

**Report of the Conservation Committee Planning meeting**  
**20<sup>th</sup> June 2016, Panorama Room, Hotel Toplice, Bled, Slovenia**  
**09.30 – 12.30**

**Summary of agreed recommendations**

<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
4	Terms of Reference for the Conservation Planning meeting	The meeting <b>agreed</b> that the Chair would include several options on the timing of the Conservation Committee planning meeting in square brackets in the draft ToR for the Conservation Committee to consider at IWC66.
5b	draft Ship Strikes Strategic Plan	The meeting <b>requested</b> that the draft Ship Strikes Strategic Plan be circulated for review before IWC66 at the earliest opportunity. The meeting <b>agreed</b> that the Chair would develop some generic guidance on the development of thematic strategic plans for further discussion.
5c	Whale watching	The meeting <b>agreed</b> that the Chair of the Whale Watching Standing Working Group and the Secretariat would work together to update the current Whale Watching Strategic Plan to present to the Conservation Committee at IWC66. The meeting <b>agreed</b> that the Conservation Committee discuss how to engage with the IORA Network should it be established and engagement with countries that are not members of IWC.
5d	Conservation Management Plans	The meeting <b>agreed</b> that a small meeting on CMPs would be held in the margins of IWC66. The meeting <b>agreed</b> to add an item on the Small Cetaceans Task Team on the Conservation Committee agenda for IWC66.
5e	Bycatch	The meeting <b>agreed</b> to participate in the intersessional group on bycatch established by the Scientific Committee. The meeting <b>agreed</b> that the potential for a CMP on bycatch or similar initiative should be further discussed at the Conservation Committee and that the issue of by-catch should be put forward as a standing item on the Conservation Committee agenda.
5g	Conservation Committee input to review of the South Atlantic Sanctuary Proposal and the second decadal review of the Southern Ocean Sanctuary	The meeting <b>agreed</b> with the process put forward by the UK (outlined under agenda item 5g). It further <b>agreed</b> that the process and timetable should be circulated to the Conservation Committee as soon as possible after the meeting, and <b>requested</b> the UK to initiate follow up with the SAWS proponents and the SOS steering group.
6	Strategic Plan and work plan for the Conservation Committee	The meeting <b>agreed</b> that an intersessional group would work with Australia to further progress the draft strategic plan. The meeting <b>agreed</b> to seek Scientific Committee representation on this group. The meeting <b>agreed</b> that periodicity of Conservation Committee meetings would be discussed at the next Conservation Committee. The meeting <b>agreed</b> that these options would be further defined intersessionally and the Secretariat would provide estimated costings of these options for discussion by the Conservation Committee.

7a	ad hoc Working Group on Relationships between the SC and CC	The meeting <b>recommended</b> that Rojas-Bracho, as chair of the ad hoc Working Group on Relationships between the SC and CC (SC/CC WG), continue to work with the joint Conservation Committee Scientific Committee Working Group and the Secretariat to refine the process for compiling conservation recommendations.
7b	Intersessional Correspondence Group on Strengthening Finance/Voluntary Conservation Fund	The meeting thanked the Secretariat for their work to support the development of this group. It highlighted the importance of the issue being presented and discussed at the Commission meeting in October. The need for a Chair of the ICGSF was stressed and volunteers invited to approach the Secretariat.
9	Draft Conservation Committee agenda	The meeting asked the Secretariat to consider the relevant points raised at the meeting and amend the draft Conservation Committee agenda accordingly before it is circulated to the Commission.

### 1. Welcome and aims of the meeting

### 2. Election of Chair

The meeting was chaired by Jamie Rendell, UK (Vice-chair of the Conservation Committee)

### 3. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted without change.

The list of participants is given at Annex A and the adopted agenda is given at Annex B. A list of documents available to the meeting is given at Annex C.

### 4. Appointment of Rapporteur

Sarah Ferriss and Sarah Smith of the Secretariat were appointed as rapporteurs.

### 5. Terms of Reference and aims of the meeting

The Chair introduced the proposed Terms of Reference for the Conservation Committee planning meeting (IWC/J16/CCPM/01). He highlighted the need to formally establish the role of the meeting in helping to set the agenda for the Conservation Committee and to ensure progress with intersessional work. He explained that the draft Terms of Reference would be discussed by the Conservation Committee at IWC66.

Rojas-Bracho (Mexico) suggested that the meeting should work in a manner similar to the Convenors meeting of the Scientific Committee.

In response to a query on how often the meeting should be held, the Chair, supported by Rojas-Bracho suggested that it meets at least annually and that a flexible approach be taken. The Chair felt it was useful to meet directly after the Scientific Committee, if the joint Working Group of the Conservation Committee and Scientific was taking place. Rojas-Bracho concurred that the Conservation Committee Planning be held after the joint Working Group of the Conservation Committee and Scientific Committee. Gales (Australia) highlighted the need to consider different options for the timing of the meetings.

The meeting **agreed** that the Chair would include several options on the timing of the Conservation Committee planning meeting in square brackets in the draft ToR for the Conservation Committee to consider at IWC66.

### 6. Progress update from the Conservation Committee and its intersessional Working Groups

#### a. Conservation Committee

Rendell (UK) recalled that the 2015 Conservation Committee planning meeting agreed to develop an outward facing Strategic Plan to describe: (1) the Committee's structure, broad role, goals/objectives and priorities; (2)

the approach used by the Committee to add value to the work undertaken by the Scientific Committee; (3) the Committee's achievements to date; and (4) how the Committee will engage with its range of stakeholders including other intergovernmental organisations. Several of the Working Groups under the Conservation Committee are also developing topic-specific strategic plans. This item was discussed in more detail in agenda item 7.

b. Ship Strikes Working Group

Brownell (US) provided an update on the intersessional work of the Ship Strikes Working Group including the development of a Ship Strikes Strategic Plan. Brownell proposed the Plan could include four sections: (1) literature review; (2) summary of previous workshops; (3) plan for mitigation of ship strikes in relation to conservation and (4) plan for mitigation in relation to welfare aspects. The plan would cover a five-year period and would be updated as necessary. A draft plan would be presented to the Commission at IWC66 in October 2016.

In discussion, the meeting **requested** the US to circulate the Plan at the earliest opportunity to allow review prior to IWC66. It agreed that the ships strikes working groups in both the Conservation Committee and Scientific Committee should be involved. The Meeting also agreed that the Ship Strikes Strategic Plan could be a relatively short document.

In response to a query on whether engagement with other organisations, in particular the International Maritime Organisation (IMO), should be included in the Ship Strikes Strategic Plan the Secretariat, supported by Gales (Australia), Rojas-Bracho (Mexico) and Briand (Monaco), recalled that the Commission had made a series of recommendations relating to engagement with the IMO and other organisations, and it would be useful to capture these. Briand emphasised the value of engaging with other organisations as a way to maximise the impact of actions.

The meeting noted that there could be a section in the Ship Strikes Strategic Plan on working with the cruise industry to develop a training and awareness programme. Ritter (Belgium) recalled that the Scientific Committee, through its Human Induced Mortality Sub-Committee, had produced two documents specifically directed to the cruise industry.

Stachowitsch (Austria) suggested that it would be useful to highlight successes to date, for example measures taken in Boston Harbour to reduce ship strikes to cetaceans. Brownell noted the measures taken in Panama and the US, and Iñiguez (Argentina) added that he could provide information on measures Argentina had taken to protect Southern Right Whales.

The meeting agreed to a suggestion by the Chair that it would be useful to produce guidance on development of thematic strategic plans for use by working groups. As well as communicating the aims within each thematic area, the plans would provide a link between science and policy. The meeting **agreed** that the Chair would develop some generic guidance for further discussion.

c. Standing Working Group on Whale Watching

Wulff (US) provided an update on the intersessional work of the Whale Watching Working Group including the development of the Whale Watching Handbook, an update on activities undertaken to implement the Strategic Plan for Whale Watching, and the outcomes of the workshop *'Building sustainable whale watching tourism in the Indian Ocean region'*.

*Whale Watching Handbook*

Wulff noted that the focus of the intersessional work of the Whale Watching Working Group had been the development of the Whale Watching Handbook (IWC/J16/CCPM/02). An early version of the Handbook would be available for comment at IWC66 in October 2016.

The Chair drew attention to a query from the Scientific Committee on engaging the whale watching industry and the Scientific Committee in the development of the Handbook. Wulff responded that the Scientific Committee would lead on the development of some sections of the Handbook and suggested that further dialogue was needed. He also highlighted previous engagement with the industry undertaken by the IWC.

In response to a query on whether funding would be needed to complete the Handbook, Wulff noted that a limited amount of voluntary funding from the US was available to support the drafting of the beta version. However, at IWC66, the Commission might need to consider additional funding, including through voluntary contributions, in order to fully complete the Handbook.

The meeting **welcomed** the progress made on the development of the Handbook and thanked the intersessional group for their work.

#### *Whale Watching Strategic Plan*

The meeting recognised that the Whale Watching Strategic Plan covered the period 2011-2016 and was therefore due to finish this year. The Working Group had not yet discussed the development of a new Strategic Plan.

The Chair proposed a process whereby strategic plans are developed by Contracting Governments and subsequently updated by the Secretariat to ensure they remain current. The Secretariat added that it could undertake 'light touch' updates, for example, summarising intersessional progress and adding any new areas of ongoing work, and then circulate to the relevant Working Group for comments. Wulff, supported by Gales (Australia), stated that the development of an entirely new Plan would be a significant task, and instead it supported updating the current Plan in this way.

Simmonds (UK) suggested that any future work with IORA agreed at IWC66 could be included in the Whale Watching Strategic Plan (see item below).

The meeting **agreed** that the Chair of the Whale Watching Standing Working Group and the Secretariat would work together to update the current Whale Watching Strategic Plan to present to the Conservation Committee at IWC66.

#### *IORA workshop 'Building sustainable whale watching tourism in the Indian Ocean region'*

Wulff provided an update on the workshop 'Building sustainable whale watching tourism in the Indian Ocean region', which was held in February 2016 in Sri Lanka (IWC/66/CC03). The workshop was delivered in partnership with the Indian Ocean Rim Association, the IWC, the Governments of Australia and Sri Lanka, and Murdoch University's Cetacean Research Unit. Workshop participants made a number of recommendations, which will be presented at IWC66 in October 2016.

Simmonds (the workshop convener) added that workshop participants had come from 16 countries in the Indian Ocean region, and represented a range of different stages of development of the whale watching industry. Workshop participants made a series of recommendations including on: sharing of information and expertise amongst IORA Member States; continuing engagement with the IWC; capacity building to disseminate information; and the establishment of an IORA whale and dolphin watching Network. The recommendations will be presented to the IORA Council of Ministers in October 2016.

Simmonds explained that, if the workshop recommendations are endorsed by the IORA Council of Ministers, the IWC will need to consider how to engage with the Network. He noted the Scientific Committee had established an intersessional group to provide advice to IORA as appropriate. This could potentially be combined with an intersessional group from the Conservation Committee to provide management advice. The Chair agreed it would be useful to explore whether the Conservation Committee could join with the intersessional group established by the Scientific Committee to explore engagement with IORA.

Callister (Australia) thanked Simmonds, Wulff and the Secretariat for their roles in delivering the workshop. She noted that some of the IORA countries are not IWC members so it provided an opportunity to demonstrate the IWC's work on conservation issues. The Chair, supported by Santos (Spain), suggested that the Conservation Committee may wish to encourage engagement with countries that are not members of the IWC.

Simmonds noted that workshop participants were from government departments of relevance to whale watching and they may have links to other government departments working on the range of issues affecting cetaceans.

The meeting **agreed** that the Conservation Committee would discuss how to engage with the IORA Network should it be established and engagement with countries that are not members of IWC.

d. Standing Working Group on Conservation Management Plans

As incoming Chair of the Standing Working Group on Conservation Management Plans, Callister (Australia) provided an update on intersessional activity since IWC65 and proposed future priorities. She noted that three CMPs are already in place, and that Peru had recently joined the SE Pacific Southern Right Whale CMP. Callister explained that the work plan identifies possible future CMPs and noted interest from Argentina in having a workshop to develop a CMP on the Franciscana. Callister noted that funds are available in the Voluntary Fund for CMPs, which offers opportunity for further progress. The Working Group and the Chair of the Finance and Administration Committee are working with the Secretariat to clarify the process to release funds in a timely way.

Callister proposed the Working Group would hold a teleconference to discuss progress with the work plan and next steps, including threat based CMPs.

Iñíguez (Argentina) provided an update on the CMPs for southern right whales, which included activities to determine the interactions between kelp gulls and the Southern Right Whales due to high mortality of calves in the Peninsular Valdez area. Although his role as coordinator had officially finished in 2014, Iñíguez had continued to coordinate these activities until a successor was in place. Brazil may take on the coordination role.

Iñíguez recalled that Argentina and Brazil had expressed interest in nominating the Franciscana for CMP. Some work had already been undertaken and it was hoped that a draft would be ready for presentation at IWC66.

Mattila (IWC Secretariat) suggested that CMPs were useful tools that identified and supported capacity building needs on entanglement. Iñíguez added that they were discussing the potential for regional training with Mattila. Simmonds (UK) drew attention to the work of the Small Cetacean Task Team on the Franciscana and suggested that this could be reported to the Conservation Committee at IWC66.

Brownell (US) highlighted the Arabian Sea Humpback Whale which faced serious problems with entanglement. A CMP for this species had been discussed and although there had been a lot of activity to take this forward, commitment from the Governments had not been secured. Mattila (IWC Secretariat) noted that the Government of Oman had requested disentanglement training and other Governments in the region had also expressed interest.

The meeting agreed that CMPs were a valuable tool and thanked Australia for its work. It **agreed** that a small meeting would be held in the margins of IWC66. The meeting agreed to add an item on the Small Cetaceans Task Team on the Conservation Committee agenda for IWC66.

e. Correspondence group on options for reducing bycatch

At the 2015 meeting of the Conservation Committee Planning meeting, an intersessional group led by Simmonds (UK) was requested to consider how the Commission might further address bycatch, including what might be included in a threat-based CMP for bycatch.

Simmonds (UK) reported that bycatch was widely discussed across the Scientific Committee agenda and that the Committee had also had some discussions about how it might be best addressed within the context of the IWC. The Scientific Committee had established a correspondence group to further consider the potential for a CMP or alternative mechanism for bycatch and this would provide suggestions in a report to the Conservation Committee. The Scientific Committee had also made a strong overarching statement on the

need for conservation action on bycatch not to be delayed by the need for further research. It also noted the need to engage with other IGOs on bycatch.

The meeting **agreed** that it would be useful for interested members of the Conservation Committee to join this correspondence group and looked forward to hearing its suggestions at the Conservation Committee meeting.

Gales (Australia) noted that there was a clear role for the Scientific Committee in addressing the issue of bycatch, including quantifying the scale of bycatch and providing commentary on the impact on populations of small cetaceans. There was also a clear role for the Conservation Committee in enacting a response to the issue. Stachowitsch noted that reporting on bycatch to the Scientific Committee had decreased and the need to reflect on this.

Gales noted that it was clear how CMPs function when applied to individual species, but that it was more difficult to see how the CMP approach would work on a global scale. There was thus a need for more discussion on how the CMP framework (based on discussion in contiguous countries) would work on a global scale as opposed to a regional one and across so many different range states. Simmonds agreed that devising a threat-based CMP would be novel. He suggested that this might have two main aspects i) establishing general mechanisms for mitigation generally ii) the need for wider engagement, including with other IGOs. The Secretary suggested that, if further considerations revealed that a CMP was not the most optimal vehicle for addressing bycatch, then the IWC may wish to develop an alternative framework for addressing this global issue.

The Secretary, supported by Briand, noted the need to influence other IGOs particularly FAO and RFMOs. He also suggested that an item on bycatch could be added to the Conservation Committee agenda.

The meeting **agreed** that this should be further discussed at the Conservation Committee and the issue of bycatch put forward as a standing item on the Conservation Committee agenda.

f. Working Group on the implementation and follow-up of conservation recommendations

Rendell (UK) recalled that an intersessional group was established through Resolution 2014-4 to undertake a collation and analysis of conservation-relevant recommendations from the Scientific Committee and organise these recommendations into key issues/areas highlighting those that feature regularly.

Rendell explained that the Annex to document IWCJ16/SC-CC/02 contained a compilation of the conservation recommendations from the 2014 and 2015 Scientific Committee reports. Page (UK) introduced the analysis of conservation recommendations outlined in IWC/J16/SC-CC/02. She noted that 138 recommendations had been collated, many of which related to conservation issues not currently on the Conservation Committee agenda. Over half of the recommendations related to co-operation with other organisations (including intergovernmental organisations, Governments, industry etc.), or to policy development and implementation. Other recommendations related to research and monitoring, communications, reporting, convening meetings, fundraising, training, capacity building and data collation.

From this analysis it was recommended the following:

- *Language and presentation* – the joint working group develop guidance on drafting recommendations to ensure that actions: (1) are presented in a consistent manner; (2) have clearly defined objectives and targets; and (3) can stand alone without supporting text.
- *Accessibility* – a database of recommendations should be established to improve their accessibility and to form the basis of a system to assess progress in implementation.
- *Consideration of issues by the Conservation Committee* – the Conservation Committee may wish to amend its agenda to take account of conservation related themes not currently covered.
- *Further analysis* – noting that this was a preliminary piece of work, the UK suggested that the analysis of recommendations could be extended back to 2010 and include a more detailed analysis of whether and how recommendations have been implemented.

Rendell thanked Page and the IWC Secretariat for their work. He explained that the intersessional group and the Secretariat would work together to further refine the process of identification and categorisation of conservation recommendations from the SC.

Wulff (US), supported by Rojas-Bracho (Mexico), drew attention to the number of conservation issues identified in the recommendations that do not currently feature on the Conservation Committee agenda. Stachowitsch drew attention to the high number of recommendations over the two-year period. Wulff asked whether the Conservation Committee agenda could more closely reflect the Scientific Committee's agenda. Simmonds (UK) noted that some recommendations are addressed to other organisations or Governments rather than to the Commission itself and therefore it may not always be necessary for the Conservation Committee to reflect the Scientific Committee's agenda. Rojas-Bracho reflected on the capacity and time available to the Conservation Committee.

Gales (Australia) believed it would be useful to look at how recommendations across the Commission were managed and communicated.

Brockington reflected on the use of Resolutions in the IWC, and whether increased use of Resolutions on a thematic basis may help to organise the issues and better understand the effectiveness of the IWC.

This item was discussed more fully in the meeting of the Joint Working Group of the Conservation Committee and Scientific Committee in the afternoon of 20 June.

- g. Conservation Committee input to review of the South Atlantic Sanctuary Proposal and the second decadal review of the Southern Ocean Sanctuary

Rendell (UK) recalled that, at its 2015 meeting, the Scientific Committee (SC) agreed on a dual process to complete the review of the proposed South Atlantic Whale Sanctuary (SAWS) and the decadal review of the Southern Ocean Sanctuary (SOS). This process established that the Committee would review the scientific aspects of the SAWS proposal and the SOS by the end of its 2016 annual meeting, and that a joint workshop of the Scientific and Conservation Committees would be held after the SC's 2016 annual meeting to order to complete the reviews. The Scientific Committee convened a workshop to review the SAWS proposal on 5-6 June 2016.

At its 2016 meeting the of the Scientific Committee had considered both the South Atlantic Sanctuary Proposal and the second decadal review of the Southern Ocean Sanctuary and for each had identified a number of questions for the Commission to consider. Rendell proposed that these might usefully be considered first by the Conservation Committee in its discussions.

Rendell proposed a process for Conservation Committee input to the reviews of the SAWS proposal and the SOS, bearing in mind that the Conservation Committee should not duplicate the work of the Scientific Committee, as follows:

- To facilitate Conservation Committee input to the review of the SAWS proposal: (1) the proponents of the SAWS will be asked to draft initial responses to the issues that had been identified for the Conservation Committee's consideration; then (2) a working document would then be circulated by the Chair of the Conservation Committee to all members requesting further input; then (3) after taking into consideration comments received, the revised working document would be tabled at the next Conservation Committee in October for discussion; and finally (4) the Conservation Committee's agreed input would be presented to Commission at IWC66 alongside the Scientific Committee's review.
- To facilitate Conservation Committee input to the decadal review of the SOS: (1) the SOS Steering Group, established at IWC65, would agree the process for Conservation Committee input to the overall review; (2) the Steering Group would develop an initial response to the questions raised by the Scientific Committee and circulating to all Conservation Committee members for further input; (3) taking into consideration comments received, the working document would be tabled at the Conservation Committee in October 2016 for discussion; and (4) the Conservation Committee's agreed input would be presented to Commission at IWC 66 alongside the Scientific Committee review

He further suggested that given the time constraints and resources available, the Conservation Committee planning meeting **agreed** that a joint workshop with the Scientific Committee was no longer required.

Brazil, De La Mare (Australia) and Callister (Australia) supported this suggested process. De la Mare added that it is important that the Commission receives both the scientific and policy/management advice. He also stressed that members who wished to contribute or prepare papers should be able to do so and that there should be a process for compiling these.

When asked to clarify timing, Rendell suggested that the process could begin immediately after the meeting with first responses due back towards the end of August. A first draft would then be sent to Conservation Committee members and towards the end of September a revised document would be produced, incorporating comments received. He agreed to circulate this timetable.

The meeting **agreed** with the process put forward by the UK. It further **agreed** that the process and timetable should be circulated to the Conservation Committee as soon as possible after the meeting, and **requested** the UK to initiate follow up with the SAWS proponents and the SOS steering group.

## **7. Strategic plan and work plan for the Conservation Committee**

This item was introduced under item 5a. Callister (Australia) presented an overview of the draft strategic plan. She noted that the first page described the Conservation Committee's constitution and role within the overall Commission, and the second page focused on how the Committee achieves its purpose. The top line on the first page, currently left blank, would include an overall vision. Callister noted that the draft Strategic Plan was intended to provide a clear and visual way of capturing the work of the Conservation Committee. Strategic plans for thematic areas would then sit beneath this high level document.

The Chair thanked Australia and noted that this was an extremely important development.

Commenting on the thematic areas included in the document, Rojas-Bracho (Mexico), supported by De La Mare suggested a distinction should be made between threats and Conservation Committee priorities. Sironi (Argentina) suggested that climate change should be included as a priority and Simmonds (UK) stated that if climate change were added then other threats such as chemical pollution should also be added. These might be generalised as "Habitat issues" or, alternatively, the Plan could set out priorities identified by the Conservation Committee rather than a comprehensive list of threats. Briand (Monaco) supported this approach. Fruet (Brazil) asked whether hunting should be included as a threat in the plan. Simmonds (UK) drew attention to taking of dolphins for bait.

Langerock (Belgium) noted that the priorities might need to be revisited in light of changes to the Conservation Committee agenda. Lundquist (New Zealand) noted that the current priorities of the Voluntary Conservation Fund are different to those for the Conservation Committee outlined in the draft strategic plan and these should be aligned. Wulff (USA), supported by Simmonds (UK) suggested that there could be a rolling programme of issues, which would include long term and shorter term priorities. Callister (Australia) concluded that there was a need to first identify all the issues and subsequently to agree the priorities. She suggested that further discussion was needed on this issue.

The Secretary said that this was a very useful document and commended the visual layout. He noted that this would be a very useful tool for communicating Conservation Committee work to others, including potential funders. In response to a query on funding streams, he noted that there are a number of relevant (and separate) funding streams to include on the document.

Langerock (Belgium) noted that the measures of success were helpful as short messages to help communicate success. Sironi (Argentina) suggested that the third measure of success ("The conservation committee's advice is valued by the Commission and its subcommittees, and other organisations") was difficult to measure and could be reworded. Stachowitsch (Austria) suggested that this could relate to evidence of Conservation Committee advice being used in Commission decisions.



Wulff (USA) noted that the “Commitments section” included a suggestion that the Conservation Committee meets annually and that this would have budgetary implications. As Chair of the Finance and Administration Committee, Wulff suggested that the Conservation Committee make some recommendations to the F&A Committee. Potential financing options could include the use of core funds or voluntary funds from a host or other government. Options for timing of the meeting would impact on costs, for example hosting an annual meeting back to back with the Scientific Committee or as a standalone meeting. Langerock suggested that figures based on these options should be prepared in advance of the next Conservation Committee meeting.

The meeting **agreed** that an intersessional group would work with Australia to further progress the draft strategic plan. Issues of substance would be identified and discussed at the next Conservation Committee meeting. Rojas-Bracho, Simmonds, Langerock and Briand volunteered and other volunteers were asked to approach the Secretariat. The meeting **agreed** to seek Scientific Committee representation.

The meeting **agreed** that periodicity of Conservation Committee meetings would be discussed at the next Conservation Committee. Various options were identified including a separate standalone meeting and a back to back meeting with the Scientific Committee. The meeting **agreed** that these options would be further defined intersessionally and the Secretariat would provide estimated costings of these options for discussion by the Conservation Committee.

a. *Work Plan*

Rendell (UK) presented the draft work plan. This was a first attempt at updating the existing work plan, which is out of date. He proposed that the UK refine this further intersessionally and circulate a revised draft for discussion at the Conservation Committee.

During discussion, it was suggested that the work plan be seen as an ongoing measure of the Conservation Committee’s work to record existing activity, to identify further actions, and to outline who is taking these forward. It was suggested that the draft include more content under “Progress” to reflect on what the Conservation Committee has already achieved.

The group agreed with the course of action suggested by the UK and looked forward to discussing a revised draft at the Conservation Committee.

## **8. Relationship between Conservation Committee and other Committees**

a. *Scientific Committee*

At its 2015 meeting the Scientific Committee established an *ad hoc* Working Group to examine the actual and potential relationships between the Scientific Committee and the Conservation Committee agendas (SC/CC WG). Rojas-Bracho (convenor of the *ad hoc* Working Group) explained that the Group’s focus was on (1) an evaluation of Scientific Committee sub-committees and working groups topics to identify areas of potential synergistic work to be developed through a joint work plan with the Conservation Committee and areas of potential or actual overlap of SC Agenda items that, in the medium-long term, could be passed onto the Conservation Committee and (2) discussion on how best deliver SC conservation and management recommendations that entail actions by governments.

Rojas-Bracho presented an initial table of conservation-relevant recommendations made by the Working Group on Non-deliberate Human-induced Mortality of Cetaceans (HIM) at the most recent Scientific Committee meeting (SC66b, 2016). He explained that this included recommendations on some topics that are not currently included on the Conservation Committee’s agenda. He explained that it was difficult to extract recommendations in isolation without including contextual information and he had identified several recommendations with no clear recipient.

After discussion, the meeting **recommended** that Rojas-Bracho, as chair of the *ad hoc* Working Group on Relationships between the SC and CC, continue to work with the joint Conservation Committee Scientific Committee Working Group and the Secretariat to refine the process for compiling conservation recommendations.

b. Intersessional Correspondence Group on Strengthening Finance/Voluntary Conservation Fund

The Secretariat gave an update on progress in implementing the recommendations of the Intersessional Correspondence Group on Strengthening Finance (ICGSF) (document J16/CCPM/07):

- The Secretariat noted that the Voluntary Conservation Fund, established in 2014, had received two contributions to date, one from Australia and one from the UK, totalling GBP75,002. The next step was for the Steering Group for the Fund to establish a process to administer and allocate the fund.
- The IWC has continued the development of strategic partnerships with international bodies and will continue this engagement with other organisations. Where appropriate, the potential for joint fund raising or partnership work to implement the Commission's recommendations will be explored.
- The Secretariat drew attention to the Commission recommendation that IWC Committees and subgroups wishing to resource projects should establish clearly budgeted work programmes and in parallel, identify potential funding or project partners. In January 2016, the Chair of the Intersessional Correspondence Group on Strengthening Finance wrote to the Chairs of the Conservation Committee Working Groups regarding the preparation of budgeted work programmes for thematic work areas under the Conservation Committee. During the remainder of 2016, the Secretariat will work with the Chairs of the Conservation Committee and its Standing Working groups to develop budgeted work plans.
- The Secretariat has begun to review the funding opportunities that could potentially be utilised by the Commission and it will work with the Chairs of the Conservation Committee and its Standing Working Groups to identify appropriate opportunities for fund raising and outreach.
- The Secretariat has developed the financial pages on the IWC website with information on the funding arrangements of the IWC, IWC funding opportunities available, and information on the work of the IWC and its Committees.

Progress with the implementation of these recommendations will be reported to the F&A Committee and Conservation Committee in October 2016.

The Secretariat also drew attention to a vacancy in the role of Chair for the Intersessional Correspondence Group on Strengthening IWC Finance. The Chair's role is open to any Commissioner or member of an IWC Contracting Government. Contracting Governments were invited to contact the Secretariat if interested in undertaking the role of Chair of the ICGSF.

The Chair noted the timely nature of this work, given the establishment as the Voluntary Conservation Fund and previous discussions on the topic (agenda item 7) on the alignment of the Voluntary Conservation Fund with the priorities of the Conservation Committee. The meeting thanked the Secretariat for their work to address this issue and noted the importance of this being presented to and discussed at the Commission meeting in October. The need for a Chair of the ICGSF was stressed and volunteers were invited to approach the Secretariat.

**c. Relationship with other inter-governmental organisations**

The Secretariat gave an update on progress in engaging other intergovernmental organisations, noting that this was also on the agenda of the Joint Scientific Committee/Conservation Committee meeting that afternoon, at which a paper would be presented [IWC/J16/SC-CC/01]. The paper provided an update on progress and activities undertaken in response to IWC recommendations and Resolution 2014-2; and suggested next steps including the opportunity to strengthen engagement with regional organisations and the opportunity for the IWC to consider its contribution to the Strategic Plan for biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Targets as well as the Sustainable Development Goals.

Gales (Australia) noted that the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) was celebrating the Year of the Whale. This provided an opportunity for regional engagement, including with non-member countries in the Pacific. Gales also drew attention to IWC engagement with CCMLAR which should be included in a revised paper.

Ritter (Belgium) suggested that a list of IWC recommendations for engagement with organisations could be included in the report. The Secretariat confirmed that this would be included in the updated report submitted to the Commission.

Simmonds (UK) drew attention to the IWC's contribution to the report of the Secretary General on the issue of "Marine Debris including Plastics and Microplastics" at the seventeenth meeting of the United Nations Open-Ended Informal Consultative Process on Oceans and Law of the Sea.

Briand (Monaco) drew attention to IWC Resolution 2014-2 which called for increased collaboration between the IWC and other international organisations with respect to highly migratory species. Briand highlighted the most recent annual resolution of the UN General Assembly on Oceans and Law of the Sea (A/RES/70/235) which notes with concern the human-related threats which may significantly impact marine life, including its higher trophic levels and calls for cooperation and coordination between States and competent international organisations. He proposed that this Resolution provided an opportunity for the IWC to contribute to the UN process.

The Chair, supported by others, thanked the Secretariat for its work.

**d. Draft Conservation Committee agenda**

This item provided an opportunity for a brief discussion on the agenda for the forthcoming Conservation Committee which would be held in October 2016 (*Document J16/CCPM/05*). The Chair noted that the meeting had already discussed issues of relevance to the agenda including: duplication of one agenda item; the need to include an item on the frequency of Conservation Committee meetings; and the addition of agenda items on bycatch, the Small Cetaceans Task Team, and the proposed Franciscana CMP.

The meeting discussed the standing agenda item on the status of right whales in Chile and Peru. It was noted that, in 2008 at IWC 60, the Conservation Committee recommended that this issue remain a high priority in the future work of the Scientific Committee and agreed the item be retained on the Conservation Committee's agenda. The draft agenda for IWC66 had combined the standing agenda item on right whales in Chile and Peru with the CMP agenda item for the South-east Pacific Southern Right Whale. The meeting asked the Secretariat to check whether there was a mandated instruction to keep this as a separate agenda item, but otherwise its inclusion under the CMP agenda item was agreed.

The meeting asked the Secretariat to amend the draft Conservation Committee agenda accordingly before it is circulated to the Commission. A revised draft agenda would be circulated via a Circular on or before 16 July 2016.

**e. Any other business**

*Update from Intersessional Working Group on Welfare*

Rendell (UK) provided an update on the Workshop to support the consideration of non-hunting threats to cetacean welfare [summary in SC/66b/O/04] and the Workshop to develop practical guidance for the handling of cetacean stranding events [summary in SC/66B/E11]. The first of these workshops had explored how welfare can be assessed, and tested a welfare assessment framework. Rendell explained that the outcomes of these workshops would be reported to IWC66 in October 2016.

The meeting was also provided with a written update on entanglement work [Document J16/CCPM/06].

## Annex A – List of Participants

### **ARGENTINA**

Miguel Iñiguez

### **AUSTRIA**

Michael Stachowitsch

### **AUSTRALIA**

Nick Gales  
Deb Callister  
William de la Mare

### **BELGIUM**

Stephanie Langerock  
Fabian Ritter

### **BRAZIL**

Pedro Fruet  
Thais Coutinho

### **DENMARK**

Gitte Hundahl

### **GERMANY**

Nicole Hielsche

### **GUINEA**

Samba Diallo

### **LUXEMBOURG**

Mel Cosentino

### **MONACO**

Frederic Briand

### **NEW ZEALAND**

David Lundquist  
Rohan Currey

### **RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

Kirill Zharikov

### **SLOVAK REPUBLIC**

Branislav Hrabkovsky

### **SPAIN**

Begona Santos

### **UNITED KINGDOM**

Jamie Rendell  
Mark Simmonds  
Liz Page

### **UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

Ryan Wulff  
Robert Brownell

### **SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE**

Lorenzo Rojas-Bracho  
Mariano Sironi

### **International Whaling Commission**

Simon Brockington  
Sarah Smith  
Sarah Ferriss  
David Mattila

**Annex B Annotated Agenda**

**Agenda for the Conservation Committee planning meeting**

**Monday, 20 June 2016 at 9.30 – 13.00**

**Panorama room, Hotel Toplice, Bled, Slovenia (map appended)**

---

**Purpose of the meeting:** To provide an update on progress since IWC65, identify priorities and major deliverables in the lead up to IWC66, and discuss a work-plan and reporting framework for the Conservation Committee

**1. Welcome**

**2. Election of Chair**

*Jamie Rendell, Vice Chair of the Conservation Committee will be proposed.*

**3. Adoption of the agenda**

**4. Terms of Reference**

*This item will provide an opportunity to discuss the establishment of a Conservation Committee Planning Group to continue the work of the Conservation Committee planning meeting. Draft Terms of Reference are provided in Document IWC/J16/CCPM/01.*

**5. Progress update from the Conservation Committee and its intersessional Working Groups**

*This item provides an opportunity for the Chair of the Conservation Committee and the Chairs of its standing working groups to provide a progress update.*

a. Conservation Committee (Jamie Rendell)

*This item will include a brief update on the development of a strategic plan and work plan for the Conservation Committee. To be discussed in more detail under items 6 and 9.*

b. Ship Strikes Working Group (Doug DeMaster/Bob Brownell)

*This item will include an update on the development of a Ship Strikes Strategic Plan and other intersessional activities, including engagement with the International Maritime Organization.*

c. Standing Working Group on Whalewatching (Ryan Wulff)

*This item will include an update on activities undertaken to implement the Strategic Plan for Whalewatching including the development of the Whalewatching Handbook and the outcomes of the workshop 'Building sustainable whale watching tourism in the Indian Ocean region'. [Document IWC/J16/CCPM/02 and IWC/66/CC03]*

d. Standing Working Group on Conservation Management Plans (Deb Callister)

*This item will include an update on intersessional activity since IWC65 and proposed future priorities.*

e. Correspondence group on options for reducing bycatch (Mark Simmonds)

*This item will include a discussion on options for addressing cetacean bycatch taking into account intersessional and Scientific Committee discussions. It will also include discussion on how the issue of bycatch can be dealt with by the Conservation Committee.*

f. Working Group on the implementation and follow-up of conservation recommendations (Jamie Rendell)

*This item will include discussion on work undertaken for the Joint Scientific Committee/Conservation Committee Working Group, which will be held in the afternoon of 20 June [Document IWC/J16/SC-CC/02].*

- g. Conservation Committee input to review of the South Atlantic Sanctuary Proposal and the second decadal review of the Southern Ocean Sanctuary (Jamie Rendell)

*This will allow discussion on how the Conservation Committee will input to the process [Document IWC/J16/CCPM/03 REV1].*

**6. Strategic plan and work plan for the Conservation Committee (Jamie Rendell)**

*This item provides an opportunity to discuss Conservation Committee planning including the development of a Conservation Committee Strategic Plan and work plan, and the development of strategic plans by its Working Groups. A draft Strategic Plan [document IWC/J16/SC-CC/03] and work plan [Document IWC/J16/CCPM/04] are provided for discussion.*

**7. Relationship between Conservation Committee and other Committees**

- a. Scientific Committee (Lorenzo Rojas-Bracho)

*This item will include an update on Scientific Committee discussions on conservation recommendations and communication with the Conservation Committee.*

- b. Intersessional Correspondence Group on Strengthening Finance/Voluntary Conservation Fund (Secretariat)

*This item will include an update on progress implementing the recommendations of the ICGSF [Document J16/CCPM/07].*

**8. Relationship with other inter-governmental organisations (Secretariat)**

*This item provides an opportunity to discuss engagement with other inter-governmental organisations, noting that this is also an agenda item for the Joint Scientific Committee/Conservation Committee meeting [IWC/J16/SC-CC/01].*

**9. Draft Conservation Committee agenda**

*This item provides an opportunity for a brief discussion on the agenda for the next Conservation Committee. A draft agenda is provided [Document J16/CCPM/05].*

**10. Any other business**

- a. Update from Intersessional Working Group on Welfare (Jamie Rendell)

*This item will include an update on intersessional activity including the workshop to support the consideration of non-hunting threats to cetacean welfare [summary in SC/66b/O/04]; the workshop to develop practical guidance for the handling of cetacean stranding events [summary in SC/66B/E11]; and an update on entanglement work [Document J16/CCPM/06].*

**Annex C List of documents available**

<b>Document Number</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Authors</b>
IWC/J16/CCPM/08 Rev 1	Agenda for Conservation Committee Planning Meeting June 2016	
IWC/J16/CCPM/01	Conservation Committee Planning Group Draft Terms of Reference	
IWC/J16/CCPM/02	Report on progress with Whale Watching Handbook	Jamie Rendell, UK
IWC/J16/CCPM/03 Rev 1	Scientific Committee recommendations to the Conservation Committee regarding Sanctuary Review	
IWC/J16/CCPM/04	Conservation Committee draft work plan June 2016	Jamie Rendell, UK
IWC/J16/CCPM/05	Draft Conservation Committee agenda	IWC Secretariat
IWC/J16/CCPM/06	Update on IWC Entanglement Response Capacity Development Initiative	IWC Secretariat
IWC/J16/CCPM/07	Progress report on implementation of IWC recommendations on strengthening financing	IWC Secretariat
IWC/J16/CCPM/09	IWC/J16/SC-CC/02 Preliminary consideration of Scientific Committee recommendations of direct relevance to the Conservation Committee	Jamie Rendell, UK
Annex A to IWC/J16/CCPM/09 (IWC/J16/SC-CC/02)	Conservation related recommendations from the 2014 and 2015 Scientific Committee meeting	IWC Secretariat
IWC/J16/CCPM/10	IWC/J16/SC-CC/03 Conservation Committee Draft Public Facing Strategy 2016-2026	Government of Australia
IWC/J16/CCPM/11	SC/66b/O/04 Chair's summary of IWC Workshop to support consideration of non-hunting threats to cetacean welfare, 3-4 May 2016	Nigel Gooding, UK
IWC/J16/CCPM/12	SC/66b/E/11 Chair's Summary of IWC Workshop to develop practical guidance for the handling of cetacean stranding events. 5-6 May 2016	Nigel Gooding, UK
IWC/J16/CCPM/13	IWC/J16/SC-CC/01 Update on progress in engaging other intergovernmental organisations	IWC Secretariat