

Report of the Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Sub-Committee

Wednesday 27 June 2012, Panama

Contents

1. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS.....	2
2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA.....	2
3. ABORIGINAL SUBSISTENCE WHALING MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE.....	2
3.1 Progress with the Greenlandic Research Programme.....	2
3.2 <i>Implementation Review</i> for gray whales.....	4
4. ABORIGINAL WHALING SCHEME (AWS).....	5
5. ASW WORKING GROUP.....	5
6. ABORIGINAL SUBSISTENCE WHALING CATCH LIMITS.....	6
6.1 Bering-Chukchi-Beaufort Seas (BCB) stock of bowhead whales.....	7
6.2 North Pacific Eastern stock of gray whales.....	7
6.3 Common minke whale stocks off Greenland.....	8
6.4 West Greenland stock of fin whales.....	9
6.5 West Greenland stock of bowhead whales.....	9
6.6 Humpback whales off West Greenland.....	10
6.7 Consideration of need for the Greenlandic hunts.....	10
6.8 North Atlantic humpback whales off St. Vincent and the Grenadines.....	12
6.9 Statement from the ASW countries.....	13
7. OTHER MATTERS.....	13
8. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT.....	13

1. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

A list of participants is given as Annex A

1.1 Appointment of Chair

Herman Oosthuizen (South Africa) was appointed Chair

1.2 Appointment of Rapporteur

Greg Donovan (Secretariat) and Karena Rosa Lyons (New Zealand) were appointed rapporteurs.

1.3 Review of Documents

The list of documents is given as Annex B.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

The adopted Agenda is given as Annex C.

3. ABORIGINAL SUBSISTENCE WHALING MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE

3.1 Progress with the Greenlandic Research Programme

3.1.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

The Chair of the Scientific Committee's SWG on the Development of an Aboriginal Whaling Management Procedure, Greg Donovan (hereafter 'Chair of the SWG'), reported on the Scientific Committee's work in this regard. He explained that two items of the Committee's agenda were relevant to this item: those relating to the work on the development of *SLAs* (IWC/64/Rep1, Item 8.3); and to consideration of conversion factors for edible products (IWC/64/Rep1, Item 8.5)

DEVELOPMENT OF STRIKE LIMIT ALGORITHMS

The Committee developed and the Commission endorsed an interim safe approach to setting catch limits for the Greenland hunts in 2008, noting that this should be considered valid for up to two blocks i.e. the target is for the Committee to have developed agreed and validated *SLAs* by species by the 2017 or 2018 Annual Meeting. The interim safe approach uses an *SLA* (*Strike Limit Algorithms*) that has been simulation tested in the normal manner but not for as full a range of scenarios as a formal long-term *SLA*.

For a number of reasons, primarily related to stock structure issues, development of *SLAs* (*Strike Limit Algorithms*) for Greenland aboriginal hunts for common minke and fin whales will be more complex than for the *Bowhead* and *Gray Whale SLAs*.

The Committee noted the multi-species nature of the Greenland hunts and Greenland's desire for flexibility amongst species in meeting its subsistence needs. It reiterated that its approach will first be to develop *SLAs* for individual species before considering whether and how to address multispecies considerations.

In order to progress essential *SLA* development work, the Committee agreed that an intersessional workshop was essential to maintain progress.

With respect to common minke whales and fin whales, it was noted that the Committee's SWG on the AWMP and its sub-committee on the RMP both have interest in North Atlantic common minke whales. The Committee endorsed the planned co-operative and collaborative process developed that will culminate in a joint workshop on the stock structure of this species in the North Atlantic in early 2014. This will greatly assist the *SLA* development process and the development of a common simulation testing framework. A similar situation exists for North Atlantic fin whales which are also of interest to the sub-committee on the RMP.

CONVERSION FACTORS

In 2009, the Commission appointed a small working group (comprising several Committee members) to visit Greenland and compile a report on the conversion factors used for each species to translate the Greenlandic need request which is provided in tonnes of edible products to numbers of animals (IWC/62/9). At that time the group provided conversion factors based upon the best available data, noting that given the low sample sizes, the values for

species other than common minke whales for which the estimate was robust should be considered provisional. The group also recommended that a focused attempt to collect new data on edible products taken from species other than common minke whales be undertaken, to allow a review of the interim factors; and that data on both 'curved' and 'standard' measurements are obtained during the coming season for all species taken. The report was endorsed by the Scientific Committee.

Last year, the Committee had welcomed an initial report from Greenland, recognising the logistical difficulty of collecting these kinds of data but had requested additional information. This year, a further report was received from the Greenlandic authorities that provided information on the data collected thus far.

Although welcoming the report, the Committee expressed some concerns about it (e.g. low sample size, method used, low yield for fin whale – see IWC/64/Rep1, Item 8.5). It was noted that the Greenland Institute of Natural Resources (GINR) has been asked to investigate the low sample sizes and is working with the hunters and authorities to improve the sample size in the future. Given these concerns the Committee reiterated its recommendations from 2011 and 2012:

- (1) the provision of a full scientific paper to the next annual meeting that details inter alia at least a full description of the field protocols and sampling strategy (taking into account previous suggestions by the Committee); analytical methods; and a presentation of the results thus far, including information on the sex and length of each of the animals for which weight data are available;
- (2) the collection and provision of data on recommendation No. 2 of IWC/62/9 comparing standard vs curvilinear whale lengths. This should be done for all three species (bowhead, humpback and fin) on as many whales as possible. Guidelines and protocols are suggested in IWC/62/9.

3.1.2 Discussion and Recommendations

The Sub-Committee endorsed the report of the Scientific Committee and its recommendations.

Greenland presented an updated report on its work on conversion factors in response to the Scientific Committee's recommendations (IWC/64/ASW10). It noted that its current need statement and request (see Item 6.7) used the conversion factors per animal included in IWC/62/9.

Greenland welcomed the comments of the Committee and noted this fuller progress report was for the information of the Sub-Committee. It will be presenting a detailed report on progress in line with the Scientific Committee's recommendations and those of the Commission's small working group of two years ago (IWC/62/9) at next years' meeting. The report can be summarised as follows:

- (1) the focus is on the three species (bowhead, humpback and fin whales) for which IWC/62/9 recommended interim factors and further work;
- (2) that the protocol was introduced seven months into the whaling season in 2010 and as noted in IWC/62/9, the difficult environmental conditions, the huge length of coastline and opportunistic nature of the hunts require collaboration between authorities, hunters, scientists and wildlife officers – the present system was developed by them and has been incorporated into the Greenlandic executive orders so that weighing and reporting is mandatory;
- (3) sample sizes have been less than expected and increased efforts to improve this are underway in co-operation with the Greenland Institute of Natural Resources;
- (4) as noted by the Scientific Committee, the methods may be modified in the light of the experience gained to date (e.g. weighing of several rather than a single bin);
- (5) the limited results obtained thus far do not suggest that changes need to be made to the interim conversion factors developed in IWC/62/9 that were endorsed by the Scientific Committee;
- (6) a full progress report will be presented to the Scientific Committee in line with its recommendations next year.

In discussion, several countries thanked Denmark/Greenland for presenting the more detailed updated progress report. However, the UK and Australia also indicated concern over the poor sample size and poor following of the developed protocols. They looked forward to receiving information on improved procedures and sample sizes next year. Austria recognised the difficulties involved but highlighted the problems noted by the Scientific Committee with both methods (weighing one rather than several bins) and the following of the protocol by only a few hunters. It

also noted a lack of consultation with the small working group. The information provided in the document was not sufficient to warrant any change in the conversion factors which should only occur if agreed by the Scientific Committee. Argentina commented that it needed more time to study the report and looks forward to the full progress report that Denmark/Greenland will be submitting to the Scientific Committee next year.

3.2 Implementation Review for gray whales

3.2.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

The Chair of the SWG noted that the Committee's discussions on this issue can be found under Item 8.1 of SC/63/Rep1. He recalled that the 2010 *Implementation Review* had shown that the eastern North Pacific population as a whole was in a healthy state (the population size in 2006/7 was around 20,000 animals), but that a new immediate *Implementation Review* was needed to evaluate the performance of *SLAs* for proposed hunting by the Makah tribe in the Pacific Northwest, with a primary focus on the small (around 200 animals) PCFG (the Pacific Coast Feeding Group). The PCFG was in essence treated as a separate management stock from the large eastern North Pacific population from which the Chukotkan hunt was taken. The process has taken work by the Committee at two annual meetings and two intersessional workshops. The report of the Scientific Committee documents the extensive work undertaken following the simulation trial approach pioneered by the Committee.

In terms of *SLAs*, the Committee explored the conservation performance of 11 variants of a management plan proposed by the Makah Tribe to reduce the likelihood that a PCFG whale might be taken in the hunt.

Evaluation of *SLAs* is based on the objectives accepted by the Commission (IWC, 1983; 1995) which are to:

- (a) ensure that the risks of extinction to individual stocks are not seriously increased by subsistence whaling;
- (b) enable aboriginal people to harvest whales in perpetuity at levels appropriate to their cultural and nutritional requirements, subject to the other objectives; and
- (c) maintain the status of stocks at or above the level giving the highest net recruitment and to ensure that stocks below that level are moved towards it, so far as the environment permits.

Highest priority is accorded to the objective of ensuring that the risk of extinction to individual stocks is not seriously increased by subsistence whaling.

In order to minimise the risk of taking PCFG whales, the management plan developed by the Makah Tribe restricts the hunt both temporally and geographically. Some PCFG whales are present during the migratory season and thus the plan proposes an allowable PCFG limit (APL) during hunts that are targeting eastern North Pacific migrating whales with the aim of ensuring that accidental takes of PCFG whales do not deplete the PCFG.

Weather conditions and availability of whales makes it likely that most hunting will occur in May. However, there are insufficient data to assess the number of strikes by month. Given this uncertainty about how the plan would respond to failing to take into account struck-and-lost PCFG whales, the Tribe had proposed two *SLA* variants (1 and 2) that spanned the options as to when the hunt might occur.

SLA variant 1 proposes that struck-and-lost whales do not count towards the APL i.e., there is no management response to PCFG whales struck but not landed. *SLA* variant 2 proposes that all struck-and-lost whales count to the APL irrespective of hunting month. i.e., the number of whales counted towards the APL may exceed the actual number of PCFG whales struck. The Committee evaluated all of the trial results against the Commission's objectives and concluded

- (1) *SLA* variant 2 performed acceptably and met the Commission's conservation objectives;
- (2) *SLA* variant 1 performed acceptably provided that it is accompanied by a photo-identification programme to monitor the relative probability of harvesting PCFG whales in the Makah U&A, and the results presented to the Scientific Committee for evaluation each year.

The Committee commended these variants to the Commission. It also agreed that the *Implementation Review* is completed. Management advice is discussed under Item 6.2 below.

However, the Committee noted that the *SLA* variants tested did not correspond exactly to the management plan proposed by the Makah to the IWC. The Committee agreed to test such a variant intersessionally and examine the results at the next Annual Meeting.

The Chair of the SWG drew attention to a further relevant aspect of the Committee's work. Last year, the Committee had stressed three points.

- (1) New information on movements of gray whales highlighted the importance of further clarification of the stock structure of North Pacific gray whales. In particular, the matches of animals from the Sakhalin feeding grounds with animals seen in the PCFG area and other areas along the west coast emphasised the need for efforts to estimate the probability of a western gray whale being taken in aboriginal hunts for Pacific gray whales (noting that this did not require incorporation of western gray whales into the *Implementation Review*).
- (2) It had strongly endorsed the basinwide research programme, noting that the results of the research may require further trials for future *SLA* testing; this would be a matter for consideration at the next *Implementation Review* if not before.
- (3) The Committee will continue to monitor the situation and was willing to respond to any guidance or requests for further information from the Commission.

This year the Committee had received a paper (SC/64/BRG9) that provided an initial modelling approach to address point (1) above. Although welcoming this work, a number of questions were raised and further work identified before any conclusions could be agreed. The Committee recommended that a revised document be developed for further review at next year's meeting, noting its potential importance for the provision of management advice.

3.2.2. *Discussion and Recommendations*

The Sub-Committee endorsed the report of the Scientific Committee and its recommendations.

4. ABORIGINAL WHALING SCHEME (AWS)

4.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

The Chair of the SWG noted that this item was found under Items 8.4 and 8.5 of IWC/64/Rep1.

GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTATION REVIEWS

An integral part of the AWMP process is the undertaking of regular or 'special' *Implementation Reviews*, as noted for example during the development process of the *Bowhead Whale SLA* (IWC, 2003).

The Committee had agreed that it would be useful to develop guidelines for *Implementation Reviews*, given the experience gained thus far. The proposed guidelines are provided in IWC/64/Rep1 (Annex E, Appendix 8) and cover the following issues: (1) Objectives; (2) Timing of regular and special *Implementation Reviews*; (3) Outcomes; (4) Data Availability; (5) Computer programs.

The Committee adopted these internal guidelines.

SCIENTIFIC ASPECTS OF AN ABORIGINAL WHALING SCHEME (AWS)

In 2002, the Committee had strongly recommended that the Commission adopt the Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Scheme (IWC, 2003b, pp.22-3). This covers a number of practical issues such as survey intervals, carryover, and guidelines for surveys. The Committee has stated in the past that the AWS provisions constitute an important and necessary component of safe management under AWMP *SLAs* and it reaffirmed this view. It noted that discussions within the Commission of some aspects such as the 'grace period' are not yet complete.

4.2 Discussion and recommendations

The Sub-Committee noted the report of the Scientific Committee.

5. ASW WORKING GROUP

5.2 Report of the *Ad Hoc* Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Working Group

In 2011, the Commission endorsed a recommendation contained in document IWC/63/12rev to form an *Ad Hoc* Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Working Group (ASWWG). The members were Argentina, Austria, Denmark, Japan, Russian Federation, Switzerland, and the USA, along with the Secretariat and two members of the Scientific

Committee. The purpose of the group was to identify and consider unresolved ASW issues, including *inter alia* those identified in the 2011 report of the ASW Sub-committee.

The Chair of the ASWWG, Rollie Schmitt (USA) presented its report (IWC/64/ASW5). The Chair updated the Sub-committee on the ASWWG's discussions over the past year. He focussed on the recommended actions of the ASWWG relating to five short-term tasks:

Task 1: Facilitate the exchange of technical information on ASW hunts.

Recommendations:

- (1) Request member governments with aboriginal subsistence hunts to cooperate, to the fullest extent, in the exchange of technical hunting information.
- (2) Acknowledge and encourage the activities of the ASW Caucus in facilitating the exchange of technical information among its members.
- (3) Request that the ASW Caucus add an item on "exchange of technical information" to the agenda for each of its meetings and consider any significant issues specific to ASW hunts, and forward them to the ASW Subcommittee.

Task 2: Standardise catch limits expressed as number of whales v. tons.

Recommendations: Encourage Denmark/Greenland to continue to report East Greenland's single species hunt in term of number of whales struck/landed. Along with this recommendation, the Chair noted that one member did not accept Greenland's explanation for expressing its nutritional subsistence need for whales in terms of tons.

Task 3: Discuss the merits of long term ASW catch limits.

Recommendations: The ASWWG noted the comments from a Scientific Committee workshop (SC/64/Rep3) and awaits final action by the Scientific Committee on long term catch limits. Along with this recommendation, the Chair noted that one member did not believe that the IWC should move beyond 5-year block catch limits for any population until it has adopted an *SLA* for that population.

Task 4: Discuss IWC or other funding sources to support implementation by ASW hunters of any new IWC requirements that may arise.

Recommendations: Propose the adoption of an IWC Voluntary Fund during IWC/65, including a request for the Secretary to make arrangements for the creation of such a fund whereby contributions can be registered and utilized by the Commission.

Task 5: Secretariat review of ASW management issues and definitions.

Recommendations: A working draft report has been completed and is with the ASWWG for review.

5.3 Discussion and recommendations (including workplan)

The Sub-Committee thanked the ASWWG for its work and endorsed its recommendations (noting the reservations of one member of the ASWWG above), noting that the recommendation regarding the establishment of a voluntary fund will need to be taken to the meeting of the Finance and Administration Committee.

6. ABORIGINAL SUBSISTENCE WHALING CATCH LIMITS

Before presenting the Scientific Committee's discussions of individual catch limits, the Chair of the SWG introduced their discussions on the topic of the implications of setting catch limits for an even number of years if the Commission moves to biennial meetings (IWC/64/Rep1, Item 9). The Committee agreed that there are no scientific reasons for the Commission not to set catch limits for blocks of even numbers of years up to 8-years for BCB bowhead and eastern gray whale stocks. Given the interim safe approach adopted in 2008 for the Greenland hunts, the Committee agrees that there are no scientific reasons why the next quota block for the Greenland hunts could not be for a 6-year period, noting that the long-term *SLAs* will be available for implementation for the following block quota.

In response to a question by the USA, the Chair of the SWG noted that the Scientific Committee had by oversight not discussed the question of the length of a block quota for the hunt of St Vincent and the Grenadines. When asked for his view, he stressed he was speaking in an individual capacity. He noted that for a similar situation (that of the East Greenland common minke whale hunt, where the advice is based on the fact that the catch is a very small proportion of the total stock – see Item 6.3 below), the Committee had agreed that up to a six-year block would be

acceptable. From this one might infer that the same was true for the St Vincent and The Grenadines hunt where the catch advice is also based on the fact that the catch was a very small proportion of the total stock (see Item 6.7.1 below).

6.1 Bering-Chukchi-Beaufort Seas (BCB) stock of bowhead whales

6.1.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

The Chair of the SWG noted that two of the Committee's agenda items were relevant to this topic: the *Implementation Review* for BCB bowhead whales (SC/64/Rep1, Item 8.2) and the consideration of stocks subject to aboriginal subsistence whaling (SC/64/Rep1, Item 9.3)

The Committee's task during an *Implementation Review* is to assess whether there is any new information that would suggest that the range of trials used to evaluate the *Bowhead SLA* is no longer sufficient to ensure that the SLA meets the Commission's conservation and user objectives. The Committee received and evaluated excellent papers on stock structure, abundance and catches and thanked US scientists, the North Slope Borough, Alaska, and the native communities for continuing to provide a considerable body of high-quality scientific work which facilitated the *Implementation Review* process. In completing the review the Committee agreed that the *Bowhead SLA* continues to be the most appropriate way for the Committee to provide management advice for the BCB population of bowhead whales.

SC/64/BRG2 presented information on the 2011 Alaskan hunt. A total of 51 bowhead whales were struck resulting in 38 animals landed. No bowhead whales were reported struck and lost at Chukotka.

In 2007, the Commission agreed that a total of up to 280 BCB bowhead whales could be landed in the period 2008-2012, with no more than 67 whales struck in any year, with up to 15 unused strikes able to be carried over each year and added to the strike limit for any one year. The use of the *Bowhead SLA* confirms that the present strike and catch limits are acceptable.

6.1.2 Consideration of need

The need statement for BCB bowhead whales by the USA is given as IWC/64/ASW 3 while the need statement for BCB bowhead whales for the Chukotkan hunt is given in IWC/64/ASW 6. In response to a request by the Chair, the USA and the Russian Federation provided short summaries of their extensive documents and these are given as Annexes D and E, respectively. The strike/catch limit requests from the USA and the Russian Federation are at the same levels as previously although scaled to a six-year block.

6.1.3 Discussion and Recommendations

The Sub-Committee endorsed the report of the Scientific Committee and its recommendations.

It also accepted the need statements provided by the USA and the Russian Federation.

6.2 North Pacific Eastern stock of gray whales

6.2.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

The Chair of the SWG noted that this referred to Item 9.2 of IWC/64/Rep3. In addition to completing the *Implementation Review* with the focus on PCFG gray whales (see Item 3.2.1 above), the Committee reviewed a wide range of excellent papers on this stock including papers from Mexico, the USA and the Russian Federation. A number of research recommendations were made but no information was presented that warranted any re-evaluation of the *Gray Whale SLA*.

The Russian Federation reported that a total of 128 gray whales were struck in Chukotka, Russia in 2011 ; two were lost and 126 were landed. Of the landed whales, two were stinky and not used for human consumption.

In 2007, the Commission had agreed that a total catch of up to 620 gray whales was allowed for the years 2008-2012 with a maximum of 140 in any year. No new data were presented this year to change the Committee's advice for the large eastern North Pacific population and therefore the Committee agreed that the *Gray Whale SLA* remains the appropriate tool to provide management advice for eastern North Pacific gray whales apart from the consideration of the PCFG and the Makah hunt (see below). The Committee reiterated that the current strike limits will not harm the stock.

With respect to the management plan variants provided by the Makah Tribe, the Committee agreed that:

- (1) variant 2 performs acceptably;
- (2) variant 1 performs acceptably provided that it is accompanied by a photo-identification programme to monitor the relative probability of harvesting PCFG whales in the Makah U&A, and the results are presented to the Scientific Committee for evaluation each year.

Matters related to the possibility of an animal feeding in the western North Pacific being taken in the PCFG area were discussed under Item 3.2.1.

6.2.2 Consideration of need

The need statement for the eastern gray whale hunt off Chukotka is given as IWC/64/ASW 6 while the need statement for Makah hunt is given in IWC/64/ASW 4. In response to a request by the Chair, the Russian Federation and the USA provided short summaries of their extensive documents and these are given as Annexes E and F, respectively.

In addition the Russian Federation presented IWC/64/ASW/9 which provided additional information on the 2011 hunt. A total of 126 gray whales (58 males, 68 females) were landed in Chukotka waters in 2011; two were struck-and-lost. Over half (57.1 %) were subadults and the average length of harvested whales was higher than in previous two years. Two were stinky¹ and inedible. Whalers did not target calves or adults seen with them and there were no signs of milk in the stomachs of landed whales. A total of 10 whales had traumas or haematomas. Some 42% of animals demonstrated aggressive behaviour. Biological sampling was conducted on 55 gray whales. No bowhead whales were taken in 2011.

6.2.3 Discussion and recommendations

The Sub-Committee endorsed the report of the Scientific Committee and its recommendations.

It also accepted the need statements provided by the USA and the Russian Federation. The strike/catch limit requests from the USA and the Russian Federation are at the same levels as previously although scaled to a six-year block.

6.3 Common minke whale stocks off Greenland

6.3.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

The Chair of the SWG noted that the Committee's advice covered two hunts: that off West Greenland (IWC/64/Rep1, Item 9.4); and that off East Greenland (IWC/64/Rep1, Item 9.5).

WEST GREENLAND

In the 2011 season, 173¹ minke whales were landed in West Greenland and 6 were struck and lost. Genetic samples were obtained from 90 of these whales. The Committee re-emphasised the importance of collecting genetic samples from these whales.

In 2007, the Commission agreed that the number of common minke whales struck from this stock shall not exceed 200 in each of the years 2008-12, except that up to 15 strikes can be carried forward. In 2009, the Committee was for the first time ever able to provide management advice for this stock based on a negatively biased estimate of abundance of 17,307 (95% CI 7,628-39,270) and the method for providing interim management advice which was confirmed by the Commission. Such advice can be used for up to two five year blocks whilst SLAs are being developed (IWC, 2009a, p.16). In the light of the advice provided the strike limit was reduced to 178 from 2010. Based on the application of the agreed approach, the Committee repeated its advice of last year that an annual strike limit of 178 will not harm the stock.

EAST GREENLAND

Nine common minke whales were struck (and landed) off East Greenland in 2011, and one was struck and lost. Catches of minke whales off East Greenland are believed to come from the large Central stock of minke whales. No genetic samples were obtained from minke whales caught in East Greenland. The Committee re-emphasises the importance of collecting genetic samples from these whales.

¹ Corrected value (from 174) provided by Denmark/Greenland after the close of the Committee.

In 2007, the Commission agreed to an annual strike limit of 12 minke whales from the stock off East Greenland for 2008-12, which the Committee stated was acceptable in 2007. The present strike limit represents a very small proportion of the Central Stock of common minke whales. The Committee repeated its advice of last year that the present strike limit will not harm the stock.

6.3.2 Consideration of need

Given the multispecies need request of Greenland, the Chair agreed that need would be discussed after presentation of the Scientific Committee's advice for all of the stocks subject to Greenlandic hunts. That discussion can therefore be found under Item 6.7.

6.3.3 Discussion and Recommendations

The Sub-Committee endorsed the report of the Scientific Committee and its recommendations.

6.4 West Greenland stock of fin whales

6.4.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

The Chair of the SWG noted that the Committee's advice is given under Item 9.6 of IWC/64/Rep3. A total of five fin whales were landed during 2011. No genetic samples were obtained. The Committee re-emphasised the importance of collecting genetic samples from these whales, particularly in the light of the proposed work to develop a long-term SLA for this stock (see Item 3.1.1).

In 2007, the Commission agreed to a quota (for the years 2008-12) of 19 fin whales struck off West Greenland. This was subsequently modified to 16 and at the 2010 Annual Meeting Greenland voluntarily reduced the limit to 10 until 2012 (IWC, 2011). The Committee agreed an approach for providing interim management advice in 2008 and this was confirmed by the Commission. It had agreed that such advice could be used for up to two blocks whilst SLAs were being developed (IWC, 2009a). Based on the agreed 2007 estimate of abundance for fin whales (4,539 95%CI 1,897-10,114), and using this approach, the Committee repeated its advice that an annual strike limit of 19 whales will not harm the stock.

6.4.2 Consideration of need

Given the multispecies need request of Greenland, the Chair agreed that need would be discussed after presentation of the Scientific Committee's advice for all of the stocks subject to Greenlandic hunts. That discussion can therefore be found under Item 6.7.

6.4.3 Discussion and Recommendations

The Sub-Committee endorsed the report of the Scientific Committee and its recommendations.

6.5 West Greenland stock of bowhead whales

6.5.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

The Chair of the SWG noted that the Committee's advice is given under Item 9.1 of IWC/64/Rep1. Discussion within the Committee in recent years has focussed on stock structure and associated abundance estimates. The present working hypothesis is that bowhead whales in eastern Canada - West Greenland comprise a single stock; the alternative hypothesis assumes two stocks: one in Hudson Bay - Foxe Basin and another in Baffin Bay - Davis Strait. The Committee welcomes a number of papers related to this stock.

In 2011, one female bowhead whale was landed in West Greenland and none were struck and lost (SC/64/ProgRepDenmark). Two bowhead whales were found dead in West Greenland in 2011, entangled in fishing gear for crabs.

During 2011, three bowhead whales were taken in Canada. Detailed information was made available by Canada to the Secretariat. The Scientific Committee was pleased to receive this information including catch as well as struck/lost data.

In 2007, the Commission agreed to an annual strike limit of 2 animals for West Greenland (for the years 2008-12) with a carryover provision that any unused strikes can be carried forward to subsequent years so long as no more than two strikes are added for any one year (IWC, 2008). The Committee agreed an approach for providing interim management advice in 2008 and this was confirmed by the Commission. The agreed abundance estimate for the

single Eastern Canada/West Greenland stock is 6,344 (95% CI: 3,119-12,906) for 2002. The most recent agreed estimate for the spring aggregation in the West Greenland area is 1,747 (95% CI: 966-2,528) for 2010.

Using the agreed interim safe approach (IWC, 2009) and the 2010 estimate for West Greenland, the Committee repeated its advice that an annual strike limit of 2 whales in West Greenland will not harm the stock.

The Committee agreed that it will review an updated analysis for the 2010 West Greenland area at next year's meeting. It noted that although this is slightly lower, if adopted it will not alter the management advice. The Committee is also aware that catches from the same stock have been taken by a non-member nation, Canada. Should Canadian catches continue at a similar level as in recent years, this would not change the Committee's advice with respect to the strike limits agreed for West Greenland. Given the importance of this issue, the Committee again recommended that the Secretariat continues to contact Canada requesting information about catches and domestic catch limits for bowhead whales, as well as any information on strandings, entanglements and ship strikes.

6.5.2 Consideration of need

Given the multispecies need request of Greenland, the Chair agreed that need would be discussed after presentation of the Scientific Committee's advice for all of the stocks subject to Greenlandic hunts. That discussion can therefore be found under Item 6.7.

6.5.3 Discussion and Recommendations

The Sub-Committee endorsed the report of the Scientific Committee and its recommendations.

6.6 Humpback whales off West Greenland

6.6.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

The Chair of the SWG noted that the Committee's advice is given under Item 9.7 of IWC/64/Rep1. A total of eight (three males; five females) humpback whales were landed (none were struck and lost) in West Greenland during 2011. Genetic samples were obtained from three of these whales. The Committee re-emphasised the importance of collecting genetic samples and photographs of the flukes from these whales, particularly with respect to international collaborative initiatives.

In 2007, the Committee agreed an approach for providing interim management advice and this was confirmed by the Commission. It had agreed that such advice could be used for up to two five year blocks whilst SLAs were being developed (IWC, 2009a, p.16). The agreed estimate of abundance for humpback whales is 3,039 (CV 0.4) with an annual rate of increase of about 9%. Using this estimate and the agreed approach, the Committee agrees that an annual strike limit of 10 whales will not harm the stock.

6.6.2 Consideration of need

Given the multispecies need request of Greenland, the Chair agreed that need would be discussed after presentation of the Scientific Committee's advice for all of the stocks subject to Greenlandic hunts. That discussion can therefore be found under Item 6.7.

6.6.3 Discussion and Recommendations

The Sub-Committee endorsed the report of the Scientific Committee and its recommendations.

6.7 Consideration of need for the Greenlandic hunts

6.7.1 Need statement by Greenland

The need statement for the Greenlandic hunts is given as IWC/64/ASW 7 and 8. In response to a request by the Chair, Denmark/Greenland provided a short summary of their extensive documents and this is given as Annex G. It noted that its request was consistent with Scientific Committee advice. The proposed catch limits for bowhead whales and for common minke whales off West and East Greenland are unchanged although modified for a six-year period. The proposed annual catch for humpback whales is for 10 animals, an increase in 1 from the current Schedule while that for fin whales is for 19 an increase of 3 from the current schedule. The request is consistent with the multispecies need of 670 tonnes of edible products for West Greenland and 12 common minke whales for East Greenland.

6.7.2 Discussion and recommendations

There was considerable discussion regarding the need statement by Greenland, including the sale of whale meat in Greenlandic restaurants acknowledged by Greenland. The Chair noted that there is clearly no consensus over this

issue within the Sub-Committee. He urged all countries to use the time between the close of the meeting and the Plenary to engage in further discussions in order to improve mutual understanding of positions and to try to reach consensus. Given the need for reflection and further consideration, rather than a near verbatim record, the report below incorporates a short summary of the main points raised.

The USA noted that it believes that the use of whale products in Greenland is consistent with the IWC definition of Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling. It also noted that there appears to be acceptance by the ASW Subcommittee of the need for approximately 670 tons of whale meat per year. It further noted that the Scientific Committee has found Greenland's proposed levels sustainable for each stock. It received information from Denmark/Greenland that the expected yield for Greenland under *status quo* catch limits (i.e., those currently defined in the Schedule) was 570 tonnes, while the expected yield from the proposed catch limits was 680 tonnes using conversion rates per animal from IWC/62/9.

Iceland, Norway, Japan, Russian Federation, St Lucia and St Vincent and The Grenadines also supported the need statement and request of Denmark/Greenland, noting that it was consistent with need requirements and the advice provided by the Scientific Committee.

A number of countries raised various concerns over the need statement and the request. The question of whale meat being available in restaurants so that it could be eaten by tourists was raised by Germany and the Dominican Republic, in terms of whether this suggested that there was a surplus of meat beyond need. Austria noted the health advice provided by Greenland's Nutrition Council (p.81 of IWC/64/ASW7) that in effect means that persons of reproductive age, including children, should not eat marine mammals. It asked how Greenlanders were informed of this and whether tourists were also informed.

Germany and Belgium commented that it was not simply the sustainability of the catches that was important but also issues related to biodiversity and overall status of populations as well as human demographics, including numbers of people living off hunting. Scientific advice was just one component of the issue; economic and social factors, nutritional health, agreement on need requirements were others. Reference was made to other food sources in Greenland such as plentiful fish stocks. Germany further noted that the average catch of fin whales has been about 10 in recent decades, including 6 in 2010 and 5 in 2011, so it questioned the need for 19 animals and also referred to the large small cetacean hunts in Greenland.

New Zealand commented that the issue of Greenlandic quotas almost has been one of the most difficult in recent years. It supports the concept of aboriginal subsistence whaling and does not dispute the sustainability of Denmark/Greenland's request. However, the question of the level of need has been problematic within the Commission and considerable effort was expended in reaching agreement two years ago. New Zealand urged all members to try to reach agreement on the numbers agreed two years ago with no increase in fin or humpback whale limits.

Australia associated itself with the views of NZ, Germany, Belgium and the Dominican Republic. Australia recalled that two years ago, Greenland agreed that adding humpback whales would reduce the overall number of whales taken because of their greater yield. It also referred to the discussion of conversion factors under Item 3.1.

Denmark/Greenland responded briefly to the comments made, noting that it was willing to engage in additional discussions outside the meeting. With respect to restaurants it noted that it did not control who could eat particular products within Greenland and saw no problem with tourists eating whale meat in restaurants. The advice from the Nutritional Council on marine mammals is well publicised within Greenland and is available in the Councils website, but as elsewhere (it is similar to advice on alcohol around the world) is not mandatory. The nutritional value of local foods is better and more environmentally sound than flying in imported foods from the west along with the associated health problems this can bring,

With respect to biodiversity and sustainability, it believed that these were issues taken into account by the Scientific Committee. With respect to fin whales, it noted that they were more difficult to catch and flense than common minke and humpback whales; given the opportunistic nature of hunting and the vagaries of environmental conditions then fin whales could be regarded as a backup when need could not be met from preferred species. The overall food requirements are met from a balance between a number of local food resources as well as imports and this will vary from year to year depending on conditions and availability. There may also have been a misunderstanding about what was said two years ago. The overall food resource need is the same and if it cannot be met by whale products than this has to be met from elsewhere including small cetaceans and imported products. It also stated that it will do

its very best to meet the request for improved data collection, although the difficulties in infrastructure must be taken into consideration.

After listening to the Denmark/Greenland response, Chile associated itself to those countries that expressed concerns over the Greenland request.

6.8 North Atlantic humpback whales off St. Vincent and the Grenadines

6.8.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

The Chair of the SWG noted that the Committee's advice is given as Item 9.8 of IWC/64/Rep1. Last year the SWG noted that it had received no catch data from St Vincent and The Grenadines for 2010-11 although after the Committee meeting the Secretariat received information from the government that a 35-foot male was taken on 18 April 2011 (IWC/63/18). This year, the Secretariat was informed that a 33.75 foot female was taken on 14 April 2012. The Committee was pleased to hear that genetic samples and photographs were taken and that the United States and St Vincent and The Grenadines have discussed the transfer of tissue samples from this whale for analysis and storage at SWFSC (the IWC archive where *inter alia* SOWER samples are stored) and the sample is now in the USA. Iníguez reported that he had received information of a hunt on the 11 April 2012 and a struck and lost animal on the 22 March 2012.

The Committee also repeated its previous recommendations that St Vincent and The Grenadines:

- (1) provide catch data, including the length of harvested animals, to the Committee; and
- (2) that genetic samples be obtained for any harvested animals as well as fluke photographs, and that this information be submitted to appropriate catalogues and collections.

In recent years, the Committee has agreed that the animals found off St. Vincent and The Grenadines are part of the large West Indies breeding population (11,570; 95% CI 10,290-13,390 – Stevick *et al.*, 2003). The Commission adopted a total block catch limit of 20 for the period 2008-12.

The Committee repeated its advice of last year that this block catch limit will not harm the stock.

6.8.2 Consideration of need

The need statement for the Bequian hunt is given as IWC/64/ASW 11. In response to a request by the Chair, St Vincent and The Grenadines provided a short summary of its need statement and this is given as Annex H. The strike/catch limit requests from St Vincent and The Grenadines is at the same level as before although scaled to a six-year block.

6.8.3 Discussion and Recommendations

The Sub-Committee endorsed the report of the Scientific Committee and its recommendations.

With respect to the recommendations, St Vincent and The Grenadines noted that it had been unable to attend the meeting last year and this led to some complications. It recognised the need for timely reporting and noted that it tries to inform the Secretariat immediately but there appeared to have been a communication problem last year. Updated details for 2010 and 2011 are with the Secretariat. It noted its desire to improve the provision of information and of the efficiency and welfare aspects of the hunt and thanked the USA for its help in this regard, especially with analysis of genetic samples. While it recognised that obtaining photographs of the underside of the flukes was preferable, it noted that this was difficult given that animals were flensed. It drew attention to previous discussions in this Sub-Committee and in the Working Group on Whale Killing Methods and Animal Welfare Issues about the importance of improving weaponry in conjunction with outside experts and with respect to local traditions. It noted that it was discussion with countries with the relevant expertise about improved equipment (the existing darting guns are from the last century). It also noted that it would appreciate assistance in repairing its winching slope. A modest budget would be required for improvements in animal welfare.

A number of comments were made with respect to the need statement and provision of data.

The USA noted that it met bilaterally with St Vincent and The Grenadines last November with a two-fold purpose. First, given that St Vincent and The Grenadines missed IWC 64, the USA encouraged it to stay as a member of the IWC if it planned to continue an ASW hunt. Secondly, the USA encouraged it to improve their reporting requirements to the Commission and the Scientific Committee. The USA was encouraged by the responses and was pleased to work cooperatively with Government of St Vincent and The Grenadines.

Argentina noted that it had not had time to read the need statement in detail yet. It requested information on previous genetic samples and photographs and St Vincent and The Grenadines agreed to provide this information during the annual meeting. St Lucia noted that in previous years it had submitted fluke photographs from the Bequia hunt to the North Atlantic Humpback Catalogue and that it was willing to assist St Vincent and The Grenadines with respect to photographs and the improved provision of information to the Commission in the future.

The UK welcomed the submission of biological samples, photographs and other data from hunts that have been requested annually by the Scientific Committee, as well as information needed by the Commission and working groups. It encouraged timely provision of such information in the future. It also welcomed the willingness of St Vincent and Grenadines to improve humaneness of the hunt and it hoped that this would include the provision of data to, and co-operation with the meetings and workshops of the Whale Killing Methods Working Group.

With respect to the needs statement, the Dominican Republic believed that the request was excessive. In its opinion whaling was not an aboriginal fishery as there were no longer indigenous Caribbeans left. It believed there was confusion between a family tradition and a cultural tradition and that the hunt did not contribute substantially to the nutritional needs of St Vincent and The Grenadines.

Denmark commented that it supported the need statement and noted that the hunt was sustainable.

6.9 Statement from the ASW countries

Greenland, on behalf of all ASW countries made a common statement that the aboriginal subsistence delegations from the countries of Denmark on behalf of Greenland, the Russian Federation on behalf of the Chukotka natives, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines on behalf of Bequian whalers, and the USA on behalf of the Alaska Eskimos and the Makah Tribe, agreed that ASW hunts are important for food security and reaffirmed the following four major points affecting each aboriginal hunt agreed at IWC/58, which are that:

- (1) subsistence hunting is for food to meet cultural and nutritional needs;
- (2) the safety of his crew is a whaling captain's most important responsibility;
- (3) with safety assured, achieving a humane death for the whale is the highest priority; and
- (4) efforts to modernise our whaling equipment and practices can only be made within the context of each communities' economic resources and the need to preserve the continuity of our hunting traditions.

The full statement is given as Annex I.

7. OTHER MATTERS

No other matters were raised.

8. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

The report was adopted by email on 30 June 2012.

Annex A

List of Participants

Argentina

Victor Marzari
Miguel Iniguez

Australia

Donna Petrachenko
Pam Eiser
Nick Gales
Stephanie Ierino
Chris Schweitzer
Victoria Wadley
Alexia Wellbelove

Austria

Andrea Nouak
Michael Stachowitsch

Belgium

Frederic Chemay
Fabian Ritter

Chile

Barbara Galletti Vernazzi

Colombia

Lilian Florez Gonzalez

Costa Rica

Eugenia Arguedas
Ricardo Meneses
Javier Rodriguez

Denmark

Ole Samsing
Leif Fontain
Amalie Jessen
Gitte Hundahl
Nette Levermann
Martin Mennecke

Dominican Republic

Peter Sanchez

Ecuador

Gustavo Iturralde
Jorge Samaniego

France

Martine Bigan
Jean Philippe Gavois

Germany

Walter Duebner
Lutz Friedrichsen
Karl-Hermann Kock

Ghana

Mike Akyeampong

Iceland

Asta Einarsdottir
Gisli Vikingsson

Italy

Plinio Conte
Caterina Fortuna
Francesca Granata

Japan

Kenji Kagawa
Dan Goodman
Shinji Hiruma
Kiyoshi Katsuyama
Toshihide Kitakado
Tomio Miyashita
Akiko Muramoto
Kayo Ohmagari
Takaaki Sakamoto
Akima Umezawa

Korea, Rep. of

Du Hae An
Yong-Rock An

Mexico

Lorenzo Rojas-Bracho
Yolanda Alaniz

Netherlands

Peter Bos

New Zealand

Gerard van Bohemen
Louise Chilvers
Karena Lyons

Norway

Ole David Stenseth
Egil Oen
Kathrine Ryeng
Truls Soloy
Einar Tallaken
Lars Walloe
Hild Ynessdal

Russian Federation

Valenin Ilyashenko
Olga Etylina
Alexiy Ottoy

St. Lucia

Jeannine Compton-Antoine

St. Vincent & the Grenadines

Raymond Ryan

South Africa

Herman Oosthuizen
Ed Couzens

Spain

Santiago Lens

Sweden

Bo Fernholm

Switzerland

Bruno Mainini
Martin Krebs

UK

Nicola Clarke
Nigel Gooding
James Gray
Jenny Lonsdale
Mark Simmonds
Anju Sharda
Jolyon Thomson

USA

Melissa Andersen
Greig Arnold
Charlotte Brower
Keith Benes
Ryland Bowe chop
Eugene Brower
Robert Brownell
Douglas DeMaster
Roger Eckert
Brian Gruber
Keith Johnson
Peter Jones
Taryn Kiekow
Michael Lawrence
Ire New Breast
George Noongwook
Lisa Phelps
Allison Reed
Ann Renker
Rollie Schmitt
DJ Schubert
Jonathan Scordino
Michael Tillman
Ryan Wulff

SC Chair

Debra Palka

IWC Secretariat

Simon Brockington
Greg Donovan

Annex B

List of Documents

IWC/64/ASW	1	Draft Agenda (and annotations)	
	2	List of documents	
	3	Quantification of Subsistence and Cultural Need for Bowhead Whales By Alaskan Eskimos (USA)	6.1.2
	4	Whale Hunting and the Makah Tribe : A Needs Statement (submitted by USA)	6.2.2
	5	Report of the Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Working Group	5.1
	6	Rationale of subsistence and cultural needs for Gray whales and Bowhead whales by indigenous people of Chukotka (Russian Federation) in 2013-2018 (submitted by Russian Federation)	6.1.2 & 6.2.2
	7	White Paper on Management and Utilization of Large Whales in Greenland (submitted by Greenland (Denmark))	6.7
	8	Note on the Greenland Needs Statement (Greenland (Denmark))	6.7
	9	Aboriginal Harvest of whales by Russian Indigenous People in 2011	6.2
	10	Progress on Conversion Factors for the Greenlandic Hunt (submitted by Greenland (Denmark))	3.1
	11	Bequian whaling – A statement of need (submitted by St Vincent and the Grenadines)	6.8

Annex C

Agenda

1. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

1.1 Appointment of Chair

1.2. Appointment of Rapporteur

1.3. Review of Documents

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

3. ABORIGINAL SUBSISTENCE WHALING MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE

3.1 Progress with the Greenlandic Research Programme

3.1.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

3.1.2 Discussion and Recommendations

3.2 Implementation Review for gray whales

3.2.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

3.2.2. Discussion and Recommendations

4. ABORIGINAL WHALING SCHEME (AWS)

4.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

4.2 Discussion and recommendations

5. ASW WORKING GROUP

5.1 Report of the *Ad Hoc* Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Working Group

5.2 Discussion and recommendations (including workplan)

6. ABORIGINAL SUBSISTENCE WHALING CATCH LIMITS

6.1 Bering-Chukchi-Beaufort Seas (BCB) stock of bowhead whales

6.1.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

6.1.2 Consideration of need

6.1.3 Discussion and Recommendations

6.2 North Pacific Eastern stock of gray whales

6.2.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

6.2.2 Consideration of need

6.2.3 Discussion and recommendations

6.3 Common minke whale stocks off Greenland

6.3.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

6.3.2 Consideration of need

6.3.3 Discussion and Recommendations

6.4 West Greenland stock of fin whales

6.4.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

6.4.2 Consideration of need

6.4.3 Discussion and Recommendations

6.5 West Greenland stock of bowhead whales

6.5.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

6.5.2 Consideration of need

6.5.3 Discussion and Recommendations

6.6 Humpback whales off West Greenland

6.6.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

6.6.2 Consideration of need

6.6.3 Discussion and Recommendations

6.7 Consideration of need for the Greenlandic hunts

6.7.1 Need statement by Greenland

6.7.2 Discussion and recommendations

6.8 North Atlantic humpback whales off St. Vincent and the Grenadines

6.8.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

6.8.2 Consideration of need

6.8.3 Discussion and Recommendations

6.9 Statement from the ASW countries

7. OTHER MATTERS

8. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

Annex D

Summary Need Statement on Behalf of the USA Regarding the Bowhead Whale Hunt

The 2012 update of the Quantification of Subsistence and Cultural Need for Bowhead Whales by Alaska Eskimos, prepared by Stephen R. Braund & Associates, is based on the 2010 United States population census and employs the methodology accepted by the IWC in 1986 and further refined for the 1988 Annual Meeting. (SRB&A 1988.) Like the 2002 and 2007 reports, this document is intended to be an addendum to the *Quantification of Subsistence and Cultural Need for Bowhead Whales by Alaska Eskimos - 1997 Update Based on 1997 Alaska Department of Labor Data* (SRB&A 1997). In the original calculation of subsistence need for bowhead whales and in all subsequent updates, only the Native population of each community is considered.

In previous subsistence and cultural needs assessments submitted to the International Whaling Commission (IWC) for years between the decennial U.S. Census, including the 2007 report, the calculation depended on the most current Alaska Department of Labor Data population estimates for the communities multiplied by the percent Native from the 1980 and 1990 U.S. Census. However, the most reliable information for assessing subsistence and cultural need using the IWC accepted method is to rely on the U. S. Census. Thus, the 2012 needs assessment is based on the 2010 U.S. Census.

Based on 2010 U.S. Census data, the number of bowheads needed by each community and by the region as a whole (all 11 communities), to meet nutritional and cultural requirements, is derived by multiplying the mean number of whales landed per capita over the base time period (1910-1969) by the 2010 Alaska Native population for each community and for the region as a whole. Using this method, the need for each community is shown on Table 1. Based on the 2010 census data, the cultural and subsistence need in the 11 Alaska Eskimo communities is 55 landed bowhead whales (58 if rounded up for each community). In 1997 the need was 54 landed bowheads (56 rounded up), and in 2002 and 2007, it was 56 landed bowheads (56 and 58 landed bowheads rounded up respectively). Applying the mean of .008515 bowhead whales landed per capita for all 11 communities for the historical period (1910-1969) to the 2010 regional Native population of 6,674 results in a 2010 **regional** cultural and subsistence need of 57 landed bowhead whales. In 1997, this regional calculation was 56 landed bowhead whales and in 2002 and 2007, it was 57 landed bowhead whales.

Table 1

Eleven Alaska Eskimo Whaling Villages' Subsistence & Cultural Need For Landed Bowhead Whales, 2010

<u>Community</u>	Number of Observations	Total Eskimo Population for ea. yr. of a Bowhead Observation	Number of Bowheads Landed 1910-1969	Mean Landed Per Capita 1910-1969	2010 Alaska Native Population	2010 Bowhead Need (Landed)	2010 Need (Landed) Rounded
Gambell	39	11,883	68	0.005722	654	3.7	4
Savoonga	0	----	----	0.005722	637	3.6	4
Wales	42	6,907	5	0.000724	136	0.1	1
Diomede	30	3,250	11	0.003678	110	0.4	1
Kivalina	7	926	3	0.003240	366	1.2	1
Point Hope	50	12,467	209	0.016764	629	10.5	12
Point Lay	34	2,080	8	0.003846	168	0.6	1
Wainwright	49	10,723	108	0.010072	510	5.1	5
Barrow	60	44,687	379	0.008481	2889	24.5	25
Nuiqsut	0	----	----	0.008481	360	3.1	3
Kaktovik	3	327	3	0.009174	215	2.0	2
Totals	314	93,250	794		6,674	54.9	58
Region	314	93,250	794	0.008515	6,674	56.8	57

Annex E

Summary of Need Statement on Behalf of the Russian Federation

Chukotka is the only place in Russia where traditional whaling is a point of special importance. The very process of hunting for gray whales and bowhead whales and further use of whale products in life are essential for preserving culture and spirit of indigenous peoples. All edible parts of these cetaceans are included in the diet, while inedible parts are fully used within the household. Meat, organs and fat are used as food. Whale bones and baleen have been used for thousands of years to make equipment, weapons, tools, decorations and toys, parts of reindeer and dog sledges and parts of marine boats. The skulls, large jaw bones and ribs of the whale are used in the construction of storage items for food and to store boats while other parts are used for drying clothes, meat and fish in open air. Skins of marine mammals are also used for clothes and boots, belts and covering of traditional boats. Sinews of whales are used for sewing fur clothes and for sewing together walrus skins and making envelopes of skin boats. Whale products are also used for sled dog food. Therefore, any whale product finds its application in either material or spiritual life of indigenous people, and traditional hunting for marine mammals is generally based on the principle of rational use and waste-free consumption. Whale harvest defines the social, cultural and economic structure of coastal villages and plays a significant role in the traditional relationship between reindeer herding families and maritime hunters. Economic relations go further than simple exchange of meat, blubber and other food. The equipment of reindeer herding families often includes parts of marine mammal skins. Cloaks made of whale intestines are highly valued by 'reindeer people' because of their evaporation features, which allows people to remain dry through the day. Therefore, traditional whaling is a part and parcel of the existence of Chukotka's native people, both from the point of physical survival and from the point of cultural continuity, which finally defines uniqueness and originality of the people of the Far North.

People have hunted for gray whales in Chukotka since prehistoric times. In the modern period (XX-XXI centuries), the most intensive whaling was from 1960-1990, when the annual take reached about 160-170 whales. After that, the harvest declined due to political, economic and social changes in Russia from 1992-1997. Since 1998 until the present, the average annual take of gray whales has been about 120 individuals. Thus, the decline in the number of taken whales was 28% compared to the Soviet Union period. At present, native communities and family enterprises are involved in traditional whaling in over 20 villages and settlements of Chukotka.

Whale hunting methods and other aspects of harvest have changed after the Soviet Union period due to the obsolete whaling fleet. The stable trend is for an increase in the number of younger animals harvested. These whales are shorter and weigh less. They are preferable targets for indigenous hunters as they are easier to kill, easier to tow and easier to flense. All these points define the targeting of the whale to a great extent.

In addition, the easier killing of smaller animals leads to a shortening of the time to death. This is a positive factor from the point of the humaneness of whaling. The trend is shown by an almost one-half decrease in the average time to death over the last 10 years.

Bowhead whales are harvested in small numbers, and the take is irregular (0 – 3 animals per year).

The severe climate of Chukotka defines the very specific nutritional needs for indigenous people. Food that is rich in protein and fat, such as marine mammal meat and blubber, is essential. Studies of the diet in native residents show that absence of whale meat in meals causes a number of potentially lethal diseases such as atherosclerosis, diabetes and others. Therefore, replacement of gray and bowhead whale products by any other food is impossible for many social, cultural, psychological and physiological reasons. Substitution of bowhead whale meat by meat of gray whales is also infeasible, because their tastes differ, they are available for hunting at different times and their cultural values for native people are not comparable.

The total annual consumption of all marine mammal products in mid-1980s was about 1,600 tons, providing over 100kg of meat, blubber, etc. for each person per year. The consumption of whale products decreased sharply from 1992-1996, primarily because of the small numbers of taken whales. The average annual gross weight of the 160-170 whales taken from 1969-1991 was about 3,000 tons, while the gross weight of the 120 whales taken in recent years is only 1,200-1,300 tons per year. Thus the 28% decrease in the number of whales taken whales has resulted in a 57% loss in actual production due to changes in targeting of whales with a preference towards smaller individuals.

A total of 11,500 residents of Chukotka depend directly on sealing and whaling. At least 1,150 tons of meat annually are required to provide the personal consumption of meat products at levels of about 100kg per year. About 120 gray whales have been taken annually in recent years. The total weight of meat products from those whales is roughly

400 tons, which is slightly higher than 30% of the required amount. Reindeer and various kinds of imported meat cannot fully substitute whale products. Taking into account the average weight of whales recently harvested, an annual additional take of 225 whales would be necessary to provide the 750 tons of meat products required. Therefore, the total annual requirement in numbers of whales is 345. To meet these needs, a smaller number of animals could be taken if the average size/weight of harvested whales increased, but this will require larger boats and more powerful outboard engines. These technical improvements cannot be achieved in a short time. In addition, hunting larger and aggressive whales causes higher risk of loss.

The Russian Federation consider that needs of native people of Chukotka is 350 gray whales and 5 bowhead whales. This is based on historical harvest, present stock state, cultural and nutritional requirements of people, and an assumption that taken whales will be of the same size as animals that have been harvested in recent years. Taking into account losses of animals during hunt (struck and lost) and 'stinky' inedible gray whales (assumed about 10 individuals per year), sustainable level of strikes and landings for eastern gray whales will be 150 and 7 bowhead whales individuals per year, if blocked quota for the population will not exceed. That should be taken into consideration for the future quota together with presence of inedible stinky whales in the total catch. However, the reality is that for technical reasons native people are not able now to take as many whales as they need.

All above-mentioned factors set the framework for recommendations on forthcoming quota. Therefore, the Russian Federation considers that it is reasonable and documentarily proven to maintain the *status quo* for gray whale and bowhead whale quotas for seasons 2013-2018 to meet the traditional needs of native people in Chukotka.

The Russian Federation considers that it is reasonable to maintain the *status quo* for the years 2013-2018 the number of gray whale landed in Chukotka shall not exceed 720 eastern gray whales, and annual number of landings shall not exceed 135 (except "stinky" whales).

The Russian Federation considers that it is reasonable to maintain the *status quo* for the years 2013-2018 such that the total the number of bowhead whale landed in Chukotka shall not exceed 30. For each of these years the number of bowhead whales struck shall not exceed 7, except that any unused portion of a strike quota from any year (including 2 unused strikes from the 2008-2012 quota) shall be carried forward and added to the strike quotas of any subsequent years, provided that no more than 2 strikes shall be added to the strike quota for any one year.

Annex F

Summary of Need Statement on Behalf of the USA Regarding the Makah Tribe Gray Whale Hunt

The needs statement for the overall gray whale catch limits supports the renewal of a status quo catch limit for the 6-year period 2013 through 2018. The Scientific Committee report indicates the requested catch limit discussed in the needs statement is sustainable.

The Makah Tribe has a documented history of whaling activities that date back at least 2,000 years. Whaling continues to be of central importance to Makah Tribal culture, identity, and health, and is a key part in the education of the Tribe's children. We have discussed the importance of Makah whaling to its subsistence, culture, and identity at past IWC meetings, so it is the intention here to concentrate on current information that supports the importance of whaling to contemporary tribal members.

In addition to a thorough anthropological discussion of Makah whaling, the current Needs Statement for the Makah Tribe conveys a number of important points regarding the Tribe's whaling activities:

- (1) A household survey conducted in December 2011 indicated that an overwhelming number of Makah reservation residents continue to support the Tribe's whaling efforts. The survey also indicated that 90.6% of households wanted more access to whale products, and desired to incorporate whale products into their regular diets. The majority of survey respondents saw traditional foods as a means to increase the health of Tribal members while reducing nutritionally-based diseases that plague the tribe. Nutrigenomic research supports this opinion.
- (2) Additional data from the 2011 Household Survey demonstrated the Tribe's commitment to preserving its whaling activities. 85.2% of respondents indicated that whaling has had a positive impact on the Tribe, with a strong majority characterizing the primary benefits in terms of cultural maintenance, tribal unity, and an improved quality of life. A clean and sober lifestyle was independently related to whaling by half of the survey respondents.

The Needs Statement clearly indicates that the Makah community has a continuing subsistence, and cultural need for whale products. The Tribe's members desire and support opportunities to maintain the central role that the whale has provided for the Tribe's health and well-being for at least the last two thousand years.

Annex G

Summary of Need Statement on Behalf of Greenland/Denmark

Denmark/Greenland are of the firm conviction that it has to be up to the politically responsible organisation to define needs in relation to whales subject to IWC management rules, not the IWC itself as was stated for the bowhead whale case in the Resolution passed in 1979.

After the introduction of Self-Governance in 2009 – the Government of Greenland’s policy is to increase its utilization of natural resources due to reduction in economic means and reduction of the subsidy from Denmark.

The discussion of Greenlandic need for whale products and its multispecies component dates back to discussions within the IWC from the late 1970s and considerable documentation has been presented over the years and discussed at the IWC Annual Meetings.

The Greenlandic hunt is a multispecies hunt and for this reason, the ‘need’ statement has traditionally been expressed in terms of tons of meat / edible products of large whales, rather than in individual animals by species.

The catch of individual species varied over the years due to a number of factors (ice and climatic conditions, weather, availability). If the result of the hunt, on one individual species, lead to an unsatisfactory result, then the hunt on other species might help to attain the objective of overall food security or an approximation to that objective.

The prospects of obtaining approval from IWC for quotas for 2013 – 2018 are particularly good for a number of reasons:

- (1) IWC scientific committee has recently approved estimates of abundance for the relevant stocks.
- (2) The control and monitoring systems are functioning well and the block quotas for the period 2008 – 2012 have not been exceeded.
- (3) With the current quotas, Greenland is 100 tons short of the documented need of 670 tons of meat from large whales that was approved by the IWC in 1991.

With a robust advice from the Scientific Committee, the IWC should be able to approve quotas for Greenland that are following the biological recommendation. These quotas would be sustainable and the hunt would be well regulated. Furthermore, Greenland will continue working actively on improving the welfare aspects of whale hunting and its data collection.

The Greenland Government hopes that the IWC will be able to take management decisions based on the best available scientific knowledge and respect for the cultural, nutritional and economical needs of Greenlanders and in this respect also fulfil the obligation of the IWC Convention. Allowing Greenland to obtain sufficient whale meat to fulfil the documented need will be a way to protect the environment by rationally utilising the natural resources at hand.

Annex H

Summary Need Statement on Behalf of St Vincent and The Grenadines

Background.

St. Vincent and the Grenadines is an island nation in the eastern Caribbean Sea made up of the eponymous main island of St. Vincent and a number of smaller islands collectively called the Grenadines. The largest of the Grenadines is Bequia, which lies only a few miles from St. Vincent. The population as of 2010 in St. Vincent and the Grenadines was 97,064, of which about 91,064 live on St. Vincent and about 6000 live on in the northern Grenadines. The main occupations on Bequia are tourism and fishing, and services. The average per capita income from full and part-time employment is about \$2700EC (Eastern Caribbean dollars or \$900 US).

From early times, even before the Europeans arrived, what is now St. Vincent and the Grenadines, akin to other island states in the eastern Caribbean, used the smaller cetaceans as a source of meat for food. Later, in the late 18th and early 19th century whale oil became the important commodity and item of trade and was much in demand to light homes and buildings in the Americas and Europe. American and European whaling ships passed through the islands using them as transshipment points for whale oil, and also to hire seamen to work on board. These men learnt how to hunt the great whales, and passed the methods on to the islanders of the eastern Caribbean (Hisashi 2001).

Aboriginal whaling in Bequia

The Bequian whaleboat is made of wood and locally built to design almost unchanged since the early 19th century. At present there are two boats operating. The boats are about 8.2 m long by 2.1 m wide and 1 m deep. They do not have engines. They have a mast, sails and oars. Each carries a crew of six men: Four oarsmen, a harpooner and the captain (Adams 1971, Hisashi 2001).

When there is wind the boats use their sails while searching for whales and to pursue them. When the boat gets close to the whale the harpooner throws a harpoon. Once the whale is struck the harpooner throws a second and third harpoon if he can, and the bow oarsman lowers the sail and mast. The boat is then hauled close and the whale is killed with a lance, or a bomb lance if needed. The whale is towed ashore to the station on Semple Cay and flensed. The meat, blubber and bone are shared out to the crew (Hisashi 2001). An old darting gun is currently being used and efforts are currently being made to improve the technology to reduce the time to death of each whale harvested.

Establishing need

There are three aspects to the exercise of establishing “Need” for whales by Bequia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines. These are: (1) social and cultural, (2) food and (3) economics.

1. Social and cultural.

On Bequia people consider whales to be a resource that should be used as long as the use is sustainable. The whalers are honored because whaling in Bequia is an old tradition that requires skill and bravery on the part of the whalers. The islanders take pride in their success and welcome the contribution of meat and fat to the island diet. Whalers and whale songs are part of the folk-art of Bequia (Ward 1995). Hisashi (2001) has witnessed the blessing of the whaleboats that takes place before the whaling season begins each year. He noted that the Anglican priest bless the boats, prays for the safety of the crews, and for a successful hunt before the boats are launched.

When a whale is landed it is a major event in St. Vincent, and people come from the other islands to try to get some fresh whale meat. The fresh meat and blubber are shared out to the crew and owners of the boats, and they give some to friends and relatives, and sell some to the other Bequians.

2. Nutrition.

Meat from whales taken in the Bequia hunt substitute for imported animal protein. Some of the production is sent to St. Vincent, so this estimate of percent substitution is biased.

In 2002 and 2007, the whales are estimated to substitute for 12-percent of the animal protein need. The 2012 population of Bequia remained relatively constant, and four whales continues to substitute for about 12-percent of the annual animal protein need.

3. Economics.

The third aspect to be considered in evaluating the need in Bequia for whale meat is economic. Table 2 indicates that in 2002, the meat from two whales substitute for 7% of the value of the imports in terms of foreign exchange

savings. Foreign exchange savings from food produced locally are extremely important to island economies that are not self-sufficient in foodstuffs. By 2007, the foreign exchange savings generated by the distribution of the products of Bequian whaling are calculated to remain relatively constant.

Conclusions

The cultural and nutritional need for whale products by Bequia was established by, and accepted by, the IWC in 2007. There appears to have been no quantitative estimation process used, and instead the level was established to be the level currently taken on average, namely two whales. It should be noted that the take of four whales in 2007 only satisfied 12% of the nutritional need, and 7.0% of the foreign exchange savings from substituting whale meat for imported meat and poultry. St. Vincent was allowed a take of four to greater address need.

Since that date the need continues given that the population remains fairly constant on the island. In order to satisfy an equivalent 12% in terms 2012 of population size, a quota of four humpback whales is needed. The relation between need and population size may not be sustainable in the long term, but should not be of concern here where the resource clearly is capable of meeting the need with a sustainable harvest.

Annex I

Statement of the Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Caucus

The aboriginal subsistence delegations from the countries of Denmark on behalf of Greenland, the Russian Federation on behalf of the Chukotka natives, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines on behalf of Bequian whalers, and the USA on behalf of the Alaska Eskimos and the Makah Tribe, agreed as follows:

- A. We reaffirm the four major points affecting each aboriginal hunt agreed at IWC 58, which are that:
- (1) Subsistence hunting is for food to meet cultural and nutritional needs;
 - (2) The safety of his crew is a whaling captain's most important responsibility;
 - (3) With safety assured, achieving a humane death for the whale is the highest priority; and
 - (4) Efforts to modernize our whaling equipment and practices can only be made within the context of each communities' economic resources and the need to preserve the continuity of our hunting traditions.
- B. We reiterate that aboriginal subsistence whaling is important to the food security of our communities, echoing the declaration at Rio Plus 20 where the global community reaffirmed their "commitment to enhancing food security and access to adequate, safe and nutritious food for present and future generations."
- C. We affirm that our hunting practices are undertaken to provide food for local consumption, traditional needs and sharing within and among our communities.
- D. We remind the Commission and reaffirm our support for the aboriginal subsistence management principles the Commission adopted in 1994, which are to "enable aboriginal people to harvest whales in perpetuity at levels appropriate to their cultural and nutritional requirements" so long as "the risks of extinction to individual stocks are not seriously increased by subsistence whaling."
- E. We support the requests for catch limits made by each of our respective governments and note that each of those requests is for a catch limit that is sustainable based on review by the Scientific Committee.
- F. We agree that scientific research on our whale stocks is important to ensuring the sustainability of our hunts; given the nature of our hunting this research must be funded and in some cases undertaken by our national governments.
- G. We support the recommendations of the ASW WG regarding recognition of the efforts of the Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Caucus and member governments facilitating the exchange of technical hunting information among members of the Caucus.