

69th Meeting of the International Whaling Commission

**REPORT OF THE
FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE**

14:00-15:30 and 16:00-17:30 (BST), Friday, 30 August 2024, Virtual

16:00-17:30 (BST), Thursday, 5 September, Virtual

SUMMARY OF MAIN OUTCOMES

Issue and Agenda item	Main Outcome
3.3 Report on the Voluntary Assistance Fund for Governments of Limited Means	The Committee noted progress of the fund to date and thanked the Government of Australia, Belgium, the Netherlands and the USA for their contributions.
3.4 Proposed agreements with other organisations	The Committee recommended that the Commission endorse these proposed agreements.
3.5 IWC Headquarters Update	The Committee recommends the Commission allow the Secretariat greater flexibility and provide authority to the Secretariat to accept offers not lower than either the new book value, or the current market value, for the sale of the Red House, through consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair.
3.6 Review and closure of items on the Database of Recommendations (DoR)	The Committee noted the progress and recommended that 37 recommendations should be closed.
4.1.1 Quorum	The Committee endorsed the core principles and agreed to propose three options contained in FA/69/REP/WGOE for consideration by the Commission
4.1.2 Exceptional circumstances	The Committee recommends the Commission consider the RoP changes reflected in FA/69/REP/WGOE .
4.1.3 Align suspension of voting rights with biennial meeting schedule	The Committee recommends the Commission consider the RoP changes reflected in FA/69/REP/WGOE .
4.1.4 Payment plans	The Committee recommends the Commission consider the RoP changes reflected in FA/69/REP/WGOE .
4.2 Voluntary Conservation Fund Steering Group	The Committee thanked the donors for their contributions and noted the intersessional work to be carried out on an improved process for fund disbursement.
4.3 Creation of a new ICG for Fundraising	The Committee endorsed the proposal in principle with amendments to the ToR to be resolved at IWC69.
4.4 Voluntary Welfare Fund	The Committee noted the progress of the fund to date.

Issue and Agenda item	Main Outcome
5. Financial implications of proposed Resolutions and Schedule Amendments	The Committee supported these draft cost estimates being shared with the Commission, with inclusion of both short and longer-term cost considerations, if possible.
6. Further information on previously approved Resolutions and Schedule Amendments	The Committee supports these draft cost estimates for the SC work being shared with the Commission together with the comments raised, as well as the draft cost estimates for the activities of the Secretariat, CC and WG-WKM&WI, not explicitly discussed during the session.
8 Proposed Rules of Procedure and Financial Regulations changes	The Committee supported the proposal and agreed to propose these changes to the Commission.
9.1.1 Review of outturn position for 2022 and 2023	The Committee supports the BSC's recommendation to adopt the audited accounts as a true and fair view of the financial position, with the BSC to investigate the matters raised in the 2023 audit around F5(a) calculations with a view to bringing recommendations to IWC70.
9.1.1 Review of the forecast outturn for 2024	The Committee notes the forecast position for 2024.
9.1.1 Observer, NGO and Media Fees	The Committee agreed to propose these increases to the Commission.
9.2 Scientific Committee	The Committee noted the SCs 2023 and 2024 to date fund position, noted the request for the 2025-26 budget and advised continued discussion of this item is necessary within the overall budgetary discussions.
9.3 2025 and 2026 budget	The Committee noted a range of views on the proposed budget and referred adoption of the budget to the Commission.
9.5 BSC Membership	The Committee noted these vacancies and deferred them to the Commission.
11 Any other matters – Science Liaison Committee	The Committee recommended the proposal be put forward for consideration to the Commission.

1. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

1.1 Appointment of Chair

Ryan Wulff (USA) was appointed Chair. Note that agenda items 9, 10, 11 and 12 were covered by Lisa Phelps (USA) in an acting capacity.

1.2 Appointment of Rapporteur

Members of the Secretariat were appointed Rapporteurs.

1.3 Review of Documents

A list of [documents](#) is given in Appendix 1.

1.4 Observer Participation

Rules of Procedure for Observers are given in Appendix 2. A list of all participants is given in Appendix 3.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Australia proposed an additional item to be discussed under item 11, a proposal to establish a Science Liaison Committee for the Commission, which would seek to improve the feedback that the SC received from the Commission. Australia prepared a paper to support this item and asked the Secretariat to circulate the paper if the Chair is willing to allow it to be added to the agenda.

The Agenda was adopted as amended. The Agenda is given in Appendix 2.

3. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

3.1 Report of Confidential Communications

Rule of Procedure P.3 requires the Executive Secretary to report any confidential communications which arise during the preceding year to the Commission, or Bureau in years when the Commission does not meet.

The Executive Secretary reported that there have been no confidential communications during the intersessional period other than personnel issues which are protected under data protection law.

Austria queried why this item is necessary.

The Executive Secretary confirmed that this agenda item relates to a Rule of Procedure where all communications must be sent to Contracting Governments, but if the Chair deems that any of the information is confidential, it will not be distributed but will be addressed during the Committee meeting.

3.2 Meetings of the Commission

3.2.1 Results of the feedback surveys from SC69A & SC69B

A summary of the results of the feedback survey conducted after the SC69A & SC69B meetings were presented, the feedback proved positive for both meetings.

3.3 Report on the Voluntary Assistance Fund for Governments of Limited Means

The Secretariat's Head of F&A provided an update to the committee on the progress of the fund and thanked the Governments of Australia, Belgium, the Netherlands and the USA for their contributions.

Austria queried that the income received less the expenditure doesn't equal the remaining balance.

The Secretariat's Head of F&A explained this is due to a carry-forward balance from the previous years.

The F&A Committee noted progress of the fund to date and thanked the Governments of Australia, Belgium, the Netherlands and the USA for their contributions.

3.4 Proposed agreements with other organisations

3.4.1 Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with Pelagos Sanctuary

3.4.2 Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between IWC and the Permanent Commission for South Pacific (CPPS)

3.4.3 Letter of Intent (LoI) between IWC and SPAW

The Executive Secretary introduced these three proposals to strengthen collaboration with organisations that have similar objectives and a common wish to achieve synergies in their conservation and management work, including research and monitoring of cetaceans.

None of them are legally binding and have no additional costs, activities would be those already included in endorsed workplans or existing mandates.

The USA thanked the Commission for taking into account the legal concerns raised at IWC68 in the proposed MoUs. Thus, the the USA has no concerns from a legal aspect, but sought clarification on

costs associated with these MoUs in light of the zero based budgeting principle adopted at IWC68.

The Executive Secretary confirmed that the work is building on existing mandates and any additional activity will be covered through securing additional funds. This has already been the case with SPAW where additional resources were secured to facilitate the necessary work.

The F&A Committee recommended that the Commission endorse these proposed agreements.

3.5 IWC Headquarters update

In January 2021, via a postal ballot, it was agreed to put the Red House up for sale.

The Executive Secretary provided an update on progress to date and requested that the Committee support the Secretariat to have more autonomy to accept unconditional offers at a price no lower than the net book value.

Austria intervened commending the UK Government for their contribution towards rent and he thought this covered most of the costs.

The Secretariat's Head of F&A explained this contribution did not cover all the rent and service charge costs.

The Executive Secretary added that the Red House has not been properly maintained for a considerable period of time and additional funds would be required in order to make the Red House habitable for use. The Executive Secretary also explained that this contribution is only available from the UK Government because we are now renting the Headquarters and not when the Commission own a property.

Belgium enquired on progress of the use reclassification of the Red House and welcomed the possibility of the sale completing as soon as possible. Also asked for clarification on the current market value of the Red House.

The Secretariat's Head of F&A confirmed the Red House is going through a process of regularization, where the planning office is requested to record all the space as offices / ancillary office use. This should take about 6 weeks. Then we can request from the planning office to change use from office to residential, which will take about another 6 weeks. All hopefully concluding at the end of 2024 / early 2025. The current market value is about £1m as the market is currently saturated and values are dropping. The current buyers appear motivated and engaged, so the outlook is positive.

Australia thanked the Secretariat for their hard work trying to sell the Red House. It has been a lengthy and frustrating process for them and the Commission. A large part of the problem is the rezoning of the use of the Red House and UK law does enable potential buyers to withdraw from the process. The move to the rental office was not a matter of convenience, it was a health and safety issue. It was not reasonable to expect the Secretariat to continue working in the Red House. Australia welcomed the move and also thanked the UK Government for their contribution and considered the relocation of the Secretariat as a positive move. If the current deal falls through, Australia supports greater flexibility for the Secretariat to accept offers no lower than the net book value. Australia supports the decision being made in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair.

Iceland queried if the continual lack of maintenance of the Red House will cause the property to continue to depreciate in value.

The Executive Secretary confirmed that current interest purchasing parties are property developers so will be purchasing the Red House with a view to develop, in this instance maintenance is not a priority relating to value.

The UK confirmed that the Red House is no longer fit for purpose and welcomes the relocation of the Secretariat. The valuation of the Red House should incorporate consideration of the additional annual costs of £37k and the additional maintenance of the Red House prior to sale. The pressure on the Secretariat will be reduced through flexibility of autonomy to accept future offers no lower than the

net book value.

Argentina thanked the UK Government for their financial support and confirmed their support in enabling the Secretariat more flexibility in accepting offers no lower than the new book value for the sale of the Red House.

The USA supported the Secretariat having more flexibility in the sale of the Red House.

The Executive Secretary thanked members for their support and also thanked the Bureau too. It was confirmed that the Secretariat staff is more comfortable in the new work environment.

The F&A Committee recommends the Commission allow the Secretariat greater flexibility and provide authority to the Secretariat to accept offers not lower than either the new book value, or the current market value, for the sale of the Red House, through consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair.

3.6 Review and closure of items on the Database of Recommendations

This item allows the Committee to endorse closure of recommendations on the Database of Recommendations. The document recommends closing 36 recommendations and leaving 4 recommendations open for further work.

The USA thanked the Committee for the document and commended the work completed. The USA further suggested that the item related to the Governance Review Process should also be closed as events have moved on from when that recommendation was approved.

The Secretariat's Head of F&A confirmed that the Governance Review is the one from 2018, where things have moved forward since then, therefore, we could close this one too.

The F&A Committee noted progress and recommended that 37 recommendations should be closed.

4. INTERSESSIONAL WORKING GROUPS

4.1 Report of the Standing Working Group for Operational Effectiveness

At IWC64, the Commission endorsed a recommendation from the F&A Committee to establish a Working Group on Operational Effectiveness (WG-OE). At IWC68, the Commission asked the WG-OE to consider a number of issues. The WG-OE met during the intersessional period to discuss these issues and prepare a draft report. The Co-Chairs of the WG-OE presented a summary of its discussions and recommendations:

4.1.1 Quorum

The Co-Chairs presented a summary of the WG-OE's discussions on quorum.

The WG-OE agreed on a number of core principles to guide any proposals to change the Commission's Rules of Procedure. 1) The definition of quorum should be simple, clear and practical to interpret and implement. 2) Any changes to the current Rules of Procedure (RoP) should be agreed by consensus and, in lieu of consensus, the Commission should continue to apply the current RoP. The WG-OE also noted that Contracting Governments have a duty to participate actively and in good faith.

The WG-OE was not able to reach consensus on a single recommended change to the existing RoP regarding quorum, and thus the Co-Chairs presented several options to the F&A Committee – see Annex 1 to the WG-OE Report for more details.

Norway recognised this is a delicate matter for the Commission and suggested it will not be possible to reach consensus before IWC69.

Australia agreed with Norway and suggested the F&A Committee endorse the core principles agreed in the WG-OE, as the agreed process and principles are worth documenting.

Regarding the footnote contained in two of the options, Brazil noted the importance of consensus but suggested it is uncommon practice for an intergovernmental organisation to contemplate counting

countries in arrears and absent from proceedings for 10 or more years to count for the definition of quorum.

In response to the comments made by Brazil regarding this footnote, IFAW noted that Financial Rule F.5(e) treats Contracting Governments in arrears for three financial years as non-member governments for the purposes of meeting attendance fees charged.

IFAW suggested text that could be incorporated into the WG-OE report to reflect this in response to the WG-OE draft report that was circulated earlier this week but as they did not raise this point during the WG-OE discussions, given we had not yet seen the text of the report capturing Brazil's intervention, we make it now, and leave to this committee and WG-OE co-chairs to decide how they might want to capture the reflection above in reporting.

The F&A Committee endorsed the core principles and agreed to propose the three options contained in Annex I of the WG-OE report (FA/69/REP/WGOE) for consideration by the Commission.

4.1.2 Exceptional circumstances

The Co-Chairs presented a summary of the WG-OE's discussions on exceptional circumstances – see Annex 1 to the WG-OE Report (FA/69/REP/WGOE). The WG-OE agreed that the RoP should define a process by which the Commission would consider restoration of voting rights in exceptional circumstances and that any criteria of 'exceptional circumstances' should be flexible in order to cope with unforeseeable eventualities.

The F&A Committee discussed two options: 'Alternative 1' and 'Alternative 2'. The F&A Chair summarised the difference between these versions: Alternative 1 requires any written requests to be received by the Chair and Vice-Chair two weeks before the next Commission meeting; Alternative 2 requires any written requests to be received four weeks before the next Commission meeting, with the Chair and Vice-Chair to respond two weeks before the next meeting.

Argentina, Belgium, New Zealand, the UK and IFAW all expressed a preference for 'Alternative 2', noting that some inconsistencies remained with the language. The F&A Chair worked with Australia, Belgium and the UK to further refine the language.

IFAW noted the paper submitted to the WG-OE originally had options of the whole commission making a decision but that was removed, to maintain transparency for the rest of the commission given that consideration would only be by the Chair/Vice-Chair (with Bureau), IFAW suggests that it may be useful to add in an additional sentence to make clear that a communication is made to the wider commission at both points, firstly about any requests received, and then confirming decision outcomes.

Australia agreed 'Alternative 2' is preferable and supported the suggestion from IFAW about needing an addition to the change to the RoP to reflect all decisions needing to be communicated to the Commission.

The UK also supported the suggestion from IFAW to communicate the request and decision to the Commission, as this helped address previous UK comments about the need for Commission to consider a decision on exceptional circumstances and to address inconsistencies with the language on exceptional circumstances adopted at IWC68

The F&A Committee recommends the Commission consider the RoP changes reflected in the final WG-OE report (FA/69/REP/WGOE).

4.1.3 Align suspension of voting rights with biennial meeting schedule

The Co-Chairs presented a summary of the WG-OE's discussions on the alignment of suspended voting rights with the biennial meeting schedule – see Annex 1 to the WG-OE Report (FA/69/REP/WGOE).

There were no objections.

The F&A Committee recommends the Commission consider the RoP changes reflected in the final WG-OE report (FA/69/REP/WGOE).

4.1.4 Payment plans

The Co-Chairs presented a summary of the WG-OE's discussions on payment plans – see Annex 1 to the WGOE Report (FA/69/REP/WGOE).

There were no objections.

The F&A Committee recommends the Commission consider the RoP changes reflected in the final WG-OE report (FA/69/REP/WGOE).

4.1.5 Other items

Nothing further to cover.

4.2 Voluntary Conservation Fund (VCF) Steering Group

The Chair of the VCF presented an update on the fund.

As Chair of the VCF Steering Group (VCF SG), I am pleased to provide an update on the VCF, also detailed in paper CC/69/17.1/01/REV1.

The Chair of the VCF SG expressed huge thanks to the Secretariat for working rapidly to get a REV1 of the report up in order to address questions raised at F&A under item 4.2. This was uploaded earlier today so hopefully everyone had a chance to read it.

The VCF SG most recently met in July 2024 at which point no new funding proposals had been received since IWC68.

Since that meeting, however, several proposals have been submitted via SWG, ICG and Committee reports. The VCF SG have also been made aware of other proposals that are currently in development and may be up for discussion and potential endorsement at IWC69. Please note that none of these have been formally discussed by the VCF SG yet.

At the F&A session under item 4.2 it was requested that a consolidated list of existing and in-development proposals should be provided. The Chair of the VCF SG was pleased to confirm that these are now captured in the REV1 of the VCF SG report which has now been uploaded.

As a brief overview, we are currently aware of 7 proposals that may seek funding through the Voluntary Conservation Fund. These include:

- Funding for the Secretariat Ship Strikes Data Manager Position
- Funding to supplement the existing Secretariat Strandings Coordinator position which is primarily funded through the Welfare Fund
- Funding for the Arabian Sea Humpback Whale CMP work
- Funding for an Ecosystem Function Pilot Project
- Funding for participation in a Climate Change workshop
- Funding for work on the impacts of Whale Watching in Timor Leste
- Funding for a bycatch workshop in the South Pacific

The total for these funding requests may be up to £231,000.

Some of these projects would be able to be funded through specific ring-fenced funding lines. For example, the CMP work would likely come out of the unallocated CMP line. The Chair of the VCF SG wanted to stress that if all of these projects were to be approved the total required funding would exceed the General Unassigned pot by approximately £10,000, assuming no further voluntary contributions are received in 2025 and 2026. The VCF SG will consider all project proposals that it receives and will prioritise distribution of funds in accordance with the agreed criteria and processes.

Whilst it would be great to see this money being used, The Chair of the VCF SG wanted to stress that

the VCF is not unending and cannot necessarily be relied upon to pick up funding shortfalls in other areas. Also, a reminder that if any new funding requests do come in, they will have to meet the agreed eligibility and evaluation criteria.

The VCF SG considered that with the potential increasing reliance on the VCF for funding, it could be worthwhile establishing a more structured use of the VCF. Currently, funding is disbursed on an ad-hoc basis which can result in proposals only being submitted towards the end of the intersessional period. This means that projects may be funded on a first-come first-served basis and can also conservation work from progressing.

The Chair of the VCF SG recommended that the group should work intersessionally to develop a more structured process for considering proposals and disbursing funds with the hope this will result in a steadier conservation output and allow for proper prioritization of projects. This structured process may include setting regular calls for funding, with deadlines for funding proposals throughout the intersessional period.

Belgium thanked the Chair for their update on the REV1 paper and said requests against the Voluntary Welfare Fund should be maintained there, not under the Voluntary Conservation Fund and requested donations to the Voluntary Welfare Fund to support their important work. There will be an evening event at IWC69 to highlight the work of all voluntary funds.

The F&A Committee thanked the donors for their contributions and noted the intersessional work to be carried out on an improved process for fund disbursement.

4.3 Creation of a new Intersessional Correspondence Group for Fundraising

The Secretariat's Head of F&A presented a summary of this proposal contained in FA/69/4.3/01. The Committee is asked to consider the draft Terms of Reference (ToR) for a new Intersessional Correspondence Group (ICG) which were drafted at IWC68. The Secretariat welcomes any support and advice from Contracting Governments about creating a new ICG.

Austria welcomed the proposal and has been advocating this issue for years and probably even initiated it. Wording in the ToR needs rephrasing: two ToR seem to imply that future money from fundraising will be channeled entirely through the Voluntary Fund categories. But fundraising is not the same thing as voluntary funds, which are traditionally provided by Contracting Governments or NGOs, and funds might well be sought for tasks that currently have no "voluntary box". Austria encouraged the Commission to think big!

Belgium stressed the importance of a group to support the Secretariat with fundraising activities, building on the good work of the ICG-SF and incorporating the Code of Ethical Fundraising. Belgium also suggested the Contracting Governments could help support the Secretariat with identifying appropriate funding sources.

Iceland suggested a new ICG does not address the core problem of the IWC's financial sustainability and highlighted the importance of addressing this problem first.

The USA stated that it supported the concept of this ICG, they would like to provide some amendments to the proposed ToR. In particular, to ensure any grants are aligned with the Commission's Code of Ethics & Rules of Procedure. The USA also sought clarity on whether the ICG would present additional work for the Secretariat given the limited resources and finances.

Australia agreed with previous comments. Fundraising is unpredictable in the medium to long-term. Australia supported the creation of the ICG but one of the core principles should be that work that is a core responsibility of the Commission should be funded by parties. Fundraising should only be used to augment and improve the ability to conduct the Commission's business, or for standalone matter that would be less impacted if the funding is disrupted.

The F&A Committee endorsed the proposal in principle with amendments to the ToR to be resolved

during IWC69.

4.4 Reports from other Committees or Working Groups as appropriate

The Secretariat's Head of F&A presented a summary of the Report on Voluntary Welfare Funds. During the intersessional period, this Fund received £145,000 in donations to fund the Stranding Coordinator's position and a number of training workshops for strandings and entanglement.

The F&A Committee noted the progress of the fund to date.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS AND SCHEDULE AMENDMENTS

This agenda item allows for discussion on any proposed Resolutions and Schedule Amendments which may require input of the F&A Committee. There are five proposed Resolutions and one proposed Schedule Amendment.

The slide presented at the Budgetary Sub-Committee meeting are estimated short-term, 2-year, draft costs to the Commission. The costs are based on interpretation of the paper and can be amended although they have been costed collaboratively with proponents.

Some of the costs mainly include travel costs and may already be covered by core funding to the Secretariat.

The UK thanked the Secretariat and Proponents for the proposed costs and asked for confirmation that the costs drafted reflected the next biennium – this was confirmed by the Secretariat's Head of F&A. The rationale for giving short-term costs relates to the wider budget discussions but it was noted that where there is scope to indicate the longer-term costs this would be helpful.

New Zealand supported the UK's comment on duration which was also discussed in the Budgetary Sub-Committee meeting. Clarification was requested relating to sequencing and how these proposals get reflected into the budgetary discussions.

The Executive Secretary indicated that the evolution of the resolutions requires an iterative process as some costs are already covered through core funding and some aspects of the resolution could be covered through voluntary funding.

Brazil asked for clarification on the costs as the SAWS Schedule Amendment, once approved would not entail short-term costs as the estimations for reassessments are planned for 20 years in the future. The Secretariat's Head of F&A apologized and agreed to remove the £8k from Annex 1 of the paper.

Hungary thanked the Secretariat for the cost drafts.

The Committee supported these draft cost estimates being shared with the Commission, with the inclusion of both short and longer-term costs considerations, if possible.

6. FURTHER INFORMATION ON PREVIOUSLY APPROVED RESOLUTIONS AND SCHEDULE AMENDMENTS

6.1 Further financial insight on the Resolution on Marine Plastic Pollution – IWC68

The background information for this item can be found in document FA/69/6.1/01, Response to the IWC Marine Plastic Resolution. This Resolution was approved at IWC68 and the Secretariat and Scientific Committee (SC) have worked together to produce the estimated costs.

The Vice-Chair of the SC presented the paper that is a response to the request from the Commission to address the Resolution. External experts to the SC from the University of Exeter, UK were consulted to provide insights from their active research programmes. The work by the Environmental Concerns Committee through the Strandings Initiative, the HIM Committee, the BMI Committee and the WW Committee also contributed to the paper; supported by a partial workplan developed by the Marine Debris ICG throughout the 2023-24 period. During the presentation, the focus was set on the role of the SC in the implementation of the resolution. Three different approaches were presented in the

paper with different levels of work and time periods. The first approach encompasses a literature review, non-quantitative risk assessment and to develop a strandings database that gives the least burden to the SC and is the most cost-effective approach at £198,000 over eight years. The second approach is to establish a detailed methodology to cultivate more expertise within the Secretariat Statistics Department, £278,000 over the next biennium. The third approach was fully comprehensive risk assessment to complete the Resolution to create a global map of hotspots, £310,000 over the biennium. The Commission will be presented with the three options for endorsement to seek external funding support and for exploration of the possibility of allocation of a portion of the Research Fund to the options.

Belgium presented comments on behalf of the European Union and its Member States Party to the ICRW to the agenda item: they thanked the SC Leadership for their work and indicated their preference for the second option given its alignment with the scope of the resolution, but its budgetary impact could be further reduced to focus on the essence of the Resolution's mandate to the SC. A more in-depth conversation can be continued during IWC69, as the virtual sub-committees were, due to time constraints, not the appropriate platform for this discussion.

The USA noted that information of risk, prevalence and global scale of the problem should be gathered first, before moving to any needed next steps. It also noted that the gear marking, global hot spots, and necropsy for inclusion of microplastic assessment would require experimental design, modeling and investment well above the proposed budget. It supports moving forward with implementing Resolution 2022-1, but recommended starting small and building on the work over time. It also asked about how the Global Strandings Database would be developed and used for a risk assessment of cetacean exposure to plastic debris.

Austria confirmed that the document is extremely thorough and therefore lengthy. Thanks to Lindsay and team for putting it together. Regarding the different options, specifically the "proposed activities and costs" listed here: there incorporate what some might consider to be activities not directly related to the plastics issues, such as contaminant mapping. This needs to be explained and may unnecessarily inflate the costs. These costs can perhaps be tweaked to make the various options more palatable and give the plastic/marine debris part itself better chances of being funded.

The F&A Committee supports these draft cost estimates for the SC work being shared with the Commission together with the comments raised, as well as the draft cost estimates for the activities of the Secretariat, CC and WG-WKM&WI, not explicitly discussed during the session.

7. FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS FORMULA

The Secretariat's Head of F&A presented a summary of the Financial Contributions Formula.

There were no interventions or questions.

8. PROPOSED RULES OF PROCEDURE AND FINANCIAL REGULATIONS CHANGES

The Chair of the Scientific Committee (SC) presented a summary of a proposal to create a new Vice-Chair Elect position and amend the Scientific Committee RoP to ensure the SC Leadership positions align with the new biennial schedule.

Austria expressed support for this proposal as a positive advance in every imaginable interpretation.

Belgium expressed support for the proposal.

The UK expressed support for the proposal and praised the potential benefits for capacity-building of expanding the SC leadership.

Argentina expressed support for the proposal.

The F&A Committee supported the proposal and agreed to propose these changes to the Commission.

9. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS, BUDGETS AND OTHER MATTERS ADDRESSED BY THE BUDGETARY SUB-COMMITTEE

These matters have previously been discussed by the Budgetary Sub-Committee at its meeting on Thursday 29 August. The financial documents are required to be presented under financial regulations D1 and D2.

9.1 Review of outturn position for 2022 and 2023 and the forecast outturn for 2024

9.1.1 Report of the Budgetary Sub-Committee, including:

- Audited accounts for 2022 (BSC/69/3.1/01) and 2023 (BSC/69/3.2/01)
- The forecast outturn position for 2024 (BSC/69/4.1/01/REV1)
- Recommendation in relation to Observer, NGO and Media fees (BSC/69/5.3/01)

The Chair of the BSC confirmed that the BSC report is now finalized and is available on the website.

The Chair of the BSC presented a summary of the accounts for 2022 (deficit £4,623) and 2023 (surplus £32,027). Both years received an unqualified audit opinion, which means the accounts were presented fairly and in compliance with accounting principles.

The Chair of the BSC presented a summary of the forecast outturn for 2024 (deficit £23,000 against a balanced budget).

The Chair of the BSC presented a summary of proposed increases to Observer, NGO and Media fees in line with inflation and previous IWC meetings.

The F&A Committee recommended the Commission adopt the 2022 and 2023 audited accounts, note the forecast position for 2024 and agree to propose the Observer, NGO and Media fee increases to the Commission.

9.1.2 Secretary's Report on Financial Contributions and Voting Status

The Executive Secretary presented document BSC/69/4.3/0.1 (Secretary's Report on Financial Contributions and Voting Status). This item is required by Financial Regulation E.4.

At the date of the report, the Commission had received 44 payments for 2024, which is 50% of members. Since that date the Commission has received 5 more payments and the Secretariat expects additional payments before the deadline of 22 September 2024. This means that the Commission is quorate.

The Executive Secretary highlighted that receiving members' contributions is critical for the Commission to be able to operate. As per the Rules of Procedure and Financial Regulations, Contracting Governments that remain in arrears on 22 September 2024, will have their right to vote suspended.

A section on the IWC website provides a monthly report of the status of financial contributions.

The UK welcomed the 5 additional contributions and thanked the Governments.

The Executive Secretary encouraged countries to pay by 22 September 2024 in order to avoid suspension of voting rights.

9.2 Scientific Committee

9.2.1 Review of prior year spending

9.2.2 Future Workplan and Research Budget Request

9.2.3 Proposed changes to the Rules of Procedure

The Vice-Chair of the SC explained how document BSC/69/4.2/01 covered the SC update on 2023 and 2024 approved projects and spend to date. At the April 2024 SC, the Convenors reviewed the status of the projects and were encouraged to aid Project Leads in completing their projects in a timely manner.

As of 31 July 2024, the Research Fund has a balance of £300,584, 82% of this balance is to cover active and committed projects, with the residual going towards funding the contingency, supporting

Commission Recommendations and Strandings Emergency Response.

The Vice-Chair of the SC then explained document BSC/69/5.2.1/01 covers the SCs budget request for 2025 and 2026.

At the SC meeting in April 2024, a rigorous process of scoring and ranking was applied to each project proposal. This ranking is included in the paper under annex 1.

The SC requests budget from the Commission to the value of £309k in 2025 and £242k in 2026, making a total of £550k for the biennium.

There is a small amount of flexibility around the year in which some projects can commence, to help even out the budget over the biennium. However, a lot of the proposals are for workshops where the outcomes are required for the 2026 SC meeting.

The Vice-Chair of the SC asked the Committee to note the fund position for 2024 to date and hoped it would support the 2025-2026 budget request.

The USA thanked the SC and its leadership for the 2025-26 research budget request and the prioritised list of projects for funding. The USA appreciated that the SC prioritised projects of several key SC sub-committees, including those that support the Commission's ASW work, as it is the only whaling currently managed by the Commission and, as such, remains a priority for the Commission. The USA also noted the need for adequate statistical staff at the Secretariat which is important for implementation of the Convention.

Belgium thanked the SC for their amazing work and for the 2025-26 project list, recognizing the difficulty of the exercise. Belgium asked for guidance on the pending discussion of the Plastics Resolution, which may impact the SC list of projects. They requested clarity on how this would be brought together with the current proposed list.

The F&A Committee noted the SCs 2023 and 2024 to date fund position, noted the request for the 2025-26 budget and advised continued discussion of this item is necessary within the overall budgetary discussions.

9.3 Consideration of Proposed Budget for 2025 and 2026

9.3.1 Report of the Budgetary Sub-Committee

9.3.2 Discussion of recommendations with financial, human or other resource implications

The Chair of the BSC reminded parties, at IWC69 the Commission will be asked to agree to a budget for 2025-26 and to agree in principle to a provisional budget for 2027-28.

The Secretariat and the BSC have worked together to build a balanced budget proposal (BSC/69/05/01) to present to IWC69. The budget was built by identifying two types of expenditure:

- (1) **Baseline:** These are items that are currently paid for and accounted for in previous years' budgets. This includes: (a) remuneration for current Secretariat staff, (b) the same budget for Commission and Scientific Committee meetings and the Scientific Committee research budget, and (c) increases to the baseline budget by 2% each year to account for inflation.
- (2) **Needs:** On top of the baseline budget, there are several additional 'needs or exceptional items' which are not currently accounted for. These include: (a) additional staff to increase the statistics capacity within the Secretariat, (b) a new database to bring the secretariat up to modern data storage standards, and (c) small increase to the Secretariat's travel budget so the IWC can be represented at important international meetings.

There are a number of other needs (Annex 3) but we have been cautious and mindful of the pressure on Parties. So, we have been very strict with only bringing forward the highest priority and more critical needs.

The result is that the paper proposes a 5% increase to Contracting Governments' fees in 2025 and a

further 5% in 2026. As well as similar rises across the 2027 and 2028 years.

The BSC paper does also propose drawing down on some of the General Reserve Funds to cover some small additional costs: including: (1) where we need to make improvements to our Compliance with the UK's Data protection laws, (2) where potentially to cover the additional, unforeseen costs associated with the upcoming IWC69 meeting, and (3) to cover a short fall that may become apparent if Red House doesn't sell in a timely manner.

Parties engaged robustly with the proposal at the BSC meetings, with many questions and clarifications from the floor and many questions on the SC Research Budget.

A range of views were expressed with quite a few parties expressing their support and an expectation for fees to increase.

The BSC Chair noted that she is willing to engage with any parties individually if they have questions on the proposal between now and IWC69. She further encouraged all members to come to IWC69 prepared to agree a balanced budget that enables the Commission to keep pace with inflation and ensure that critical needs are funded.

Australia welcomed and strongly supported the budget proposal. Australia noted that a 5% increase in membership contributions is a balanced and reasonable proposal that will allow the Commission to keep pace with inflation and continue to deliver the program that members expect.

Statistics is a core capability of the Commission, critical for both its science and conservation work. Australia noted full support in the need for greater statistics capacity within the Secretariat. Australia also noted their support for the essential modernisation of the Commission's databases and recognised the need to increase the Secretariat's travel budget to facilitate engagement with other international organisations. Finally, Australia supports the uses of the General Fund reserves as proposed.

Iceland thanked the BSC and said it was a bit disappointing that some of the comments raised 2 years ago have not come across in terms of streamlining the Secretariat and striving for more realistic budgets. Proposal to increase fees for 2025-26 is not acceptable to all countries and if balanced budget means a fee increase every year, there needs to be a serious look at the Secretariat's operations. Prioritisation is needed. Iceland urges the F&A to take a serious look at the proposal and see if cost-cutting can be introduced.

The UK thanked the BSC and the Secretariat for this important work and their huge efforts in producing the budget proposal. And particular thanks to Margie, Emma and team for their excellent leadership. They are encouraged that the finances look healthier following the adoption of the Budgetary Reform Strategy at IWC68, we've heard positive updates about the state of the General Fund, but we remain concerned by the significant financial challenges facing the IWC, including inflationary pressures on operating costs. Grateful to the Secretariat and the SC for the excellent work undertaken over the last two years, but we are conscious that they have delivered all this work under resource constraints following cuts at IWC68.

The UK acknowledged that this has left some critical gaps in services and welcomed the work of the BSC to identify and prioritise these as part of the budget proposal. They fully support prioritisation and streamlining of work as mentioned by others. This includes suggested additional items such as the consultancy to ensure GDPR compliance, which we note should be considered holistically alongside all budget lines.

The UK believed it is important to be pragmatic about the need for increases to contribution fees to ensure the effective operation of the IWC. The UK is therefore prepared to support necessary increases to contributions, at least in line with inflation.

Having said that, we also fully recognise the significant fiscal challenges many member countries are facing and the sensitivities around balancing this with any increase to contributions, and so stand ready

to work with other Parties on the best way forward.

The Netherlands echoed the UK's comments. 2 years ago the situation was quite problematic. The Secretariat situation was horrible and cuts they took kept the IWC afloat. Good to see the position has improved. Must be realistic what inflation has meant. Willing to support proposed increase.

New Zealand thanked those for the huge amount of work undertaken. Pleased to see the Budget Reform Strategy principle are the basis for the proposals. Welcomed the disciplined approach. Know this has involved hard conversations on priorities. Lima will be challenging but have to have these conversations. New Zealand accepts the increase proposal, it's reasonable and also necessary.

Germany thanked the BSC and the Secretariat. They are fully aware of the ambition of this exercise. There is no position from the German Government at this stage and will try to be well prepared for Lima with a clear mandate. A 5% increase is complicated for Germany. Will see if there is some flexibility at least re inflation. Raised the question what would happen if there is not the additional statistics capacity or the new database in the Secretariat. This information is needed to convince Germany's capital.

The Secretariat's Head of Science, Conservation and Management said the capacity of the Statistics Department is already overstretched, the Lead is working excessive hours to keep on top of demand. If more resource is not available then the amount the Department can achieve will have to be reduced. The number of assessments by the SC will need to be reduced and their timetable will have to be reevaluated.

The Executive Secretary advised that regarding the database, the Secretariat are working with a risky model where data is held in different places including PCs of individuals. An example of a risk is recently 6 months worth of data input was lost because systems are not fit for purpose. This is critical data needed for the work of the Commission on assessments, abundance etc. and the Secretariat are currently entering it into systems twice which is inefficient. The Secretariat made a huge effort regarding budgeting, focusing on critical needs for core functions. It is the Executive Secretary's responsibility to ensure the Secretariat delivers proper balanced work and this is not the case at the moment.

The Chair of the BSC referred Germany to the budget report and annex 2 which might help support making the case for identified critical needs.

The USA said that a 5% increase in the overall budget is difficult to support.

The Executive Secretary said about the rigor that this budget has been developed with and we are very aware of the constraints and of the severe cuts to the Secretariat at the IWC68. The Secretariat is happy to be in the new office but impacts are still being felt. She suggested some important principles for parties to take into account:

- (1) Importance of ensuring the mandate given to the Secretariat is in line with capacity, which is not currently the case.
- (2) What can be fundraised for and what must be covered with Core funds. Many Secretariat roles are Core functions
- (3) Important to consider areas where fundraising is possible
- (4) Voluntary Funds – how to include Secretariat costs into the project costing
- (5) Take into account risks that result from turnover, keeping institutional memory and also maintain and attract new talent.
- (6) Principle of considering commitments made, work plans already approved.
- (7) Look across all budget lines, we have looked at Secretariat expenditure and we are at maximum capacity and there are no more cuts to make without compromising its ability to

serve the Commission.

- (8) In the current context of budget constraints, it is more important to be clear on criteria and principles, and to align work assigned to the Secretariat with actual Secretariat capacity.

The F&A Committee noted a range of views on the proposed budget and referred adoption of the budget to the Commission.

9.4 F&A Committee Discussions and Recommendations

As per 9.3.1 above.

9.5 Budgetary Sub-Committee Operations

The Chair of the BSC informed that membership of the BSC is through rotation of Contracting Governments. Two seats are allocated to Contracting Governments in each capacity to pay group, and Governments serve for four years with membership then passing on in alphabetical order.

The BSC supported Australia remaining as Chair of the Sub-Committee for the next biennium to support the implementation of the proposals adopted by the Commission and to progress any additional adjustments needed to be brought to IWC70.

The BSC agreed that they would bring to the F&A Committee's attention that there are a few vacant seats on the BSC, these are the two open seats and the Vice-Chair position. The BSC Chair noted there were no nominations for the vacant positions during the BSC meeting.

The F&A Committee noted these vacancies and deferred them to the Commission.

10. BUREAU MEMBERSHIP

The Bureau is constituted under Rule of Procedure M.9. which also describes its membership. This item allows for discussion and nomination of members for the 2-year period to the next Commission meeting. Changes in the membership are expected this year because of the election of new Chair and Vice Chair as well as expiration of two-year terms for some Commissioners.

The F&A Committee made no recommendations to the Commission on this item.

11. ANY OTHER MATTERS

Australia thanked the Committee for accommodating an additional item.

Paper FA/69/11/01 has been in mind for a long time, to explore improving communications between This proposal seeks agreement to establish what I have called a 'Science Liaison Committee'.

Over the past few years, the SC has worked hard to improve the manner in which it communicates its work and recommendations to the Commission.

However, the Commission's communication with the SC is ad hoc and unconsolidated, with feedback embedded across the record of the Commission's plenary deliberations.

Clear and regular two-way communication between the Commission and its subcommittees is critical to ensure the Commission appropriately understands and considers the recommendations it receives, and that the subcommittees respond to the changing priorities of the Commission in a cost effective, timely and efficient manner.

Australia's proposal to establish a Science Liaison Committee seeks to address this gap. It is a cost neutral proposal but will require Commissioners to designate their time during Commission meetings. It would be composed of six science-literate Commissioners or their appointed delegates and be tasked with providing the Scientific Committee with clear feedback and instructions from the Commission to inform the Scientific Committee's prioritisation of its work program.

Document number FA/69/11/01 provides more detail and contains a draft Terms of Reference.

The document asks the F&A to recommend to the Commission that this Science Liaison Committee is established. If agreed by the Commission, it would begin work after IWC69 and provide its first report at IWC70.

Australia suggested this could be run as an attempt in an ad-hoc way at IWC69 depending on whether there is appetite for this at Private Commissioners meeting.

The Vice-Chair of the SC confirmed the SC leadership discussed the paper. The Chair of the SC was concerned that the Secretariat's Head of Science, Conservation and Management and Secretariat are already over-stretched. The idea that the Secretariat's Head of Science, Conservation and Management would be the conduit adds burden to the Secretariat. A good model might be to include the SC Chair and Vice-Chair in the meetings – it's simple and makes things open and transparent. Improved communication is important and will help the SC focus on what the commission want, especially in times of budgetary pressure. The Chair of the SC just wants to ensure it is not burdensome.

The USA thanked Australia and voiced its support for the proposal, as it would allow for improved transparency and communications from the Commission to the SC and be helpful in identifying how to prioritise the work of the SC. The USA expressed willingness to work with Australia and others on the ToR to reflect the discussion.

Belgium supported the proposal. Better communications, prioritisation and outreach with the SC is important. Especially as the SC has made a big effort to communicate more clearly with the Commission. Belgium considers it is appropriate for the Secretariat to provide holistic information to the group and for the Secretariat's Head of Science, Conservation and Management to be involved in the group. Belgium was of the understanding that the SC leadership was already included in the proposal put forward by Australia.

The UK thanked Australia and Nick and is generally supportive of the proposal for the reasons the USA and Belgium have provided. The previous comments we've heard from the Vice-Chair of the SC on resourcing implications are good to bear in mind, and if helpful, they could look at the joint working group of the CC&SC for any lessons learned.

Australia added that the SC Chair and Vice-Chair have a key role in the Committee and are spokespeople for what happens at the SC. Agreed with importance of having the Secretariat play a role, essential for the Secretariat's Head of Science, Conservation and Management to be involved.

The Vice-Chair of the SC said she wasn't suggesting that the SC replace the Secretariate in the liaison group but removing the perceived layer going through the Secretariat's Head of Science, Conservation and Management. Inclusiveness and transparency would be great.

The F&A Committee recommended the proposal be put forward for consideration by the Commission.

12. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

The report was adopted by correspondence on 12 September 2024 at 16:00hrs.

Appendix 1

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

<i>Document number</i>	<i>Title</i>
FA/69/02/01/Rev1/EN	Annotated Agenda – Revised
FA/69/3.3/01	Report on the Voluntary Assistance Fund for Governments of Limited Means
FA/69/3.4.1/01	Proposed Memorandum of Understanding between the IWC and Permanent Secretariat of the Agreement for the Creation of a Sanctuary for Marine Mammals in the Mediterranean (Pelagos Agreement)
FA/69/3.4.2/01	Proposed Memorandum of Understanding between the IWC and Permanent Commission for the South Pacific (CPPS)
FA/69/3.4.3/01	Proposed Letter of Intent between the IWC and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
FA/69/3.5/01	Update on the IWC Headquarters
FA/69/3.6/01	Progress on Finance and Administration Recommendations
FA/69/4.3/01	Creation of a new Intersessional Correspondence Group for Fundraising
FA/69/6.1/01	Report on the Response of the IWC to the Marine Plastic Resolution 2022-1
FA/69/07/01	Report on the Financial Contributions Formula
FA/69/08/01/EN	Proposed Changes in the Rules of Procedure and Financial Regulations
FA/69/9.2.3/01/EN	Draft Amendments to the Scientific Committee Rules of Procedure
FA/69/11/01	A proposal for a Science Liaison Committee (SLC) for the Commission
FA/69/REP/BSC	Report of the Budgetary Sub-Committee Virtual Meeting, 29 August 2024
FA/69/REP/WGOE	Report of the Working Group on Operational Effectiveness, 5 September 2024

Appendix 2

AGENDA

1. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

- 1.1 Appointment of Chair
- 1.2 Appointment of Rapporteur
- 1.3 Review of Documents
- 1.4 Observer Participation

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

3. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

- 3.1 Report of Confidential Communications
- 3.2 Meetings of the Commission
 - 3.2.1 Results of the feedback surveys from SC69A & SC69B
- 3.3 Report on the Voluntary Assistance Fund for Governments of Limited Means
- 3.4 Proposed agreements with other organisations
 - 3.4.1 Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with Pelagos Sanctuary
 - 3.4.2 Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between IWC and the Permanent Commission for South Pacific (CPPS)
 - 3.4.3 Letter of Intent (LoI) between IWC and SPAW
- 3.5 IWC Headquarters update
- 3.6 Review and closure of items on the Database of Recommendations (DoR)

4. INTERSESSIONAL WORKING GROUPS

- 4.1 Report of the Standing Working Group for Operational Effectiveness (WGOE)
 - 4.1.1 Quorum
 - 4.1.2 Exceptional circumstances
 - 4.1.3 Align suspension of voting rights with biennial meeting schedule
 - 4.1.4 Payment plans
 - 4.1.5 Other items
- 4.2 Voluntary Conservation Fund Steering Group
- 4.3 Creation of a new Intersessional Correspondence Group for Fundraising
- 4.4 Reports from other Committees or Working Groups as appropriate

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS AND SCHEDULE AMENDMENTS

- 5.1 Resolution on Food Security
- 5.2 Resolution for the Implementation of a Conservation and Management Programme for Whale Stocks aimed towards the lifting of the moratorium and orderly development of the whaling industry
- 5.3 Resolution on Co-operation with CCAMLR in Antarctica
- 5.4 Resolution on synergies between the IWC, the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and the BBNJ Agreement
- 5.5 Resolution on International Legal Obligations in Commercial Whaling Activities
- 5.6 Schedule Amendment on South Atlantic Whale Sanctuary

6. FURTHER INFORMATION ON PREVIOUSLY APPROVED RESOLUTIONS AND SCHEDULE AMENDMENTS

- 6.1 Further financial insight on the Resolution on Marine Plastic Pollution – IWC68

7. FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS FORMULA

8. PROPOSED RULES OF PROCEDURE AND FINANCIAL REGULATIONS CHANGES

9. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS, BUDGETS AND OTHER MATTERS ADDRESSED BY THE BUDGETARY SUB-COMMITTEE

9.1 Review of outturn position for 2022 and 2023 and the forecast outturn for 2024

9.1.1 Report of the Budgetary Sub-Committee, including:

- Audited accounts for 2022 and 2023
- The forecast outturn position for 2024
- Recommendation in relation to Observer, NGO and Media fees

9.1.2 Secretary's Report on Financial Contributions and Voting Status

9.2 Scientific Committee

9.2.1 Review of prior year spending

9.2.2 Future Workplan and Research Budget Request

9.2.3 Proposed changes to the Rules of Procedure

9.3 Consideration of Proposed Budget for 2025 and 2026

9.3.1 Report of the Budgetary Sub-Committee

9.3.2 Discussion of recommendations with financial, human or other resource implications

9.4 F&A Committee Discussions and Recommendations

9.5 Budgetary Sub-Committee Operations

10. BUREAU MEMBERSHIP

11. ANY OTHER MATTERS

12. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Finance and Administration Committee shall advise the Commission on expenditure, budgets, scale of contributions, financial regulations, staff questions and other such matters as the Commission may refer to it from time to time (*Rule of Procedure M.8.*)

ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS

Rule of Procedure C.2

2. Observers accredited in accordance with Rule [of procedure] C.1.(a) and (b) are admitted to all meetings of the Commission and the Technical Committee, and to any meetings of Committees and all subsidiary groups of the Commission and the Technical Committee, except the Commissioners-only meetings, meetings of the Bureau and closed meetings of the Finance and Administration Committee.

SPEAKING RIGHTS FOR OBSERVERS

Rule of Procedure C.3

2. Observers accredited in accordance with rule C.1.(a) and (b) will have speaking rights during Plenary sessions and sessions of Commission subsidiary groups and Committees to which they are admitted to under C.2, in accordance with the Rules of Debate of the Commission. Observers might also submit documents for information to the delegations and observers participating in such sessions, provided these are submitted through the Secretariat at least 48 hours before the session in which they are intended to be made available, and are duly authored or endorsed by the accredited organisation making the submission, which is to be held responsible for its contents.

Rules of Debate Paragraph A

A. Right to Speak

1. The Chair shall call upon speakers in the order in which they signify their desire to speak, with the exception of accredited Observers, which should be allowed to speak only after all Commissioners desiring to speak do so. As a general rule, Observers will only be allowed to speak once at each Agenda item under discussion, and at the discretion of the Chair.

Appendix 3

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Argentina

Miguel Iñiguez

Australia

Nick Gales
Emma Day
Margie Eddington
Mike Double
Suzi Heaton

Austria

Michael Stachowitsch

Belgium

Stephanie Langerock
Jens Warrie

Brazil

Ricardo Leal

Chile

Barbara Galletti

Czech Republic

Jiri Mach

Denmark

Lars Thostrup

Dominican Republic

Harolenne Gomez

Finland

Penina Blankett

France

Nabil Medaghri Alaoui

Germany

Bernd Sontgerath
Nicole Hielscher

Guinea, Republic of

Amadou Tével Diallo

Hungary

Levente Kőrösi
Andras Rakoczi
Éva Fejes
Rita Varga-Turos

Iceland

Jón Þrándur Stefánsson
Guðjón Már Sigurðsson
Þorvarður Atli Þórsson

Mexico

Dulce Maria Avila-Martínez

Netherlands

Anne-Marie Svoboda
Verna de Groes

New Zealand

Jan Henderson
Tara Willans

Norway

Petter Meier

Slovenia

Andrej Bibic

South Africa

Gerhard Cilliers
M'du Seakamela

UK

Jack Collier
Georgina Clarke
Lara Turtle
Mark Simmonds
Murray Fyfe
Sue Fisher

USA

Ryan Wulff
Lisa Phelps
Alisha Falberg
Brian Gruber
Dave Weller
Grace Ferrara
Heather Rockwell

USA (cont.)

Madi Harris
Mahvish Madad
Mi Ae Kim
Robert Suydam

Scientific Committee

Alex Zerbini (Chair)
Lindsay Porter (Vice-Chair)

INTERGOVERNMENTAL

ORGANISATION

OBSERVERS

European Commission

Julia Rusch

IUCN

Lorenzo Rojas Bracho

Pelagos Agreement

Costanza Favilli

NON-MEMBER COUNTRY

OBSERVERS

Japan

Joji Morishita

NON-GOVERNMENTAL

ORGANISATION

OBSERVERS

**Alaska Eskimo Whaling
Commission (AEWC)**

John Citta

**Animal Welfare Institute
(AWI)**

DJ Schubert
Kate O'Connell
Georgia Hancock

BANEA

Yasuhiro Sanada

**Centro de Conservacion
Cetacea (CCC)**

Elsa Cabrera
Javier Rodriguez

Dolphin Connection

Nancy Azzam

**Environmental
Investigation Agency (EIA)**

Sarah Dolman

**International Fund for
Animal Welfare (IFAW)**

Matt Collis

Cat Bell

Fundacion Cethus

Vanessa Tossenberger

Carolina Cassani

Makah Indian Tribe

Lena Hutzler

ProWildlife

Mona Schweizer

**Whale and Dolphin
Conservation (WDC)**

Katie Hunter

Interpreters

Elizabeth Lewis

Luciana Pavez Phillips

Mohammed Bennis

Schéhérazade Matallah-

Salah

Sharona Wolkowicz

Warda Tazi

IWC Secretariat

Martha Rojas Urrego

Elizabeth Campbell

Harriett Pinder

Iain Staniland

Imogen Hunter

Isidora Katara

Kate Wilson

Mark Tandy

Moussa Ki Sow

Nikki Bartmeier

Patrick Naylor

Stella Duff

Stewart Thomas