**Government of Nunavut**

No comments or concerns were raised.

**Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada**

Incorporation of Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit and community knowledge;  
 Mitigation measures to prevent any disturbance to wildlife and the environment, and to prevent disturbances to sites of cultural, archaeological, and/or environmental significance;  
 Involving the community members experience in traditional harvesting activities within or in close proximity to the project area;  
 Procurement opportunities for Inuit and community members and;  
 Regular updates on the status of project activities.

**4. b. Comments and Concerns with respect to Inuit Qaujimaningit, Indigenous and Community Knowledge**

No concerns or comments were received with respect to Inuit Qaujimaningit or Indigenous and Community knowledge in relation to the proposed project. However, Inuit Qaujimaningit and Indigenous and community knowledge is incorporated into the terms and conditions recommended below based on information collected from prior and similar projects, data collected and mapped by the Commission, and other available sources.

**ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT PROPOSAL IN ACCORDANCE WITH PART 3 OF NuPPAA**

In determining whether a review of the project is required, the Board considered whether the project proposal had potential to result in significant ecosystemic or socio-economic impacts. Table 3. The Board took particular care to consider Inuit Qaujimaningit, Indigenous and Community Knowledge in carrying out its assessment and determination of the significance of impacts.

**Table 3: Summary of the Board’s Assessment of Factors s. 90 NuPPAA**

Factor	Comment
The size of the geographic area, including the size of wildlife habitats, likely to be affected by the impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The aerial footprint of the proposed project component spans across sea ice between the Inuvialuit Region, Kitikmeot region and Qikiqtani region.</li> <li>▪ The proposed activities would occur over marine and sea ice environments that may be used by wildlife species, including migratory birds and marine mammals.</li> </ul>

Factor	Comment
The ecosystemic sensitivity of that area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No specific areas of ecosystemic sensitivity have been identified by the Proponent within the project area. The proposed activities are limited to brief aerial surveys that do not involve any ground disturbance. As a result, no significant impacts to sensitive ecosystems are expected.</li> </ul>
The historical, cultural and archaeological significance of that area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No specific areas of historical, cultural and archaeological significance have been identified by the Proponent within the project area. The proposed activities are limited to aerial surveys and do not involve ground disturbance, which limits the potential for interaction with heritage resources.</li> </ul>
The size of the human and the animal populations likely to be affected by the impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The proposed aerial survey activities are unlikely to result in significant adverse impacts to local human or wildlife populations, as they are limited to short-term, non-intrusive overflights with no ground disturbance.</li> </ul>
The nature, magnitude and complexity of the impacts; the probability of the impacts occurring; the frequency and duration of the impacts; and the reversibility or irreversibility of the impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The proposed activities consist of short-term aerial surveys conducted over sea ice using an aircraft. Potential interactions with wildlife or other receptors would be limited to overflight disturbances during survey periods. The activities are temporary in nature and would occur over a limited duration, with no ground disturbance or permanent infrastructure proposed.</li> </ul>
The cumulative impacts that could result from the impacts of the project combined with those of any other project that has been carried out, is being carried out or is likely to be carried out.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The project area includes regions with significant development, including tourism and research. The NIRB has considered past, present, and reasonably foreseeable activities. The Board has recommended terms, conditions, and mitigation measures with consideration for the potential for cumulative effects in the Board Views section.</li> </ul>
Any other factor that the Board considers relevant to the assessment of the significance of impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No other relevant factors were identified; however, see below for Regulatory Requirements mandating mitigation and/or reporting.</li> </ul>

## Regulatory Requirements

*The Proponent is also advised that the following legislation may apply to the Project:*

### Acts and Regulations

1. The *Migratory Birds Convention Act* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/M-7.01/>), the *Migratory Birds Regulations* ([https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/C.R.C.,\\_c.\\_1035/index.html](https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/C.R.C.,_c._1035/index.html)) and the *Migratory Bird Sanctuary Regulations* ([https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/C.R.C.,\\_c.\\_1036/index.html](https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/C.R.C.,_c._1036/index.html)).

2. The *Species at Risk Act* (<https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/s-15.3/>). Attached in **Appendix A** is a list of Species at Risk in Nunavut.
3. The *Wildlife Act (Nunavut)* and its corresponding regulations (<http://www.canlii.org/en/nu/laws/stat/snu-2003-c-26/latest/snu-2003-c-26.html>).
4. The *Aeronautics Act* (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/A-2/>) and the *Canadian Aviation Regulations* (<https://www.tc.gc.ca/eng/acts-regulations/regulations-sor96-433.html>).

#### VIEWS OF THE BOARD

In considering the above factors, the Board has identified the following and respectfully provides its views regarding whether or not the proposed project has the potential to result in significant impacts. The NIRB has also proposed terms and conditions that would mitigate the potential adverse impacts identified.

#### **Ecosystem, wildlife habitat and Inuit harvesting activities:**

<b>Valued Component</b>	Migratory and non-migratory birds, terrestrial wildlife and Species at Risk
<b>Potential effects:</b>	Aircraft overflights may cause temporary disturbance to birds and terrestrial wildlife, including behavioural responses such as avoidance or displacement due to noise and visual presence.
<b>Nature of Impacts:</b>	Impacts are expected to be low in magnitude, short-term, and transient, as aircraft would operate at relatively high altitudes (300-600m over sea ice and higher over land), with no landings or ground-based activities outside of the Cambridge Bay airport. Any disturbances to wildlife are expected to be temporary and limited to the duration of overflights.
<b>Mitigating Factors:</b>	The Proponent would minimize disturbance to wildlife by maintaining appropriate flight altitudes, limiting the duration and frequency of flights, avoiding unnecessary low-level overflights, and using a wildlife spotter where practicable.
<b>Proposed Terms and Conditions:</b>	Migratory birds and Raptors Disturbance – 7 Aircraft Flight Restrictions – 8 through 12 Caribou and Muskoxen Disturbance - 13

<b>Valued Component</b>	Air Quality
<b>Potential effects:</b>	Aircraft operations may result in minor, short-term emissions of exhaust gases.
<b>Nature of Impacts:</b>	Given the limited number, duration, and altitude of flights, these effects are expected to be low and localized, with no measurable impact on air quality in Cambridge Bay or the surrounding environment.
<b>Mitigating Factors:</b>	No specific mitigation measures are required, as project emissions are minor, short-term, and fully reversible.
<b>Proposed Terms and Conditions:</b>	Air Quality - 6

<b>Valued Component</b>	Public and traditional land use activities
<b>Potential effects:</b>	No concerns related to public and traditional land use activities were raised during the comment period. Project activities may interact with areas used for Inuit harvesting and traditional land use.
<b>Nature of Impacts:</b>	Impacts to public and traditional land use activities are expected to be low in magnitude, localized, and short-term, as project activities are limited to high-altitude overflights and no landings or ground-based operations would occur outside the Cambridge Bay airport. Any potential interference with Inuit harvesting activities or land use is expected to be temporary and minimal.
<b>Mitigating Factors:</b>	No specific mitigation measures are provided by the Proponent; however, Board-recommended terms and conditions will guide project activities to avoid interfering with Inuit harvesting and traditional land use practices.
<b>Proposed Terms and Conditions:</b>	Other – 14 through 16

**Socio-economic effects on northerners:**

<b>Valued Component</b>	Socio-economics, including historical and cultural sites
<b>Potential effects:</b>	No concerns related to socio-economic conditions were raised during the comment period. Project activities are limited to aerial overflights and airport-based operations.
<b>Nature of Impacts:</b>	Interactions with local socio-economic conditions would be minimal, as no ground-based activities or changes to infrastructure are proposed outside of the Cambridge Bay Airport.
<b>Mitigating Factors:</b>	No specific mitigation measures related to socio-economic conditions are considered necessary given the nature and scope of the proposed activities.
<b>Proposed Terms and Conditions:</b>	Other – 14 through 16

**Technological innovations for which the effects are unknown:**

- No specific issues have been identified associated with this project proposal.

**Administrative Conditions:**

To encourage compliance with applicable regulatory requirements and assist the Board and responsible authorities with compliance and effects monitoring for project activities, the following project-specific terms and conditions have been recommended: 1-5.

In considering the above factors and subject to the Proponent’s compliance with regulatory requirements and the terms and conditions necessary to mitigate against the potential adverse environmental and social effects, the Board is of the view that the proposed project is unlikely to cause significant public concern and its adverse ecosystemic and socioeconomic impacts are unlikely to be significant, or are highly predictable and can be adequately mitigated by known technologies.

The Board is recommending the following specific terms and conditions to apply in respect of the project:

### **General**

1. California Institute of Technology, Jet Propulsion Laboratory (NASA) (the Proponent) shall maintain a copy of the Project Terms and Conditions at the site of operation at all times and make it accessible to enforcement officers upon request.
2. The Proponent shall operate in accordance with all commitments stated in correspondence provided to the Nunavut Planning Commission (NPC File No.: 151026), and the NIRB (Online Application Form, March 9, 2026). This information should be accessible to enforcement officers upon request.
3. The Proponent shall operate the site in accordance with all applicable Acts, Regulations and Guidelines.
4. The Proponent shall ensure that it meets the standards and/or limits as set out in the authorizing agencies' permits or licences as required for this project.
5. The Proponent shall ensure that all personnel, staff and contractors are adequately trained prior to commencement of all project activities, and shall be made aware of all operational plans, management plans, guidelines and Proponent commitments relating to the project.

### **Air Quality**

6. The Proponent shall eliminate unnecessary idling to reduce greenhouse gas emissions as much as possible.

### **Migratory Birds and Raptors Disturbance**

7. The Proponent shall carry out all phases of the project in a manner that protects migratory birds and avoids harming, killing or disturbing migratory birds or destroying, disturbing or taking their nests or eggs. In this regard, the Proponent shall take into account Environment and Climate Change Canada's *Avoidance Guidelines*. The Proponent's actions in applying the *Avoidance Guidelines* shall be in compliance with the *Migratory Birds Convention Act, 1994* and with the *Species at Risk Act*.

### **Aircraft Flight Restrictions**

8. The Proponent shall not alter flight paths to approach wildlife and avoid flying directly over animals.
9. The Proponent shall plan flight paths that minimize flights over known habitat likely to have birds or concentrations of wildlife. Aircraft should avoid critical and sensitive wildlife areas at all times by choosing alternate flight corridors.
10. The Proponent shall restrict aircraft/helicopter activity related to the project to a minimum flight altitude of 610 metres (2,100 ft) above ground level except during landing, take-off or if there is a specific requirement for low-level flying, which does not disturb wildlife or migratory birds.

11. The Proponent shall avoid known concentrations of birds (e.g., bird colonies, moulting areas) by a lateral distance of 1.5 kilometre. If avoidance is not possible maintain a minimum flight altitude of 1,100 metres (3,500 feet) over these areas.
12. The Proponent shall advise all pilots of relevant flight restrictions and enforce their application over the project area, including flight paths to/from the project area.

### **Caribou and Muskoxen Disturbance**

13. During the period of April 14 to June 1 when muskoxen are present, the Proponent shall not approach muskoxen closer than one (1) kilometer. This includes all operations, including low-level over flights, blasting, and use of snowmobiles and all-terrain vehicles outside the immediate vicinity of the camps.

### **Other**

14. The Proponent should engage with local residents regarding planned activities in the area and should solicit available Inuit Qaujimaningit and information regarding current recreational and traditional usage of the project area which may inform project activities. Posting of translated public notices and direct engagement with potentially interested groups and individuals prior to undertaking project activities is strongly encouraged.
15. The Proponent should consult with local residents regarding their activities in the area and solicit available Inuit Qaujimaningit and information that can inform project activities.
16. The Proponent shall ensure that project activities do not interfere with Inuit wildlife harvesting or traditional land use activities.

## OTHER NIRB CONCERNS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In addition to the project-specific terms and conditions, the Board is recommending the following:

### **Change in Project Scope**

1. Responsible authorities or Proponent shall notify the Nunavut Planning Commission and/or Parks Canada as appropriate, and the NIRB of any changes in operating plans or conditions, including phase advancement, associated with this project prior to any such change.

### **Copy of licences, etc. to the Board and Commission**

2. The NIRB respectfully requests that responsible authorities submit a copy of each licence, permit or other authorization issued for the Project to the NIRB to assist in enabling possible project monitoring that may be required. Please forward a copy of the licences, permits and/or other authorizations to the NIRB directly at [info@nirb.ca](mailto:info@nirb.ca) or upload a copy to the NIRB's online registry at [www.nirb.ca](http://www.nirb.ca).

### **Use of Inuit Qaujimaningit**

3. The Proponent is encouraged to work with local communities and knowledge holders to inform project design, to carry out the project, and to confirm or validate the perspectives represented in publications, and reports as part of the project. Care should be taken to ensure that Inuit Qaujimaningit and local knowledge collected for the project is used with permission and is accurately represented.

### **Species at Risk**

4. The Proponent review Environment and Climate Change Canada’s “Environment Assessment Best Practice Guide for Wildlife at Risk in Canada”, available at the following link: [http://www.sararegistry.gc.ca/virtual\\_sara/files/policies/EA%20Best%20Practices%202004.pdf](http://www.sararegistry.gc.ca/virtual_sara/files/policies/EA%20Best%20Practices%202004.pdf). The guide provides information to the Proponent on what is required when Wildlife at Risk, including *Species at Risk*, are encountered or affected by the project.

### **Migratory Birds**

5. The Proponent review Canadian Wildlife Services’ “Key migratory bird terrestrial habitat sites in the Northwest Territories and Nunavut”, available at the following link: <http://publications.gc.ca/site/eng/317630/publication.html> and “Key marine habitat sites for migratory birds in Nunavut and the Northwest Territories”, available at the following link: <http://publications.gc.ca/site/eng/392824/publication.html>. The guide provides information to the Proponent on key terrestrial and marine habitat areas that are essential to the welfare of various migratory bird species in Canada.
6. For further information on how to protect migratory birds, their nests and eggs when planning or carrying out project activities, consult Environment and Climate Change Canada’s Incidental Take web page and the fact sheet “Planning Ahead to Reduce the Risk of Detrimental Effects to Migratory Birds, and their Nests and Eggs” available at: [http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection\\_2013/ec/CW66-324-2013-eng.pdf](http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2013/ec/CW66-324-2013-eng.pdf).

### **Aircraft Identification**

7. The Proponent shall provide the community of the planned helicopter activities, including photo(s) of the helicopter to be used, approximate flight paths, plans and times as available prior to commencement of activities to ensure community members are aware of the planned activities.

## CONCLUSION

The foregoing constitutes the Board’s screening decision with respect to the California Institute of Technology, Jet Propulsion Laboratory (NASA)’s “CRISTAL Airborne Survey”. The NIRB remains available for consultation with the Minister regarding this report as necessary.

Dated April 10, 2026 at Iqaluit, NU.



Albert Ehaloak, *Acting* Chairperson

Attachments: Appendix A: Species at Risk in Nunavut

## APPENDIX A: SPECIES AT RISK IN NUNAVUT

Due to the requirements of Section 79(2) of the *Species at Risk Act*, S.C. 2002, c. 29 (*SARA*), and the potential for project-specific adverse effects on listed wildlife species and its critical habitat, measures should be taken as appropriate to avoid or lessen those effects, and the effects need to be monitored. Project effects could include species disturbance, attraction to operations and

destruction of habitat. This section applies to all species listed on Schedule 1 of *SARA*, as listed in the table below, or have been assessed by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC), which may be encountered in the project area. This list may not include all species identified as at risk by the Territorial Government. The following points provide clarification on the applicability of the species outlined in the table.

- Schedule 1 is the official legal list of Species at Risk for *SARA*. *SARA* applies to all species on Schedule 1. The term “listed” species refers to species on Schedule 1.
- Schedule 2 and 3 of *SARA* identify species that were designated at risk by the COSEWIC prior to October 1999 and must be reassessed using revised criteria before they can be considered for addition to Schedule 1.
- Some species identified at risk by COSEWIC are “pending” addition to Schedule 1 of *SARA*. These species are under consideration for addition to Schedule 1, subject to further consultation or assessment.

If species at risk are encountered or affected, the primary mitigation measure should be avoidance. The Proponent should avoid contact with or disturbance to each species, its habitat and/or its residence. All direct, indirect, and cumulative effects should be considered. Refer to species status reports and other information on the Species at Risk Registry at <http://www.sararegistry.gc.ca> for information on specific species.

Monitoring should be undertaken by the Proponent to determine the effectiveness of mitigation and/or identify where further mitigation is required. As a minimum, this monitoring should include recording the locations and dates of any observations of Species at Risk, behaviour or actions taken by the animals when project activities were encountered, and any actions taken by the proponent to avoid contact or disturbance to the species, its habitat, and/or its residence. This information should be submitted to the appropriate regulators and organizations with management responsibility for that species, as requested.

For species primarily managed by the Territorial Government, the Territorial Government should be consulted to identify other appropriate mitigation and/or monitoring measures to minimize effects to these species from the project.

Mitigation and monitoring measures must be undertaken in a way that is consistent with applicable recovery strategies and action/management plans.

Schedules of *SARA* are amended on a regular basis, so it is important to check the *SARA* registry ([www.sararegistry.gc.ca](http://www.sararegistry.gc.ca)) to get the current status of a species.

Updated: September 2024

<b>Terrestrial Species at Risk<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>COSEWIC Designation</b>	<b>Schedule of SARA</b>	<b>Government Organization with Primary Management Responsibility<sup>2</sup></b>
Buff-breasted Sandpiper	Special Concern	Schedule 1	Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC)
Common Nighthawk	Threatened	Schedule 1	ECCC
Eskimo Curlew	Endangered	Schedule 1	ECCC
Harlequin Duck	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Harris's Sparrow	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Horned Grebe	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Ivory Gull	Endangered	Schedule 1	ECCC
Olive-sided Flycatcher	Threatened	Schedule 1	ECCC
Peregrine Falcon	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Red Knot Islandica Subspecies	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Red-necked Phalarope	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Ross's Gull	Threatened	Schedule 1	ECCC
Rusty Blackbird	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Short-eared Owl	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Porsild's Bryum	Threatened	Schedule 1	Government of Nunavut (GN)
Transverse Lady Beetle	Special Concern	No Schedule	GN
Caribou (Dolphin and Union Population)	Endangered	Schedule 1	GN
Caribou (Barren-ground Population)	Threatened	No Schedule	GN
Caribou (Torngat Mountains Population)	Endangered	No Schedule	GN
Grizzly Bear (Western Population)	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Peary Caribou	Endangered	Schedule 1	GN
Polar Bear	Special Concern	Schedule 1	ECCC
Wolverine	Special Concern	Schedule 1	GN
Atlantic Walrus (High Arctic Population)	Special Concern	No Schedule	Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO)
Atlantic Walrus (Central/Low Arctic Population)	Special Concern	No Schedule	DFO
Beluga Whale (Cumberland Sound Population)	Threatened	Schedule 1	DFO
Beluga Whale (Eastern Hudson Bay Population)	Endangered	No Schedule	DFO
Beluga Whale (Eastern High Arctic-Baffin Bay Population)	Special Concern	No Schedule	DFO
Beluga Whale (Western Hudson Bay Population)	Special Concern	No Schedule	DFO
Atlantic Cod (Arctic Lakes Population)	Special Concern	No Schedule	DFO
Fourhorn Sculpin (Freshwater Form)	Data Deficient	Schedule 3	DFO
Lumpfish	Threatened	No Schedule	DFO
Thorny Skate	Special Concern	No Schedule	DFO

<sup>1</sup> The Department of Fisheries and Oceans has responsibility for aquatic species.

<sup>2</sup> Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) has a national role to play in the conservation and recovery of Species at Risk in Canada, as well as responsibility for management of birds described in the Migratory Birds Convention Act (MBCA). Day-to-day management of terrestrial species not covered in the MBCA is the responsibility of the Territorial Government. Populations that exist in National Parks are also managed under the authority of the Parks Canada Agency.

