

Report of the joint Conservation Committee and Scientific Committee Working Group (CC/SC WG)

20th June 2016, Panorama Room, Hotel Toplice, Bled

14.30 – 17.00

Summary of agreed recommendations

| Agenda item | Subject | Recommendation |
|-------------|--|---|
| 2 | Conservation recommendations | The Working Group agreed to work with the Scientific Committee convenors to refine the collation of recommendations, including through an extension of the exercise back to 2010 and a more in depth analysis of status and implementation. The UK and the Secretariat will lead the preparation of a revised working document for the Conservation Committee at IWC 66 in 2016. |
| 3 | Scientific Committee Working Group on relationship between SC and CC | The Working Group agreed that the SC <i>ad hoc</i> Working Group on the relationship between SC and CC (SC/CC WG) would continue to work with the Chair of the Scientific Committee, the Secretariat and the intersessional group established by the joint CC/SC Working Group to further refine the approach to compiling conservation-relevant recommendations. |
| 4 | Conservation Committee Strategic planning | The Working Group agreed to participate in the Conservation Committee intersessional group to progress drafting of its Strategic Plan. |
| 5 | Review of South Atlantic Whale Sanctuary proposal | The Working Group agreed to the following approach regarding Conservation Committee input to the review of the SAWS proposal: (1) the proponents of the SAWS will be asked to draft initial responses to the issues that had been identified by the SC for the CC's consideration; then (2) a paper would then be circulated by the CC Chair to all members requesting further input; then (3) after taking into consideration comments received, the revised working document would be tabled at the CC meeting next October for discussion; and finally (4) the Conservation Committee's agreed input would be presented to Commission at IWC66 alongside the Scientific Committee's review. |
| 5 | Decadal review of Southern Ocean Sanctuary | The Working Group agreed to the following approach regarding Conservation Committee input to the decadal review of the SOS: (1) the SOS Steering Group, established at IWC65, would agree the process for CC input to the overall review; (2) the Steering Group would develop an initial response to the questions identified for consideration of the CC and circulate to all CC members for further input; (3) taking into consideration comments received, the revised paper would be tabled at the CC next October for discussion; and (4) the Conservation Committee's agreed input would be presented to Commission at IWC 66 alongside the Scientific Committee review. |
| 6 | Relationships with other organisations | The Working Group recommended continuation of work to engage with other Inter-governmental organisations, building on the progress reported. |
| 7 | Future meetings of the joint CC/SC Working Group | The Working Group agreed that further consideration was needed on the timing of the CC/SC WG meetings and the Chair will develop proposals on this issue. |

1. Welcome and aims of the meeting

a. Appointment of chairs

The meeting was chaired by Jamie Rendell, UK (Vice-chair of the Conservation Committee), and Caterina Fortuna, Italy (Chair of the Scientific Committee).

b. Appointment of Rapporteur

Sarah Ferriss and Sarah Smith of the Secretariat agreed to act as rapporteurs.

c. Review of Terms of Reference for the group and aims of the meeting

The Joint CC/SC working group (CC/SC WG) was established by Resolution 2014-4 and tasked with facilitating the communication, implementation, and follow-up of conservation recommendations. The Chairs drew attention to the Terms of Reference for the Working Group which were established at its meeting in June 2015. These are:

- To review, collate and prioritise conservation recommendations made by the Scientific and Conservation Committees where further efforts/actions are needed, in the first instance focussing on those from 2010 onwards.
- To report, as appropriate, to the Commission on progress in delivering conservation recommendations.
- To develop clear procedures/strategies for effectively transmitting and facilitating the implementation of conservation recommendations to and from the CC/SC WG to the appropriate Committees and sub-committees/working groups, including for further technical work.
- To provide advice to the Conservation Committee on those priority conservation recommendations it could assist in implementing;
- To provide feedback to the Scientific Committee on further advice and/or actions to assist in the implementation of conservation recommendations;
- To respond to specific requests for support in facilitating the implementation of conservation recommendations from the Scientific and/or Conservation Committees.

The Terms of Reference indicate that the CC/SC WG will comprise of nominees from the Scientific Committee, Conservation Committee and Contracting Governments. Additional expertise may be included as appropriate at the discretion of the Scientific Committee and Conservation Committee Chairs.

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

2. Identifying the IWC Scientific Committee conservation recommendations (2014-2015) and a process to facilitate follow up

At its 2015 meeting, the joint Working Group agreed that an intersessional group would undertake a collation and analysis of conservation-relevant recommendations from the Scientific Committee and organise these recommendations into key issues/areas highlighting those that feature regularly.

Collation of recommendations

At the request of the Chair, the Secretariat introduced Annex A of Paper IWC/J16/SC-CC/02 which contained conservation recommendations from the 2014 and 2015 Scientific Committee reports compiled into an Excel spreadsheet. The Secretariat described the criteria used for including recommendations and noted that recommendations were provisionally categorised according to theme, objective, and target (actor) in order to provide an initial overview of the number and types of recommendations being made. Conservation themes included topics such as ship strikes, whale watching and bycatch. Categories of recommendation included cooperation with governments or with other organisations, communication, policy implementation etc. Targets or actors included Governments, the Secretariat, and other bodies in the Commission.

The Secretariat said it was ready to work with the intersessional Working Group to continue compiling and reviewing the data on recommendations, including the process used for identification and categorisation.

Analysis of recommendations

Following the Secretariat's presentation, Rendell and Page (UK) introduced their analysis of conservation recommendations (IWC/J16/SC-CC/02 A). They noted that 138 recommendations had been collated, many of which related to conservation issues not currently on the Conservation Committee agenda. Over half of the

recommendations related to co-operation with other organisations (including intergovernmental organisations, Governments, industry etc.), or to policy development and implementation. Other recommendations related to research and monitoring, communications, reporting, convening meetings, fundraising, training, capacity building and data collation.

From this analysis the following recommendations were made:

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

Discussions arising

The Working Group thanked the Secretariat and the UK for their work and **endorsed** the recommendations in IWC/J16/SC-CC/02.

Gales (Australia) observed that, whilst the context for this piece of work was Scientific Committee recommendations, the issues identified are also relevant to recommendations made by the Commission and other subgroups, and therefore to overall governance and communication. He highlighted that less than half of the themes identified in the Scientific Committee's recommendations appear on the Conservation Committee agenda and that the Conservation Committee should take this into account.

De la Mare (Australia) agreed that guidance on drafting recommendations to improve clarity would be useful and that the Committee could request other Commission bodies to report back on whether there is sufficient clarity. The Chair of the Scientific Committee, supported by Rojas-Bracho (SC/CC WG convenor) observed that it would be useful to further discuss the paper and its recommendations with the Scientific Committee convenors.

The Working Group reflected on the large numbers of recommendations being made to the Conservation Committee. Paterson (New Zealand) reported that, in other fora including the Convention on Biological Diversity, there was a move to prioritise and reduce the number of recommendations produced and the associated actions on Secretariats. The Chair of the Scientific Committee suggested this could be achieved by grouping recommendations that address the same issue.

Several working group members noted the Scientific Committee's recent improvements in drafting recommendations.

Cook (IUCN observer at the SC) noted that IUCN has a database to track recommendations, which contains information on status and progress with implementation. It was suggested that the IUCN could make this infrastructure available to the IWC Secretariat to support development of its own database. Paterson (New Zealand) drew attention to the Convention on Biological Diversity's recommendations tracking system. The Working Group **agreed** to liaise with IUCN to explore whether their database could be used by the IWC.

After discussion, the working group **agreed** that the UK and the Secretariat should work with the intersessional group and the Scientific Committee convenors to refine the collation of recommendations, including through an extension of the exercise back to 2010 and a more in depth analysis of status and implementation. The Working Group **agreed** to prepare a revised working document and submit it to the Conservation Committee at IWC 66 in 2016.

3. Report of the Scientific Committee Working Group on the relationship between the Scientific Committee and Conservation Committee (SC/CC WG)

At its 2015 meeting the Scientific Committee established an *ad hoc* Working Group to examine the actual and potential relationships between the Scientific Committee and the Conservation Committee agendas (SC/CC WG). Rojas-Bracho (convenor of the *ad hoc* Working Group) presented the group's progress and noted that he

had prepared an initial table of conservation-relevant recommendations from SC66b (2016 Scientific Committee) and included background material as context.

In response to query on the language used in Scientific Committee recommendations, the Head of Science indicated that variations in language may arise throughout the report. For example, if the Committee wishes to make a very firm statement it may “*urge* action” or to emphasise agreement it may “*agree* action”. He recognised that this may be confusing, and would support efforts to standardise the language.

In discussion, the Working Group **agreed** to give further consideration on when issues could be transferred from the Scientific Committee agenda to the Conservation Committee agenda. Simmonds (UK) suggested that there could be improved feedback between the two committees on progress made implementing recommendations. De la Mare added that the development of a database as described above will support the feedback process.

The Working Group reflected on the timing of its meeting immediately after the close of the Scientific Committee and whether it was feasible to thoroughly review recommendations which had just been generated. Rojas-Bracho suggested that the Working Group could meet before the Conservation Committee Planning meeting. This was further discussed under agenda item 7 below.

The Working Group thanked Rojas-Bracho for this work and **agreed** that the SC/CC WG would continue to work with the Chair of the Scientific Committee, the Secretariat and the intersessional group established by the joint CC/SC Working Group to further refine the approach to compiling and analysing conservation-relevant recommendations.

4. Report on the Conservation Committee’s strategic planning process

Rendell recalled the agreement from the 2015 Conservation Committee planning meeting to develop an outward facing Strategic Plan to describe: (1) the Committee’s structure, broad role, goals/objectives and priorities; (2) the approach used by the Committee to add value to the work undertaken by the Scientific Committee; (3) the Committee’s achievements to date; and (4) how the Committee will engage with its range of stakeholders including other intergovernmental organisations. Several of the Working Groups under the Conservation Committee are also developing topic-specific strategic plans.

Callister (Australia) introduced IWC/J16/SC-CC/03 which provided a draft strategic plan. The plan provided a high level overview of the work of the Conservation Committee including its vision, mission, priorities and approach to achieving its aims.

Callister reported that the Conservation Committee planning meeting, held earlier in the day, had discussed the draft Plan and found that it was a useful articulation of the Conservation Committee’s work and approach. The plan did not aim to capture all threats to cetaceans but instead outlined the Committee’s priorities. The Conservation Committee planning meeting had noted that further discussion was required on the Committee’s governance including periodicity of meetings (on which there were a range of options to be further considered) and financing. Callister added that the planning meeting had agreed to set up an intersessional group, led by Australia, to undertake further work on the plan in collaboration with the Scientific Committee. Callister invited reflections on the draft Strategic Plan as a model and on whether it could also be useful for articulating other areas of work of the Commission.

The IWC Executive Secretary suggested that the document could describe the relationship between the Scientific Committee and Conservation Committee and how the latter would report back to the Scientific Committee on progress with implementation of recommendations. Briand (Monaco) suggested that the measures of success need further refinement to ensure they captured an appropriate level of ambition. In response to a discussion on the timeframe for the strategic plan it was suggested that a ten-year plan might be appropriate with an in-depth review after five years.

The Working Group thanked Australia for its work and welcomed the overall approach. It **agreed** that members of the joint Working Group would participate in the intersessional group proposed by the Conservation Committee planning meeting to progress drafting of the Strategic Plan. Paterson expressed an interest in joining this group and other volunteers were invited to contact the Secretariat.

5. Sanctuary reviews

Zerbini (SC Sanctuaries Working Group convenor) recalled that, at its 2015 meeting, the Scientific Committee (SC) agreed on a dual process to complete the review of the proposed South Atlantic Whale Sanctuary (SAWS) and the decadal review of the Southern Ocean Sanctuary (SOS). This process established that the Committee would review the scientific aspects of the SAWS proposal and the SOS by the end of its 2016 annual meeting, and that a joint workshop of the Scientific and Conservation Committees would be held after the SC's 2016 annual meeting to order to complete the reviews. Zerbini noted that the Scientific Committee had identified a number of questions for the Commission to consider that might usefully be considered first by the Conservation Committee in its discussions.

The CC vice Chair referred to the Conservation Committee planning meeting held earlier in the day, which discussed Conservation Committee input to the reviews of the SAWS proposal and the SOS. The planning meeting agreed the Conservation Committee should not duplicate the excellent work of the Scientific Committee and, with this in mind, participants had agreed the next steps to develop Conservation Committee input to the reviews as outlined below. Given the time constraints and resources available, the Conservation Committee planning meeting had agreed that a joint workshop with the Scientific Committee was no longer required.

5.1 South Atlantic Whale Sanctuary proposal

Zerbini recalled that the Scientific Committee convened a workshop to review the SAWS proposal on 5-6 June 2016. The review followed the Terms of Reference developed by the Scientific Committee at its 2015 meeting (IWC, 2016; Annex O, Appendix 5) and the workshop reached a series of conclusions and recommendations.

The Chair proposed the following process to facilitate Conservation Committee input to the review of the SAWS proposal as follows: (1) the proponents of the SAWS will be asked to draft initial responses to the issues that had been identified for the Conservation Committee's consideration; then (2) a working document would then be circulated by the Chair of the Conservation Committee to all members requesting further input; then (3) after taking into consideration comments received, the revised working document would be tabled at the next Conservation Committee in October for discussion; and finally (4) the Conservation Committee's agreed input would be presented to Commission at IWC66 alongside the Scientific Committee's review. The Working Group **agreed** this approach.

5.2 Decadal review of Southern Ocean Sanctuary

Zerbini explained that, at its 2016 meeting, the Scientific Committee reviewed the scientific aspects of the SOS, taking into consideration the Terms of Reference from the Commission and the recommendations from its own 2004 review. The Scientific Committee provided advice and recommendations to the Commission and had raised a number of issues for further consideration which might usefully be considered first by the Conservation Committee.

The Chair proposed the following steps to facilitate Conservation Committee input to the decadal review of the SOS: (1) the SOS Steering Group, established at IWC65, would agree the process for Conservation Committee input to the overall review; (2) the Steering Group would develop an initial response to the questions raised by the Scientific Committee and circulating to all CC members for further input; (3) taking into consideration comments received, the working document would be tabled at the Conservation Committee in October 2016 for discussion; and (4) the Conservation Committee's agreed input would be presented to Commission at IWC 66 alongside the Scientific Committee review. The Working Group **agreed** this approach.

6. Relationships with other organisations

The Secretariat introduced IWC/J16/SC-CC/01 which provided an update on engaging other intergovernmental organisations. The Secretariat explained that, at its 2015 meeting, the joint Committee Working Group noted that there were a number of IWC recommendations for increased engagement with a range of organisations and that engagement would increase the likelihood of IWC priorities being picked up and acted on by other organisations. In turn, this could improve the success of bids to international funding agencies.

The Secretariat reported on the main actions undertaken. This included engagement with: (1) the International Maritime Organisation (IMO); (2) the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD); (3) the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) as well as with ASCOBANS and ACCOBAMS; (4) NAMMCO; and (5) FAO and its Committee on Fisheries (COFI). The Secretariat drew attention to the substantive input provided to the report of the UN Secretary General entitled "Marine debris, including plastics and microplastics" to the UN's open ended informal consultative process on oceans and law of the sea.

The Secretariat highlighted future opportunities for taking forward IWC recommendations through cooperation with other IGOs including the opportunity to strengthen IWC engagement with a number of regional organisations. In addition, the IWC may wish to consider its contribution to the Strategic Plan for biodiversity 2011-2020 adopted by the CBD and other Conventions, including reporting progress against the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

Smith (US) thanked the Secretariat for its efforts on outreach to other organisations. Langerock (Belgium) noted the importance of relationships with other organisations.

In response to a query, the Secretariat confirmed that other intergovernmental organisations were invited to IWC meetings and noted that the IMO had expressed an interest in attending IWC66. The Secretariat will give further consideration to how invitations to intergovernmental organisations are issued in order to support IGOs making interventions on agenda items relevant to their sectors of interest.

Briand drew attention to IWC Resolution 2014-2 which called for increased collaboration between the IWC and other international organisations with respect to highly migratory species. He welcomed the opportunities provided through this Resolution to increase engagement with other organisations. Briand also highlighted the most recent annual resolution of the UN General Assembly on Oceans and Law of the Sea (A/RES/70/235) which notes with concern the human-related threats which may significantly impact marine life, including its higher trophic levels and calls for cooperation and coordination between States and competent international organisations. He proposed that this Resolution provided an opportunity for the IWC to contribute to the UN process. He also noted that regional co-operation should involve Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs), particularly to deal with the threat arising through bycatch.

Simmonds noted that there had been two IWC workshops on marine debris and substantial discussion on the topic. He highlighted the value of providing this information to the relevant UN process through IWC contribution to the report of the Secretary General on the issue of "Marine Debris including Plastics and Microplastics" at the seventeenth meeting of the United Nations Open-Ended Informal Consultative Process on Oceans and Law of the Sea.

In response to query on the Global Partnership on Marine Litter (GPML), the Secretariat clarified that the initiative brings together a range of intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations and other stakeholders and it provided an opportunity for networking, sharing outputs and monitoring progress made across relevant decisions.

In closing the item, the Chair thanked the Secretariat for the work they had undertaken on this issue, welcomed the progress made and **recommended** continuation of the work to engage with other Inter-governmental organisations.

7. Any other business

7.1 Conservation Management Plans (CMPs)

Participants drew attention to discussions of the Scientific Committee on CMPs as follows:

- Jackson noted that the Sub-Committee on other Southern Hemisphere Whale Stocks agreed that a CMP for Northern Indian Ocean Humpback Whales should be discussed at the meeting of the joint Conservation Committee Scientific Committee Working Group.
- Simmonds noted that the Scientific Committee had established a Working Group to discuss the issue of bycatch and the potential development of a CMP for bycatch. This group would report to the Commission through the Conservation Committee. Simmonds invited anybody that wished to join this Working Group to contact the Chair.

- De La Mare noted that the Scientific Committee had suggested that there could be a role for the Conservation Committee in developing sanctuary management plans, noting that some of the elements in a CMP might be relevant to the design of a sanctuary management plan.

Callister, as Chair of the Conservation Committee's CMP standing working group, observed that there were a number of recommendations arising from the Scientific Committee relating to CMPs, including on the Southern Right Whale CMP, which needed further discussion. It was proposed these items could be discussed together in a teleconference in a couple of months.

7.2 Workshop on 'Building sustainable whale and dolphin watching tourism in the Indian Ocean region'

Simmonds presented a summary of the 'Building sustainable whale and dolphin watching tourism in the Indian Ocean region' workshop which was held in Sri Lanka in February 2016. The workshop was developed and delivered in partnership by the Australian Government, the International Whaling Commission (IWC), the IORA Secretariat, the Sri Lankan Institute of Policy Studies and Murdoch University's Cetacean Research Unit. Representatives from 16 IORA member states attended. The Workshop was funded through a grant from Australia to the IWC's Voluntary Conservation Fund.

Simmonds summarised the workshop conclusions and noted that participants had recommended sharing information and expertise among IORA Member States to sustainably manage whale and dolphin watching operations to ensure the industry's economic, social and ecological sustainability. The recommendations included collaboration with the IWC and the establishment of an IORA sustainable whale and dolphin watching tourism network.

The workshop's primary recommendation to establish a whale watching network was noted by the IORA Committee of Senior Officials at its meeting on 22-23 May 2016 and will be considered by the IORA Council of Ministers in October 2016. Simmonds recalled that the Scientific Committee had recommended the establishment of an intersessional group to help provide advice to IORA and participants should contact the Secretariat if they are interested in joining this group.

7.3 Future meetings of the joint Conservation Committee Scientific Committee Working Group

The Chair noted that there had been discussion on holding the Joint Scientific Committee-Conservation Committee Working Group in the morning prior to the Conservation Committee Planning meeting. Alternatively, it was suggested that perhaps both meetings could be combined. IWC's Head of Science highlighted the need to further consider the timing of the joint Working Group to allow time for the relevant information from the Scientific Committee report to be compiled. The US suggested that having a joint CC/SC meeting in October before IWC66 would give the group time to digest the SC report and give feedback to the SC. It was noted that, at its next meeting in October 2016, the Conservation Committee would discuss the timing and format of the Conservation Committee planning meeting. It was suggested that it would also be useful to consider how the Conservation Committee can feed its work into the Scientific Committee.

After some discussion, the Chair concluded that further consideration was needed on the timing of the meetings and stated that he would develop some proposals on this issue.

Annex A – Adopted Agenda

Annotated Agenda

Joint Conservation Committee and Scientific Committee Working Group

Monday 20th June, 2016, 2.30 pm

Location: Panorama Room, Hotel Toplice, Bled, Slovenia

1. Welcome and aims of the meeting

- a. Appointment of Chairs
- b. Appointment of Rapporteur [*The Secretariat will offer to act as rapporteur.*]
- c. Review of terms of reference for the group and aims of the meeting.
- d. Review of documents available to the meeting.

IWC Resolution 2014-4 agreed to establish a working group between the Conservation Committee and the Scientific Committee in order to propose a procedure to facilitate the implementation and follow-up of conservation recommendations. At its first meeting, on 4th June 2015, the Working Group adopted Terms of Reference. These are attached in Annex 1.

2. Identifying the IWC Scientific Committee conservation recommendations and identification of a process to facilitate follow-up

- a. Review of Scientific Committee conservation recommendations (2014-2015) and their implementation, and lessons learned.
- b. Identification of actions arising from the review.

The drafting group established at the June 2015 Joint CC-SC Working Group will present its work to compile and analyse conservation recommendations. Paper IWC/J16/SC-CC/02 summarises progress and provides an initial consideration of ways to identify, communicate and follow up the Scientific Committee's conservation related recommendations of relevance to the Conservation Committee. Annex A to document IWC/J16/SC-CC/02 provides a list of 138 conservation related recommendations from the 2014 and 2015 Scientific Committee meetings. Annex A is available from <https://shared.iwc.int/data/public/494bc3>.

The Working Group is invited to make observations relevant to the review of Scientific Committee conservation recommendations, including on the recommendations presented in Paper IWC/J16/SC-CC/02 and the proposed next steps.

3. Report of the Scientific Committee Working Group on the Relationship between the SC and CC

The Scientific Committee Chair has established an ad hoc working group to examine the actual and potential relationships between the Scientific Committee and Conservation Committee agendas. This item will allow the ad-hoc group to report its progress.

4. Report on the Conservation Committee's strategic planning process

The Conservation Committee has agreed to develop an outward facing strategic plan for its work that will outline (1) its structure, its broad role, goals/objectives and priorities; (2) how the Committee is adding value to the work already undertaken by the Scientific Committee; (3) its achievements to date; and (4) how the Committee will engage with its range of stakeholders including other intergovernmental organisations.

Several of the Working Groups under the Conservation Committee are also considering development of their own topic specific strategic plans.

This agenda item will provide an opportunity to update the Joint CC SC Working Group on progress and to seek input from the Scientific Committee. An early draft of an outward facing strategic plan is provided as a basis for discussion IWC/J16/SC-CC/03.

5. Sanctuary reviews

At the June 2015 meeting of the Joint CC-SC WG, the Scientific Committee's agreed process for completing (a) the second decadal review of the Southern Ocean Sanctuary (SOS) and (b) the review of the proposed South Atlantic Whale Sanctuary (SAWS) at the 2016 meeting was presented. This agenda item provides an opportunity for the Scientific Committee and the Conservation Committee to present their progress with sanctuary reviews and to invite comments from the members of the Working Group.

6. Relationships with other organisations

- a. Report on progress in engagement with other IGOs
- b. Future opportunities
- c. Reporting to the Commission

At the June 2015 meeting, the Joint CC-SC WG noted and discussed the range of recommendations and opportunities for the IWC to engage with other intergovernmental organisations. Following these discussions, the meeting agreed that the Secretariat would establish contact with the Arctic Council, the IMO, the CMS and other organisations as required in order to progress recommendations arising through the Scientific Committee, Conservation Committee and associated IWC workshops.

The Secretariat will report on progress with the above actions and identify future opportunities for engagement with other IGOs. In addition, the Secretariat will outline how progress in this area might be reported to the Commission. Paper IWC/J16/SC-CC/01 will be available to support discussions.

The Joint CC-SC WG is invited to comment on progress to date and to identify any further actions.

8. Any other business

Annex B – List of Participants

ARGENTINA

Miguel Iñíguez

AUSTRALIA

Nick Gales
Deb Callister
Bill de la Mare

BELGIUM

Stephanie Langerock
Fabian Ritter

BRAZIL

Pedro Fruet

COSTA RICA

Javier Rodriguez-Fonseca

DENMARK

Gitte Hundahl

GERMANY

Nicole Hielscher

JAPAN

Joji Morishita
Naohito Okazoe

LUXEMBOURG

Melania Andrea Cosentino

MONACO

Frederic Briand

NETHERLANDS

Antje Annegien Helmens

NEW ZEALAND

Rosemary Paterson
David Lundquist
Rohan Currey

NORWAY

Arne Bjørge

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Dennis Litovka

SLOVAK REPUBLIC

Branislav Hrabkovsky
Lucia Vlckova

SLOVENIA

Andrej Bibic

SPAIN

Carmen Asencio
Begona Santos

SWITZERLAND

Patricia Holm

UNITED KINGDOM

Jamie Rendell
Sarah Baulch
Liz Page
Mark Simmonds

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Russell Smith
Robert Brownell
Lisa Phelps
Teri Rowles (SC Environmental concerns
subcommittee convenor)
Robert Suydam (SC vice chair)
Ryan Wulff

SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

Barbara Galletti Vernazzani
Caterina Fortuna (Chair, ITALY)
Chris Parsons (SC Environmental concerns
subcommittee co-convenor, IP)
Frank Cipriano (IP)
Lars Walløe (BRG subcommittee convenor, IP)
Liz Slooten (IP)
Lorenzo Rojas Bracho (SC/CC WG convenor, IP)
Jennifer Jackson (SH convenor, IP)
Alexandre Zerbini (SC Sanctuaries working group
convenor, IP)
Mariano Sironi (IP)
Naomi Rose (IP)
Maria Jimenez (observer) Centro de Conservacion
Cetacean

IUCN

Justin Cooke

IWC

Simon Brockington
Sarah Smith
Sarah Ferriss
Kate Wilson
Greg Donovan
David Mattila

Annex C – List of Documents available to the meeting

| Document Number | Title | Authors |
|-----------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| IWC/J16/SC-CC/GEN/01 Rev 1 | Final Agenda | |
| IWC/J16/SC-CC/01 | Update on IWC progress in engaging other Intergovernmental Organisations | IWC Secretariat |
| IWC/J16/SC-CC/02 | Preliminary consideration of Scientific Committee recommendations of relevance to the Conservation Committee | Jamie Rendell, UK |
| Annex A to IWC/J16/SC-CC/02 | Conservation related recommendations from the 2014 and 2015 Scientific Committee meeting | IWC Secretariat |
| IWC/J16/SC-CC/03 | Conservation Committee draft public facing strategy 2016-2026 | Government of Australia |
| IWC/J16/SC-CC/04 | The ad hoc Working Group on Relationships between the SC and CC (SC/CC) | Lorenzo Rojas-Bracho |
| IWC/J16/SC-CC/GEN/02 | Minutes of Scientific Committee-Conservation Committee joint working group 4th June 2015 | IWC Secretariat |