

IWC/J15/ALL/3

Summary of Recommendations from IWC Conservation Meetings in 2014

Greg Donovan



INTERNATIONAL
WHALING COMMISSION

Summary of recommendations

Reference	Wording	Type	Actors	Action
Ship Strikes Workshop IWC/65/CC Rep01				
	The Workshop therefore concludes that the highest priority for the IWC at this time is to place emphasis on the collection and reporting of data to the IWC Global Ship Strikes Database which will both:		Secretariat, SS co-ordinators, SSWG (DeMaster)	Publicity/reporting
	(1) facilitate a proper evaluation, prioritisation and monitoring of ship strikes as a threat to various populations and regions (2) assist in the development of mitigation measures			
	In tandem with this effort, the Workshop recognises the importance of the species distribution modelling exercises (where sufficient data exist) to identify the important areas for cetaceans at appropriate temporal and geographical scales to compare with potential threats, including ship strikes; where insufficient data exist efforts to obtain this at the regional level are essential. This information is required both to evaluate and prioritise efforts as well as to assist with mitigation and monitoring measures. Associated recommendations are given under Item 5.1.5.2.		Scientific Committee	Palacios EMM
	The Workshop emphasised the global distribution nature of the ship strikes problem and re-affirms the primacy of the IMO as the competent international organisation responsible for vessel routing measures and the need for the IWC to work with the IMO on this issue.			
	The Workshop recommends that the IWC maintains and develops a close relationship with the IMO . To establish a presence at and to build a long-term working relationship with the IMO , the IWC Secretariat (or its representative, who could be a representative from a member state of IWC and IMO) should routinely attend relevant sessions of the IMO 's Marine Environment Protection Committee (MEPC) and other appropriate IMO committee/subcommittees. The IWC already has an agreement of co-operation with the IMO dating from 2009; the IWC should take advantage of and build on this existing relationship (e.g. notifying member countries of relevant agenda topics, assisting member nations with the process of submitting national proposals)		IWC Secretariat, IMO, IWC members	
	More particularly, the Workshop recommends the submission of a 'Substantive Document' to MEPC. The IWC Secretariat should submit the document (perhaps under the 'report from other organisations' agenda item or under the 'other' agenda item) to MEPC 68 in May 2015). The document		IWC Secretariat find out deadlines, SSWG (e.g. Silber, USA), IWC members to cosponsor IMO Secretariat	

	<p>should provide the report of the present Panama Workshop including a summary of its relevant outcomes. The document should also provide results of recent scientific studies regarding the issue of ship strikes of large whales; descriptions of the measures used to reduce the occurrence of fatal strikes and their relative effectiveness; and any other relevant information. The report should be accompanied by a request to the IMO Secretariat to allow the IWC to make a presentation about the goals, mission, and function of the IWC and ship strikes contemporaneous with the introduction of the document in Plenary.</p> <p>In addition, the document should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) reference previous submissions to the IMO on this matter; (b) reiterate the concerns about ship strikes of cetaceans worldwide; (c) describe the function and importance of the IWC's global 'ship strike database'; (d) provide specific information on how to report the occurrence of a ship strike of a whale; and (e) request that the MEPC (a) bring this information to the attention of Member Governments and international organisations for action and (b) urge IMO members to report ship strikes to the IWC global ship strikes database. <p>The document should be drafted and formally submitted by the IWC, ideally co-sponsored by a number of interested Member States (in particular) as well as relevant intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations.</p> <p>To be considered at MEPC 68, the document (6 pages or less) must be submitted to the MEPC no later than March 2015. A draft should be prepared in adequate time to allow for adequate review and consideration by member states for co-sponsorship. The IWC could also consider submitting the document to both MEPC and Safety of Navigation Sub-Committee back to back, if there are instructions, to reach a wider audience at the IMO.</p>			
	<p>With respect to routing/traffic separation schemes, the Workshop recommends that an appropriate mechanism be developed with IMO to encourage consideration of cetaceans when new or revised routing schemes are brought to IMO. The Workshop also recommends that for any such schemes, stakeholders be engaged from the beginning and consulted often and regularly throughout the process.</p>		IWC and IMO Secretariats - process	

	<p>The Workshop recommends that the IUCN Marine Mammal Protected Area Task Force (MMPATF):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) investigates the idea of developing a ‘go slow’ ethic or speed limits for marine mammal protected areas (MMPAs) using maps, ‘apps’ and other methods of conveying messages to ships; (2) develop a database of the approximately 500 MMPA (marine mammal protected areas) managers to facilitate contact with them in a systematic way with respect to: data reporting for the IWC ship strikes database, as well as strandings; concerns they may have about ship strikes, to gauge if ship strikes are a problem in MMPAs; (3) investigate Marine Mammal Protected Area (MMPA) management plans for guidelines, regulations or rules related to ship strikes for transiting vessels as well as vessels based in the area (including pleasure craft); and (3) in light of the IMMA criteria under preparation, consults the IWC Scientific Committee for advice before the criteria are finalised. 		<p>IUCN MMPATF</p>	
	<p>Noting that the Eastern Tropical Pacific region is a data-rich area, the Workshop recommends that the modelling of marine mammal species and ecosystems in this region be utilised to the extent feasible to help test and fine-tune draft criteria for the Important Marine Mammal Areas (IMMAs).</p>		<p>US members of SC</p>	<p>Palacios, EMM</p>
	<p>The recommendations under Items 8.2.1 and 8.3.1 highlight collaboration with IMO, UNEP-CEP-SPAW and CPPS. In addition, the Workshop commends the IWC’s current cooperative work with IGOs and NGOs and recommends that it expand the work with regional organisations, NGOs and IGOs (e.g. CPPS, SPAW and other UNEP Regional Seas programmes) on the ship strikes issue. The Workshop notes that some organisations have databases on cetaceans, experts and well-established communication mechanisms with countries. The Workshop recommends that the IWC works with both Parties and non-Parties of IWC on the issue of ship strikes, as well as assisting with training programmes on marine conservation that may help to increase awareness on the issue (including the IWC ship strike database), improve the quality of population and marine spatial analyses for</p>		<p>IMO, UNEP, SPAW, Secretariat, SSWG</p>	

	the species, promote regional networking and advance the goals of the IWC on this issue.			
	In addition to IMO , the Workshop strongly recommends that the IWC increases its engagement with the maritime sector (e.g. shipping associations, and other maritime user groups and associations such as the World Ocean Council, which has offered to assist in engaging the diverse ocean business community on the issue of ship strikes).		IWC Secretariat, SS co-ordinators, SSWG, maritime sector bodies	
	<p>The Workshop affirms that the IWC Ship Strikes Database is a crucial tool in addressing the issue of ship strikes around the world. Populating the database is a high priority in terms of assessing priorities. The Workshop strongly recommends that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) IWC member countries place greater emphasis on publicising the database and the need to report ship strike data directly into it within their countries, including within the relevant government departments (including the navy and coast guard) as well as maritime users in general; (2) IWC member countries all also submit relevant information to the Scientific Committee including through national Progress Reports; (3) the IWC continues to fund the ship strikes database co-ordinators and that the co-ordinators continue to publicise the database; and (4) the IWC increases its efforts to publicise the database to other intergovernmental and regional organisations, as well as all parts of the maritime sector. 		SS co-ordinators, IWC members, SSWG, IWC Secretariat	
	<p>The Workshop recognises the expertise of the IWC Scientific Committee with respect to many aspects of the ship strikes issue. It has highlighted a number of areas for which the Committee can provide advice to other organisations including IUCN (Item 8.2.2) and CPPS (Item 8.3.1). The Workshop agrees that the IWC Scientific Committee should continue to provide advice and collaborate with other organisations and research groups on matter related to ship strikes and encourages the submission of relevant work to the Committee.</p> <p>The Workshop highlighted two areas where Scientific Expertise could prove extremely valuable.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) While there was insufficient time at the Workshop to explore the use of simulation modelling to examine potential mitigation measures, as discussed under Item 7.1.6, the Workshop recommends that the IWC Scientific Committee establishes an expert group to build upon existing modelling approaches with a view to developing a broad simulation 		Scientific Committee, especially US members of SC. Other Scientific Committees	Palacios, EMM

	<p>framework that could be used to examine the likely effectiveness of various mitigation strategies.</p> <p>The Workshop commended the work undertaken thus far on one of the best long-term datasets in the world for habitat modelling in the Eastern Tropical Pacific. It noted the potential of using this dataset to explore certain generic questions including the relationship between reliable predictions and, for example, length of datasets and/or geographical extent of datasets. It recommends investigation of these issues by ‘censoring’ the datasets in various ways and comparing the reliability of the predictions against those from the full dataset. Similarly, it recommends exploration of the relationship between use of presence/absence data and presence-only data. It agrees that presentation of this work to the Scientific Committee could prove mutually valuable to the scientists undertaking the work (e.g. Redfern and colleagues) and to the Committee’s work</p>			
Workshop on Mitigation and Management of the Threats Posed by Marine Debris to Cetaceans				
	<p>The Workshop requests that the IWC Scientific Committee considers ways of combining estimates of oceanic debris and information on cetaceans to identify priorities for mitigating and managing the impacts of marine debris on cetaceans. One approach to consider would be using a semi-quantitative ERA method with the available data on fisheries, cetaceans and cetacean-marine debris interactions to provide preliminary estimates of high-risk locations or species, and to identify situations and/or populations that should be high priorities for additional data collection, more detailed analysis and/or immediate mitigation and management. The results from any analyses should of course, explicitly account for uncertainty in the underlying data, such that fisheries, NGOs and IGOs understand the scientific basis for any recommendations.</p>		Scientific Committee	
	<p>It agreed that the most effective approach to reducing the incidental capture of cetaceans in all fishing gear would be through co-operation with FAO, RFMOs and the fishing sector. Recommendations relevant to this appear under Items 8.1 and 8.6.</p> <p>The Workshop suggested the IWC Secretariat, in cooperation with others such as UNEP, CMS and CBD, bring the issue of incidental capture of marine mammals to the attention of the UNGA and/or COFI. Consideration should also be given to multi-agency funding proposals to support mitigation actions. Other suggested areas that might be appropriate for future co-operation included relevant aspects of gear-marking, removal of</p>		IWC Secretariat, FAO, RFMOs, UNEP, CMS, CBD	

	ALDFG, development of guideline documents, holding of joint expert workshops, databases of lost gear, sharing of fishing effort data, links between biodiversity and livelihood, mitigation measures and the harmonising of data recording.			
	The Workshop thanked all presenters and commended the ALDFG reduction and removal initiatives underway. It encouraged continuation, replication and expansion of such effective initiatives. It welcomed the development of cross-sectoral partnerships to address ALDFG, including the Global Partnership on Marine Litter and the Global Ghost Gear Initiative. The Workshop also emphasised the importance of focusing on reduction and prevention efforts as the most sustainable, long-term solution to the problem of ALDFG.		IWC Entanglement	
	Develop a probability matrix (ALDFG vs Active) much like has been done recently in arriving at serious injury determinations in the USA for large whales impacted from ship strikes and entanglement. It was agreed that this issue should also be considered by the IWC entanglement expert group at its next meeting, and at the forthcoming IWC Workshop on prevention of entanglement to be held in March-April 2016.		IWC Entanglement	
	As with understanding and preventing ALDFG, the Workshop strongly encouraged including the fishing sector in the growth of the entanglement response network, especially in high priority areas, and also during the follow up examinations of the gear removed from whales. Smith noted that on the Atlantic Coast of the USA, former fishers examined the gear.		IWC Entanglement, fishing sector	
	With regard to how the IWC and other IGOs can best communicate with the relevant target audiences, the Workshop agreed that the report of this workshop should be distilled and highlighted into an executive summary for the IWC's member countries and those of other IGOs. This could be placed on the IWC's new and expanding web site. In addition, it was suggested that the IWC, member countries or NGOs might hold side events where feasible at meetings of the parties. One potential opportunity might be to participate in COFI 2016 side events addressing bycatch and incidental capture of non target species.		IWC Secretariat, COFI	
	It strongly recommends as the highest priority that the IWC and its Secretariat work together with the Secretariats of the other major IGOS and RMFOs relevant to this issue to ensure consistency of approach, synergy of effort and collection and exchange of information to develop		IWC and other Secretariats , IWC members	

	<p>appropriate mitigation strategies that recognise that: (a) prevention is the ultimate solution; but that (b) removal is important until that ideal is realised.</p> <p>It also recommends that individual IWC member countries collaborate with such initiatives and that the IWC continues to highlight issues surrounding marine debris and cetaceans.</p>			
	<p>The Workshop also recommends that every effort is made to work with fisheries, terrestrial waste management industries and other relevant industries and NGOs as appropriate. Understanding both the extent of the actual and potential threats to cetaceans as well as the development of mitigation measures cannot be achieved without industry involvement. The present workshop has begun that process but increased industry participation at relevant future workshops and other IWC initiatives (see below) is strongly encouraged. In addition, the IWC Secretariat and Member Governments should explore opportunities to build awareness and collaboration with the commercial sector, for example at industry events.</p>		IWC Secretariat, member governments, industry	
	<p>Finally, the Workshop recommends that the IWC (and other IGOs) encourage their members to review national level implementation of MARPOL Annex V and other conventions relevant to marine debris reduction. The IWC should encourage its members to prioritise the strategic use of a range of measures to improve marine and terrestrial waste management, including national legislation and policy, stakeholder partnerships, industry training schemes and economic tools aimed at reducing public consumption of key types of debris such as packaging waste.</p>		IWC Secretariats and other IGOs esp. IMO (MARPOL), IWC members	
	<p>It recommends that the IWC and IMO Secretariats consider the most effective way (e.g. via IMO's Marine Environment Protection Committee) to request that the GISIS port reception facility database is updated to specify which ports accept end of life fishing gear, including any restrictions on the gear they accept and additional useful information (such as recycling potential) and to encourage an expansion of the provision of no-special-fee port reception facilities.</p>		IWC and IMO Secretariats	
	<p>The Workshop welcomes information that SPREP will report annually to the IWC on progress with initiatives on the issue of marine debris. It encourages SPREP to work with regional and international agencies on existing and new initiatives to address the problem of marine debris including its impact on cetaceans.</p>		SPREP	

	<p>However, the Workshop agrees that while at present COAFG was the major factor, there was insufficient evidence to reliably assign a precise proportion of entanglements to either COAFG or ALDFG (or both). It therefore recommends that a concerted effort be made to collect data using a standard approach that will allow a better assignation of entanglements (see Item 3.1.4.1).</p>		IWC entanglement,	
	<p>Recognising past and existing efforts, especially within FAO, with respect to the marking of gear, it recommends that the IWC encourages COFI to conclude its work on gear marking and that the IWC participates in technical work associated with its finalisation, this process, drawing attention to the value that gear marking can contribute to mitigation approaches. In particular, it noted that a ‘low-tech’ gear marking scheme in combination with examinations of gear removed from whales would be particularly important to resolve three key questions: (1) the region in which gear is set; (2) the fisheries from which gear came (e.g. traps vs gillnets); and (3) the part of fishing gear from which it came (e.g. buoy lines vs. groundlines between traps).</p>		IWC Secretariats, COFI, FAO	
	<p>The Workshop also recommends that the IWC encourages disentanglement and stranding teams to collect detailed information on entangling gear/material that is removed from whales, and on marine debris present in the immediate environment of the entangled or stranded whale (although this must be interpreted carefully given the great distances whales can travel with gear), in order to improve collective knowledge of the scope and source of entangling debris (including COAFG vs. ALDFG gear).</p>		IWC Secretariat, strandings networks, IWC members	
	<p>The Workshop endorses the forthcoming IWC workshop (anticipated March-April 2016) on prevention of the incidental capture of cetaceans. It agrees that this should incorporate discussion of entangling ALDFG as well as in-use gear.</p>			
	<p>The Workshop requests that the IWC Scientific Committee explores ways of combining estimates of oceanic debris and information on cetaceans to identify priorities for mitigating and managing the impacts of marine debris on cetaceans as discussed under Item 2.5.</p>		Scientific Committee	
	<p>The Workshop commends the present IWC Global Cetacean Entanglement Response Network, recognising its value both from an individual animal welfare perspective as well as at the population level, especially for threatened and endangered populations. The network is extremely valuable and effective in building capacity and raising awareness. The Workshop</p>		IWC entanglement	

	therefore recommends that the IWC continues to support and develop this network, and carefully considers incorporating the issue of all marine debris into the training programme. This could include the dissemination of information on gear identification, data collection and necropsy protocols which were developed during the first workshop on marine debris (IWC, 2014a).			
	The Workshop recommends that the IWC promotes and shares lessons from its successful model of expert training/capacity building for disentangling whales (see Item 5.1).		IWC Secretariat, IWC entanglement	
	The Workshop recognises the funding implications of many of its recommendations. It recommends that the IWC, in concert with other IGOs, approach a range of organisations for financial and other support including financial institutions, public and private foundations, industry, businesses and NGOs.		IWC Secretariats and other IGO secretariats	
	The Workshop recommends that the IWC Secretariat examine ways in which it and its member nations can most effectively communicate these recommendations to the relevant target audience(s) including IGOs, appropriate government agencies and NGOs. In addition, the IWC should develop a dedicated section of its website to the issue of marine debris with the assistance of a small expert group. The IWC Secretariat should also consider highlighting the IWC's work on the impacts of marine debris on cetaceans at meetings of other IGOs, e.g. the forthcoming COFI in 2016.		IWC Secretariat and relevant stakeholders	
	The Workshop also recommends that the IWC develops improved methods to encourage its member nations and others to provide the marine debris and entanglement related data discussed in this report) and to provide progress reports on their general work on reducing marine debris as part of their national conservation reports.		IWC Secretariat, Scientific Committee, IWC member nations	
Conservation Committee Report, Slovenia Sep 14 IWC/65/CCRep05				
	The reason some gray whales in Chukotka are 'stinky' is unknown. In order to make progress on this issue the Committee recommended that the item be moved to the Scientific Committee agenda.		IWC Secretariat, Scientific Committee	
	Following on from recent cooperative work with the IWC, CPPS will support workshops on ship strikes and entanglement in Cartagena, Colombia 1-5 December 2014, in conjunction with meetings of the Sociedad		IWC Secretariat	

	Latinoamericana de Especialistas de Mamiferos Acuaticos (SOLAMAC-SOMEMA), and have invited the IWC Secretariat to participate.			
	In order to clarify the relationship between the Scientific Committee and the Commission over the development of the WW Handbook, it was agreed that the two whalewatching sub-committee convenors and the Conservation Committee chair, should work together. It was also agreed that a budget request should be developed and forwarded to the SWG-WW for submission to the Commission.		Scientific Committee, Conservation Committee (WWWG), IWC Secretariat	
	The Conservation Committee recommend that the Scientific Committee review the new hypothesis [that the Valdés Peninsula population has reached its carrying capacity] and invite the expert to attend a future meeting.		Scientific Committee, Convenors	
	The Conservation Committee agreed that work on new and existing CMPS should include an assessment of marine debris as a potential future CMP but noted that immediate priority should be given to species-based CMPs since resources are limited.		CMPWG	
	The Conservation Committee ... in addition recommended that the marine debris issue be made a standing agenda item of the Scientific Committee; and that work should be initiated to explore how a CMP might best be developed for marine debris.		Scientific Committee	
	The CC Chair agreed to liaise with the SC to establish an intersessional group to oversee the process for southern ocean sanctuary review.		Scientific Committee and Conservation Committee chairs	
Report of the Working Group on Whale Watching IWC/65/CCRep06				
	During 2014, work on an outline for the handbook occurred both in the Conservation Committee's WGWW and the Scientific Committee's Sub-Committee on Whale Watching (SCWW). The outlines remain as working drafts. The main focus of the next intersessional period (2014-2016) will be on combining these documents into a final outline and to begin populating the handbook. To help achieve this focus, the WGWW recommends a joint workshop with representatives of the WGWW and the SCWW just prior to the next IWC Scientific Committee meeting in 2015.		WGWW and Scientific Committee	
	The WGWW further recommended that, once the survey document was completed, it should be distributed to an initial "pilot" region for feedback. [Draft Survey for Capacity Building]		WGWW and Scientific Committee	

	<p>The WGWW proposes the following plan of work for the next intersessional period of 2014-2016:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Reconsider the recommendations that were proposed at the Brisbane workshop and how they can be achieved. * Host a joint WGWW-SCWW workshop immediately prior to the next Scientific Committee meeting to complete the outline of the web-based living Handbook; * Continue to populate sections of the Handbook; * Complete the survey referenced in action 3.1 and give consideration to where the survey could be best applied as a pilot. Distribute it to the “pilot” region for feedback and ‘piloting’; * Add two new ex officio industry members, one each from the United States and Argentina, to the WGWW from 2014-2016. 			
Arctic Workshop				
	<p>The recommendations in this section represent the participants’ contributions, and are represented as recommendations from the Workshop. The Workshop strongly emphasized that the IWC has an important role to play in the protection of the Arctic environment and its subsistence whaling communities. An important challenge for the IWC is to determine the details of how best it can encourage and contribute to such a major effort in a timely and comprehensive manner. It also recommends that the IWC considers including a standing agenda item on the Arctic at each biennial meeting to consolidate the progress made by its subsidiary bodies and the Secretariat during intersessional periods and to discuss future actions</p>		IWC	
	<p>The Workshop recognises the importance of the work already underway by the Arctic Council and its working groups and programmes (see Item 5.1.1). As a matter of highest priority, it strongly recommends that the IWC Secretariat:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Approaches the Arctic Council requesting observer status and provides as part of that request a short summary of the types of expertise the IWC can provide (see Item 5.1.4) as well as a copy of the present report; (2) Liaises with the Arctic Council Secretariat and chairs of the various Arctic Council working groups to determine how best the IWC can contribute to and participate in their work, including cetacean-related 		IWC Secretariat, Arctic Council Secretariat, IWC Arctic Council members, Scientific Committee, SSWG, SS co-ordinators	

	<p>aspects of the development of common standards, measures and monitoring across the Arctic (see Item 5.1.3);</p> <p>(3) Invites the Arctic Council to participate in relevant IWC meetings and workshops, including those of Committees, sub-committees and working groups;</p> <p>(4) Liaises with the Arctic Council over the need for a formal Memorandum of Understanding between the two bodies, as appropriate;</p> <p>(5) Invites the Arctic Council to publicise the IWC global ship strikes database and encourage member nations, observer nations and observers to submit data to the database to allow a better characterisation of the issue for the Arctic;</p> <p>(6) Encourages the Arctic Council to continue to recognise the importance of taking into account the needs of subsistence whaling communities and offers to provide information on IWC regulated hunts.</p>			
	<p>In addition, the Workshop requests that the Commission develops an approach to funding IWC participation at relevant meetings of the Arctic Council and its working groups.</p>		IWC Secretariat, F&A	
	<p>The Workshop recommends increased co-operation by the IWC (Secretariat and member nations) with IMO with respect to mitigation measures for threats to cetaceans (e.g. Traffic Separation Schemes, speed restrictions, noise reduction) and increased awareness of the issue of ship strikes and the importance of the IWC global ship strikes database. It strongly urges Arctic nations to submit data to the IWC database to allow priorities for action to be developed, and referred to the July 2014 IWC workshop on ship strikes as an appropriate place to take this general issue forward</p>		IWC Secretariat, IWC members esp Arctic nations, SSWG	
	<p>One of the most important IMO initiatives related to the Arctic is the development of a mandatory international code of safety for ships operating in polar waters (the 'Polar Code'), to cover the full range of design, construction, equipment, operational, training, search and rescue and environmental protection matters relevant to ships operating in the polar waters. The Workshop strongly endorses the need for such a code and commends the excellent work carried out to date. It urges IWC member nations and others to support the finalisation and ratification of the Polar Code as soon as possible.</p>		IWC Secretariat, IWC member nations, IMO	

	<p>An important component of the Workshop was to bring together a variety of stakeholders from intergovernmental organisations, member states, national agencies, industry, subsistence communities and NGOs. The Workshop agrees that effective mitigation requires <i>inter alia</i> participation of all stakeholders from an early stage in the process from identifying whether problems exist, developing mitigation measures, addressing competing stakeholder priorities and developing compliance and monitoring measures.</p> <p>In an IWC context, the Workshop recommends:</p> <p>(1) Stakeholder participation is encouraged in relevant meetings of the IWC and its subsidiary bodies, as well as meetings of other intergovernmental organisations such as the Arctic Council and national authorities;</p> <p>(2) The IWC Secretariat, in consultation with others (e.g. the Arctic Council and IMO secretariats), draws up a list of relevant international and national stakeholder bodies for the Arctic region, in light of the discussions at this workshop that prioritised the following: oil and gas operations; vessel traffic (of many kinds including transport, tourism/whale watching, fishing, servicing oil and gas operations); fishing activities; and hunting;</p> <p>(3) The IWC Secretariat contacts the identified organisations with a copy of the present Workshop report and subsequent Commission discussions of it, expressing the interest of the IWC in co-operating and providing advice on issues of mutual interest including: (1) the sharing of scientific expertise (see Item 5.1.4); (2) assistance with issues of data sharing and common field work and analyses; and (3) information on subsistence hunts;</p> <p>(4) The IWC considers additional ways (including possible expansion of the Commission’s successful whale disentanglement training effort) to increase the awareness of and sensitivity of industry operators (e.g. the shipping, oil and gas, fishing and tourism sectors) to conservation concerns and the cultural aspects of aboriginal subsistence whaling;</p> <p>(5) The IWC considers mechanisms to provide technical support to individual companies or industry bodies.</p>		<p>IWC, Arctic Council and IMO secretariats, stakeholder groups, Scientific Committee</p>	
	<p>The Workshop recommends that the IWC Scientific Committee be requested to:</p>		<p>IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Secretariat</p>	

	<p>(1) Develop a summary of present knowledge of cetacean population status, distribution and movements, density and important habitat of the Arctic species;</p> <p>(2) Develop plans for a co-hosted specialist workshop or workshops with appropriate stakeholder participation (with a focus on the Arctic and with particular case studies to be determined) on identifying and evaluating threats to cetaceans from human activities including:</p> <p>(a) Data and analytical requirements (both for cetaceans and human activities) for identifying high risk areas to cetaceans at the correct geographical and temporal scales;</p> <p>(b) Evaluation of non-direct threats to cetaceans at the population level including chemical pollution, noise, climate change etc.</p> <p>(c) Methods to examine synergistic and cumulative effects of a range of actual and potential threats at the population level (see Item 4.1.3);</p> <p>(d) Specific recommendations with respect to data requirements and monitoring for the Arctic region in the light of projected human activities within the region.</p> <p>(3) Collate a summary of advice relevant to the Arctic it has provided with respect to a number of issues identified at this workshop including: climate change; chronic and acute noise; oil spills, ship strikes, fishery bycatch, habitat degradation;</p> <p>(4) Work with the IWC Secretariat to increase the prominence, awareness and availability of its advice through the IWC website.</p>			
	<p>The Workshop also recommends that the IWC Scientific Committee contributes to efforts to develop of common standards, measures and monitoring across the Arctic (see Item 5.1.3) with respect to issues related to the effects of human activities on cetaceans</p>		<p>Scientific Committee</p>	