

IWC Bureau Meeting 21-23 September 2015 Bern, Switzerland

The IWC's Bureau met in Bern, on 21-23 September 2015 at the invitation of the Government of Switzerland. The meeting was convened under Commission Rule of Procedure B.4 which requires the Bureau to meet in those years in which the Commission does not meet, and to otherwise meet as required to fulfil its functions in accordance with Rule M.9.

The Chair of the Commission, Bruno Mainini (Switzerland) acted as Chair of the meeting. The list of participants is given as Annex A.

1. WELCOME FROM CHAIR AND BUREAU PROCEDURES

Bruno Mainini (IWC Chair) welcomed participants. He referred to the Bureau's Terms of Reference¹ and procedures guidance². He explained that the Bureau is an advisory body, and that any decisions would be brought to the Commission when it meets in 2016.

2. APPOINTMENT OF RAPPORTEUR

Sarah Ferriss (IWC Secretariat) agreed to act as rapporteur.

3. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

The Agenda was adopted and is given at Annex B.

A list of the documents available to participants is given at Annex C.

4. MINUTES FROM LAST MEETING

The minutes from the Bureau's teleconference held on 26 March 2015 were adopted by email. A copy was available as Document BUR/S15/04. No further comments were received.

5. CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATIONS

Rule of Procedure P.3 requires the Secretary to report any confidential communications during the preceding year to the Bureau.³ The Secretary reported that no confidential communications had been issued during the preceding year.

6. PROGRESS ON COMMISSION INTERSESSIONAL WORKING

6.1 Pilot six month performance report

The Chair explained that the Bureau had previously discussed how to measure the progress of the Commission's work in the two year intersessional period. It had asked the Secretariat to produce a trial progress report, with a view to making a formal proposal to the Commission in 2016.

The Secretary introduced document BUR/S15/05, which aimed to assess intersessional progress across the whole of the Commission. He drew attention to the increasing number of working groups and the range of intersessional work underway. The Secretary said that the first section of the report presented key metrics that assessed the work of the Secretariat and Commission together, in particular measures to assess the provision of benefits to Contracting Governments, measures assessing organisational communications and data, measures recording the IWC's financial position and measures which highlight the IWC's internal capabilities. The second section reported working group activities and progress in implementing Commission decisions. A 'traffic light' system was proposed to indicate the status of intersessional progress.

¹ The Bureau's Terms of Reference are described at IWC Rule of Procedure M.9

² Circulated to Bureau members as a background document, document BUR/S15/03.

³ Rule of Procedure P.3 requests that: '...a list of dates and subject titles of such confidential communications shall be presented to the next Biennial Meeting and to the Bureau in years when the Commission does not meet'.

The Secretary explained that, at the current time, the draft document did not include input from working group chairs and therefore the content may not be fully up-to-date. Instead, the document was intended to illustrate a potential framework which could be used to start discussions on the development of a proposal to present to the Commission in 2016. The report could be completed every six months to better monitor and assess intersessional progress.

The Chair, Australia, Japan and the USA thanked the Secretariat for its work on this useful document. Japan noted that this type of exercise is standard practice in many organisations and Australia added that the report would bring the IWC in line with best practice and helps with transparency.

Japan stated that it was important not to micromanage the Sub-committees but instead to facilitate information sharing and to provide early warning of any issues. Australia agreed with Japan, and further noted that the process should facilitate information exchange and tracking progress. Australia suggested that the title 'performance report' could be changed to 'IWC progress report' as the former might imply judgement. The Chair and the USA agreed with this change in title. Through its experience developing a progress tracker in ICCAT, the USA supported by Japan highlighted the importance of avoiding judgement, both in the title and also through the 'traffic light' system used in the current pilot.

Japan reflected that a number of other Regional Fisheries Management Organisations are either undertaking or have recently completed performance review programs. These had often led to constitutional changes, or to changes in processes used by those organisations. The Secretary responded that the intention of the IWC performance report was to understand and record the extent and breadth of progress which was taking place across the Commission's 30 plus working groups. This was needed in order to be sure that Commission decisions arising from recent Plenary meetings were being correctly implemented. There was no intention to use the performance report as a review process, and that the proposal to change the title to a 'progress report' would help address these concerns.

Australia agreed that the document could be updated on a six monthly basis, and suggested that this can be achieved electronically. It suggested that an online process would facilitate the involvement of Sub-committee chairs and would allow the length of the comments to be managed.

In terms of the structure of the document proposed by the Secretary, Australia agreed with the purpose of Section One.

Regarding Section Two, Australia reflected that the document was currently structured by Committee but it could also be done on a thematic basis⁴. Australia suggested that it might be useful to include the name of the country or working group Chair against each item; that it might be useful to indicate whether there is any budget allocated to the activity; and that each section could be individually numbered. The USA observed that the columns on status and progress were similar in some instances, and it may be better to include just one column to provide a factual account of the status of work. Another column, perhaps called 'any notes for Bureau', could include any comments from chairs of working groups, the Secretariat or budgetary information.

The Chair reflected that there are a wide range of activities going on intersessionally and that this document was a very useful way of understanding the work of the Commission and would be very helpful to those new to the Commission.

The Bureau **agreed** that the Secretariat should prepare an updated document for its next meeting that took account of the comments above and any additional suggestions subsequently received from Committee chairs. It would also be useful if the Secretariat included information on how much time was needed to compile the document by both the Secretariat and Sub-committee chairs, and any potential costs of developing an electronic system.

⁴ See also discussions under Agenda Item 7.3 which examined adoption of a themed approach to the Commission's agenda in 2016.

6.2 Finance and Administration Committee

The USA (as Chair of the F&A Committee) updated the Bureau on work underway through the three main working groups under the F&A Committee:

- a) The Chair of the Intersessional Correspondence Group on Strengthening IWC Financing had met recently with the IWC Secretariat to discuss how to take forward the recommendations that were adopted at IWC65.
- b) The Working Group on Providing Options to Governments with Limited Means to Participate in the Commission's Work had recently been re-established by Japan as Chair of that group.
- c) The Operational Effectiveness Working Group had exchanged correspondence during the year, and responses received will be compiled and circulated. As part of its update, the USA and the Secretary drew Bureau member's attention to a recent letter from a group of 16 NGOs on facilitating intersessional work and the role of observers. The USA observed that this Working Group has a full agenda and discussions would commence in the next few months.

The USA noted that discussions on the website and finance would be addressed in separate agenda items (Items 6.2 i and 8 below).

6.2.1 Working group on website guidance convened by the Bureau

The Chair noted that, at its last meeting, the Bureau had discussed the type of information that can be distributed through the IWC website⁵. In March 2015 the Bureau established a working group, inclusive of all Bureau members to take forward discussions.

The USA noted that the majority of work since the Bureau teleconference in March related to development of draft Terms of Reference for the Working Group as follows:

- Present to IWC66, a document that provides general principles on use of the IWC website, and practical guidance as appropriate. In developing the guidance, the group should:
 - 1) Draw a distinction between work that has been passed by a Resolution of the Commission and proposals or initiatives which have not received this endorsement.
 - 2) Consider the evolution of the IWC website, and how it might be used to increase transparency and improve public understanding of issues under discussion at the IWC.
 - 3) Consider how the website might be used to facilitate communication amongst Commission members.
- Liaise with the Operational Effectiveness Group to ensure they are aware of this work.

The USA noted that discussions to date had included reference to Japan's small type coastal whaling proposals and the proposed South Atlantic Whale Sanctuary.

Japan noted that the discussions at the IWC biennial meeting are condensed within a five day period. Intersessional exchanges of information using the website could contribute to Commission discussions and support the collection of objective information. This would allow discussions at the next Commission meeting to start from an informed basis. Australia stated that the website is an important tool for providing information to Commission members and to improve public understanding. It was important that there were fair and transparent rules on how it can be used.

Japan agreed with the draft Terms of Reference and believed there needed to be a process and guidance on what material should be placed on the website. The process and guidance would need to be agreed through the Commission, via the F&A Committee. Australia also agreed with the draft Terms of Reference and suggested that the Secretariat should bring a paper on the issue to the F&A Committee in 2016. Australia's preference was that the guidelines are set up in such a way that the Secretariat can make the decisions on website content. Japan agreed that the guidelines and criteria should allow the Secretariat to make decisions

⁵ See item 6 of the minutes of the Bureau's teleconference in March 2015.

on web content in consultation with the Chair of the Commission. The USA noted that the development of guidelines would be an important next step.

Referring to the working group's Terms of Reference (above) Japan recalled that their proposal on small type coastal whaling, as presented at IWC65 in 2014, did not give rise to a Resolution although it had brought proposals several times in the past and the Commission had agreed through several Resolutions that discussions on the topic are important. Uruguay queried whether information on the South Atlantic Sanctuary proposal could go on the website. The Chair clarified that this had been agreed by the Working Group, and the Secretary agreed to work with Uruguay on a proposal on the South Atlantic Whale Sanctuary for the website.

Japan expressed concern regarding the additional burden on the Secretariat of managing a members' only section of the website and regarding any cost implications, if any. Japan did not consider a password protected, members' only section of the website to be helpful and highlighted that this may be perceived as a lack of transparency. Japan recalled that there was already a confidential communications procedure. Australia noted that CCAMLR has a protected website and suggested that it might be useful to see how well that has worked⁶.

The Bureau **agreed** that the USA, the Secretariat and the Chair would work together to develop the guidelines to be presented to the Bureau at its next meeting. This would include consultation with the Secretariat's Communications Officer on any cost implications arising from these guidelines.

6.3 Conservation Committee

The Secretary, the USA and Australia provided a brief summary of working group activity under the Conservation Committee arising from actions undertaken since IWC65 in 2014.

The Secretary noted that the Ship Strikes database had been redeveloped and relaunched. He added that the Secretariat has re-established contact with the International Maritime Organisation, with whom the IWC has observer status.

Australia noted that it had prepared factual material for the IWC website on Conservation Management Plans (CMPs). It expected that a CMP meeting would be held during 2016 and prior to the next Commission meeting. Australia also reported that at the joint Conservation Committee/Scientific Committee meeting in June 2015 in San Diego, Norway had suggested that bowhead whales might benefit from a CMP.

The USA noted that the Whale Watching Working Group had met in the margins of the 2015 Scientific Committee meeting. The Working Group is working on a beta version of the Whale Watching Handbook ahead of the Commission meeting in 2016. Australia added that they were moving ahead with plans for a workshop to be held in Sri Lanka in February or March 2016 – hosted jointly by the IWC and the Indian Ocean Rim Association – on regional whale watching capacity building. Australia thanked the Secretariat for their help and leadership in preparing for the workshop.

The Secretary reported that the Scientific Committee had commenced discussions on the process for the decadal review of the Southern Ocean Sanctuary and the completion of the initial review for the proposed South Atlantic Sanctuary. This process indicated how the Scientific Committee would develop its advice ahead of a joint Scientific Committee/Conservation Committee workshop prior to IWC66 in 2016.

The Secretary said that work was ongoing to implement the Commission's recommendations on marine debris as adopted at IWC65. He reported that the Secretariat of the Convention on Migratory Species had expressed interest in collaboration on this issue.

The Secretary also noted that Contracting Governments submit voluntary conservation reports to the Conservation Committee and that there was an opportunity to provide a synthesis of these reports in order to understanding national conservation progress.

⁶ See also discussions on use of a password protected area under Agenda Item 7.2 on distribution of documents for the biennial Private Commissioners' Meeting.

Australia commended the work of the Conservation Committee, noting there had been a useful strategic planning meeting in June 2015. Further consideration was needed on whether the Conservation Committee should meet annually.

Australia also noted that a joint Conservation Committee and Scientific Committee meeting had been held in June 2015. This meeting had developed terms of reference for a joint Conservation Committee/Scientific Committee Working Group and the Secretariat should encourage the Working Group to continue its progress.

6.4 Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Sub-committee

The Secretary introduced the intersessional work of the Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling (ASW) Sub-committee and drew attention to Resolution 2014-1 which emphasised the need for the Commission to manage ASW on a more consistent and long term basis.

He noted that an IWC expert workshop had taken place in Greenland in September 2015 which included presentations from anthropologists on communities, community functions, culture and financial transactions; and from human rights experts on the evolution of human rights language from a needs basis to the right to self-determinations. St Lucia concurred that the workshop had been very useful.

Japan welcomed the workshop discussions and recommendations related to the ASW needs statements. Prior to the workshop, it had been widely felt that discussion on whether and how to standardise needs statements was required. However, the view of the workshop was that needs statements do not need to be standardised too much as ASW activities vary so much from country to country. Instead, the workshop had agreed that it would be helpful for both ASW countries and the Commission to develop simple general guidance that could take the form of a template or outline comprising headings with guidance notes based upon the recommendations of the workshop and past practice by ASW countries. The workshop also identified that the term 'needs statement' required revision and recommended its amendment to 'Description of the [insert name] hunt relevant to ASW catch/strike limit requests'.

St Lucia explained that the workshop had made several recommendations directed to the Bureau including one to place an item on the Commission's agenda at IWC66 for allowing discussion on indigenous people's rights. The Bureau **received** this recommendation and acted upon it at Item 7.3 below.

Australia welcomed the workshop report and drew attention to an additional forum on indigenous people's rights, namely the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (established under the UN Human Rights Council) which meets in Geneva. Japan noted that there may be budget needs to invite experts to relevant IWC meetings, and the Secretary suggested that perhaps the ASW Voluntary Fund could be used for this purpose.

6.5 Infractions Sub-committee

The Infractions Sub-committee last met at IWC65 under the Chairmanship of Prof Lars Walløe (Norway). No intersessional work was expected.

6.6 Working group on Whale Killing Methods and Welfare Issues

The Secretary noted that the Working Group last met at IWC65 under the Chairmanship of Dr Michael Stachowitsch (Austria). The Working Group's standing agenda items on provision of data on whales killed and measures to improve the humaneness of whaling operations are addressed at biennial meetings. In addition, intersessional progress had taken place in two other areas, these being: the IWC's continued work on entanglement response, led by David Mattila of the Secretariat; and work on other welfare issues chaired by the UK. The Secretary noted that the UK had recently circulated a work plan for comments.

6.7 Scientific Committee

The Secretary introduced the work of the Scientific Committee and thanked the USA for hosting its 2015 meeting in San Diego. It was a very successful meeting with a high attendance, including by many local scientists.

The Secretary drew the Bureau's attention to a report from the Chair of the Scientific Committee (Dr Caterina Fortuna, Italy) that highlighted progress on the Committee's work plan and associated ongoing activities (the

report is given at Annex D). The Chair noted that the report was an excellent overview and the Bureau expressed its thanks to Dr Fortuna.

Australia drew attention to a recent letter from the Government of the United Kingdom to the IWC Executive Secretary regarding political opinions entering the debate at the 2015 meeting of the Scientific Committee. The letter suggested a review of the Scientific Committee's Rules of Procedure and Rules of Debate to enable the Chairs of the working groups to keep discussions focussed and appropriate. Australia noted the UK's proposal and also reflected upon the UK's call to structure Scientific Committee debate in such a way that potentially difficult issues – such as the revision of Annex P – are raised early in Committee meetings to allow time for appropriate debate and to ensure the clearest possible advice can be provided to the Commission.

In relation to the items raised in the United Kingdom's letter, the Chair explained that he had attended the 2015 Scientific Committee meeting as an observer, partly in order to explore how the information flow between IWC bodies could be improved. He emphasised the importance of the work and expertise of the Scientific Committee and its role in supporting IWC decision making. However, he noted that, in his opinion, on some occasions the debate at the Scientific Committee had included interventions of a political character. He emphasised that the Commission meetings were the place to conduct political discussions.

Australia asked the Secretary to work with the Chair of the Scientific Committee and the Scientific Committee convenors to examine the Rules of Procedure and determine whether the Chair and Convenors had the authority to manage the debate as appropriate. Australia clarified that this could potentially include amendments to the Scientific Committee's Handbook or the more formal Rules of Procedure, for which amendments would need to be approved by the Commission.

The Bureau **agreed** to ask the Scientific Committee Chair to provide feedback on this issue for the next Bureau meeting, and that the Secretary would respond to the UK to inform them about the Bureau discussions.

6.8. Joint Conservation Committee/Scientific Committee Working Group

The Secretary reported that the joint Scientific Committee/Conservation Committee meeting held in June 2015 had been very productive.

Australia highlighted the potential for this group to make IWC work more streamlined and suggested that a similar joint meeting should take place in 2016. The Bureau **agreed** that this meeting should be scheduled at the end of the next Scientific Committee meeting in Bled, Slovenia in June 2016⁷. Australia suggested that it would be useful for the Secretariat to encourage the group to take forward their agreed actions arising from the 2015 meeting.

7. PREPARATION FOR IWC66 IN 2016

The Secretary noted that Rule of Procedure M.9 requests the Bureau's advice on planning for the next Commission meeting.

7.1 Duration and timing of sub-groups and Commission meeting

The Secretary introduced document BUR/S15/07 which included two alternative timetables for the Subcommittee and Commission meetings in 2016 and the results of a feedback survey from participants at IWC65 in 2014. He also drew attention to a letter from a group of 16 NGOs (first considered under Item 6.2 above) which included comments on the timing and duration of the meetings.

Scheduling of coffee breaks

The Chair thanked the Secretariat for preparing the document and noted the suggestion in the feedback to remove coffee breaks in order to increase time available for discussion. He indicated that the Chair could manage the timing in order to avoid the removal of breaks and this was supported by St Lucia and Japan.

⁷ See also discussions under Agenda Item 7.1 below on a joint Scientific Committee / Conservation Committee meeting at IWC66 in 2016.

Addition of an additional day in the meeting schedule

Addressing the question of whether to plan for a four or a five day Plenary meeting, the Chair suggested that an extra day would be beneficial in order to allow increased reporting of Scientific Committee progress. The USA and St Lucia recalled that the meetings were shortened initially from 12 days (e.g. at IWC64 in 2012) to 8 days (IWC65 in 2014) to reduce costs. However, the USA suggested that one extra day would be beneficial and wouldn't incur prohibitively high costs. It advised that further consideration was needed on whether the extra day was for Sub-committee or Plenary discussions.

Australia noted that its preference would be to give an extra day for Sub-committee deliberations, especially if there will be a joint Scientific Committee/Conservation Committee meeting. The USA suggested that it would be useful to have fuller participation and more substantive discussions in the Sub-committees, which would avoid lengthier discussions in Plenary. Japan was flexible but preferred the extra day to be for Plenary discussions because Sub-committee discussions were often repeated in Plenary. It indicated this was because many Commissioners didn't have the capacity or resources to attend Sub-committees and so they were hearing discussions for the first time in Plenary. Japan suggested it would be useful to consider how to support better participation in Sub-committees. St Lucia agreed that an increase in the number of days allocated to Sub-committees was unlikely to increase participation.

Slovenia noted that EU countries would benefit from an extra half day in Plenary to facilitate their coordination process. Australia drew attention to the time available before and after the Private Commissioners' on the day before Plenary, which could potentially help with EU coordination.

Australia recognised that other countries preferred a longer Plenary, which it would support. However, it wished to ensure that a joint CC/SC meeting is accommodated. The USA agreed that a joint CC/SC meeting was needed but queried whether that should be back to back with the Scientific Committee in Bled in June 2016. In response, Australia suggested that there should be a joint CC/SC meeting at both the SC and the Plenary.

Timing of observer interventions

In response to a query from Uruguay on the time allocated to civil society organisations, the Chair noted the Commission's rules governing this issue. The Chair explained that, at the start of the Commission meeting, he would indicate how he would call on observers to intervene. Any change in the length of the Plenary session would be for the primary purpose of allowing the Commission to complete its discussions. St Lucia supported this view and suggested a communication could be circulated on this topic in advance of the 2016 meeting.

St Lucia also recalled that, at IWC65, the NGO community had coordinated among themselves to align their positions, to advise the Chair in advance if they wished to speak on a particular agenda item, and to associate with other statements where possible. Australia noted that in other organisations, NGOs align with each other and speak as a group. It was important for Commissioners to hear observer statements at the appropriate agenda item after Contracting Governments had concluded their interventions.

Outcome

The Bureau **agreed** that the Plenary would last five days and that coffee breaks would be retained but reduced to 15 minutes. The timetable for the IWC65 meeting was **agreed** (Table 1 below). The Bureau **agreed** to seek advice from the Chairs of the CC and SC on how the joint session would be managed, whether as two separate meetings on the second day or one meeting with an integrated agenda.

Table 1. Proposed IWC66 Timetable

Date (2016)	Day Number	Morning		Afternoon	
Thurs 20 Oct	1 (Sub Committee)	ASW 9.00-12.30		WKM-WI 14.00-16.00	BSC 16.30-18.30
Fri 21 Oct	2 (Sub Committee)	INF 9.00-10.00	CC 10.30-17.30 with time for joint SC/CC discussions OR		
			CC 10.30-15.30 Lunch 12.30-14.00		Joint SC/CC 16.00-17.30
Sat 22 Oct	3 (Sub Committee)	F&A 09.00am start		(Bureau 16.30)	
Sun 23 Oct	4			PCOMMS (11am start)	
Mon 24 Oct	5 (Plenary)	Plenary (Five Days) 9.00-17.30 (10.00am start on first day) Coffee: 10.45-11.00 Lunch: 12.30-14.00 Coffee: 15.45-16.00			
Tues 25 Oct	6 (Plenary)				
Weds 26 Oct	7 (Plenary)				
Thurs 27 Oct	8 (Plenary)				
Fri 28 Oct	9 (Plenary)				

7.2 Draft agenda for Private Commissioners' Meeting

The Secretary explained that the Private Commissioners' Meeting (PCOMMS) provided an opportunity to organise the handling of items during the forthcoming Commission meeting. He sought advice from the Bureau on how the agenda should be distributed, how discussions on proposed Resolutions and Schedule amendments should be conducted, and whether any additions to the draft agenda for the PCOMMS meeting were required.

Distribution of agenda

The USA suggested that the agenda could be circulated electronically to Commissioners and in hard copy envelopes on desks. Australia suggested that a password protected section of the website be established, where Commissioners could access the PCOMMS documents when they are ready. Japan agreed that that was an option, but explained that some of the documents (e.g. on voting rights) for the PCOMMS are not ready until the day before the meeting itself and therefore additional ways of distributing documents is needed. Additionally Japan noted that some countries are still having problems downloading documents from the website, and it may not be possible to always get internet access upon immediate arrival at the meeting venue. For these reasons, there is likely to be requests for hard copy documents. Japan concluded that there was no single solution to address all needs.

The Bureau **agreed** that the Secretariat would investigate a password protected section of the website for upload of documents, and would also distribute hard copy documents at the meeting. The Bureau **agreed** that the PCOMMS agenda would be circulated by email 60 days in advance of the meeting.

Suggestion to develop drafting groups

The Secretary referred to a suggestion given in the feedback from IWC65 that drafting groups (and delegations that may have capacity to support them) could be established during the PCOMMS meeting. This would support the strengthening of the Commission's decision making role as previously identified by the Bureau.

The USA and Australia agreed that drafting groups could be useful, but cautioned that countries may not wish to form drafting groups before their proposal has been considered by the Commission. Therefore, the USA and Australia suggested that it would be useful for the PCOMMS meeting to develop an understanding on how Resolutions would be handled if they require modification in order to gain consensus agreement. Slovenia noted that drafting groups/friends of the Chair groups are quite common in inter-governmental organisations and so their introduction at IWC would not be an issue from an EU perspective. It suggested

that it may be useful for countries to be prepared to go into drafting groups to help progress discussions and for proponents to have an understanding of which countries represent which positions.

St Lucia and the Chair suggested that the PCOMMS meeting could help to identify concerns with Resolutions and in those cases, drafting groups could be established and consultations initiated.

Japan noted that governments can speak with each other in advance of the Commission meeting about future Resolutions. The Chair of the Commission could encourage such dialogue to develop before the meeting, recognising that most Chairs will be in a position to estimate the time required for the Commission to develop an agreement on individual issues. The Chair could help identify particular countries to start talking to each other, which would save time at the Commission meeting itself. Early submission of draft proposals will facilitate pre-meeting discussions.

The USA noted that, in the past, the PCOMMS meeting was used to discover positions but that hasn't been the case at more recent meetings. The USA suggested, and the Bureau **agreed**, that the Chair of the Commission could advocate for dialogue between countries after proposals are made available. During the PCOMMS meeting, the Chair could ask the proponents to describe their consultations and use the feedback to stimulate debate aimed at consensus agreement.

The Bureau **agreed** the PCOMMS meeting would start at 11 am on the day before Plenary.

7.3 Development of draft agenda for IWC66⁸

At the invitation of the Chair, the Secretary introduced document BUR/S15/09 which proposed a draft agenda for IWC66 in 2016 based on the decision making approach employed at IWC65 in 2014. BUR/S15/09 also included some suggested amendments, for example grouping conservation items under the Conservation Committee part of the agenda.

Proposal for a themed approach to the agenda

The Bureau discussed whether the agenda should be organised by Committee (as at present) or by thematic area. Australia and Japan noted that several agenda items are considered by both the Conservation Committee and the Scientific Committee, including for example Conservation Management Plans, ship strikes and whale watching. For this reason, they suggested grouping items together on a thematic basis. Japan noted that one option might be to have separate agenda items for issues that need to be considered by more than one Committee, and to group all other items under the relevant Committee heading. St Lucia suggested that perhaps the agenda heading 'Conservation Committee' could be amended to 'Conservation issues'.

Scientific Committee interventions

Japan asked for clarification on how much time would be given to the Scientific Committee presentation at IWC66. The USA, supported by the Chair, said that the summary Scientific Committee presentation at IWC65 was helpful and that input on specific agenda items from the Scientific Committee was very useful. St Lucia recalled that, in advance of IWC65, Commissioners were asked to send questions on the Scientific Committee's report in advance of the Commission meeting so they could be addressed in the Scientific Committee's presentation. The Bureau **agreed** to ask the Scientific Committee Chair to give a short summary presentation early in the Commission meeting and to make additional specific input on certain agenda items.

Conservation Committee interventions

The Bureau also **agreed** that the Conservation Committee should give a short introductory presentation on the Conservation Committee's work and recommendations at the start of the Commission meeting, similar in character to the Scientific Committee's presentation. The Conservation Committee presentation could potentially include a joint Conservation Committee/Scientific Committee item. Substantive Conservation Committee input would also be requested during the thematic discussions as appropriate. The Bureau **agreed** that the Commission's agenda could be annotated to indicate that the Conservation Committee

⁸ Commission Rule of Procedure F.2.d (i) requests the Chair to consult with the Bureau to develop a draft agenda based on decisions and recommendations made at the previous biennial meeting.

presentation will provide a means of formalising the relationship between the Conservation Committee and Scientific Committee.

Compilation of progress on whale stocks

Japan reflected that information on whale stocks (agenda item 9) is included in various places in the Scientific Committee report. To facilitate access to this information Japan suggested the preparation of a table that lists all stocks of whales under consideration by the IWC, status of the stocks, and the work undertaken through the different Committees and working groups. For example, Japan explained that an RMP *Implementation or Implementation Reviews* were either in progress or had been completed for several stocks, while strike limit algorithms had been developed to manage aboriginal subsistence whaling on other stocks. Further still, other stocks were the subject of Conservation Management Plans. Japan suggested the table be included in the Scientific Committee presentation in the Commission meeting. Australia and the USA supported this proposal and the Secretary **agreed** to work with Bureau members, the Chairs of the Scientific and Conservation Committees and the Secretariat's Head of Science to produce a draft table.

Australia suggested that it would be useful for the table to indicate which whale stocks are the next priority/focus, so that the Commission has the opportunity to provide its views, thereby making the prioritisation process more transparent. Australia also suggested that small cetaceans be included in the table. Japan noted that if this were to be included a caveat would also be required to reflect the differences of opinion on the competency of the IWC to deal with small cetaceans. Slovenia suggested also adding an IUCN (or CMS, CITES) threat listing column to the table. Japan commented that the listings were inconsistent and categorising stocks as subject to RMP implementation or a CMP would be sufficient. Australia supported Slovenia's suggestion.

Discussion on specific agenda items

The Secretary requested clarification on whether the agenda item 'Future of the IWC' was required on the agenda.

Japan recalled that the 'Future of the IWC' process was established at the Commission's 59th Annual Meeting in 2007 and was an extensive body of work intended to address the main issues faced by the Commission. The majority of this work was completed over a three year period between 2007 and the Commission's 62nd Annual Meeting in 2010. The main product was a document called '*A Proposed Consensus Decision to Improve the Conservation of Whales*'. This document was discussed extensively at the 62nd Annual Meeting, but at the end of the discussions the Chair concluded that the Commission was not in a position to come to a consensus agreement on the measures proposed. Given this outcome, Japan suggested that the annotations to the agenda for IWC66 in 2016 should invite interventions from Contracting Governments on how to formally close out the process.

The Bureau identified several corrections to the description of items in BUR/S15/09 as follows: under agenda item 25, the terms of the Chairs should read '2016-2018'; an agenda item on the venue and timing of the next meeting should be included; and an agenda item on Arctic issues should be included, as agreed at IWC65.

Outcome

Following discussions, Australia, Japan and USA worked overnight to incorporate the changes discussed above. They produced a revised agenda which was **agreed** by the Bureau and is available at Annex E.

8. FINANCIAL AFFAIRS

8.1 First half Financial Statement and forecast for full year 2015

The Secretary introduced document BUR/S15/10, noting that the IWC has an annual financial cycle and that the Commission meets every two years. The Financial Regulations state that in years when no Biennial Commission Meeting is held the provisional financial statement for the current financial year should be laid before the Bureau.

The Secretary explained that the provisional financial statement (document BUR/S15/10) covers the bridge period 1 September-31 December 2014, and the first six months of the 2015 financial year (1 January to 30 June). It also contained the forecast for the second six month period of 2015. He explained that income and expenditure are broadly running to budget and that the voluntary contributions to all funds for the 16

month period are estimated to total £468,000. He drew attention to an increased dilapidations estimate for the Secretariat offices which amounted to a cost of £100k-£130k.

The Secretary sought advice from the Bureau on the presentation of data relating to income and expenditure (page 5 of the audited accounts). He noted that currently all income (both core and voluntary) is credited to and disbursed from the General Fund and this can be confusing to read. It may be easier to present income and expenditure for the General Fund separately to that of all the other funds, many of which are supported entirely by voluntary contributions. The Bureau **agreed** to this suggested change, which will be done on a trial basis in the first instance.

The USA commended the Secretariat on another successful audit. It noted that the projected surplus was lower than previously expected and it suggested the Commission remain vigilant to this issue. The USA observed that Contracting Government contributions remained level (i.e. a below inflation increase) at IWC65, and it suggested that further cuts and prioritisation of spending may be needed.

Japan asked whether the F&A Committee could draw the Commission's attention to the potential projected deficit and its associated risks. It underlined the importance of monitoring the situation, noting that the finances could decrease quickly. The USA clarified that the F&A Committee had begun considering this issue. Japan and the USA suggested that improved visuals to illustrate projected scenarios could be useful to help the Commission better understand the issues, including graphs illustrating five and ten year scenarios, with various assumptions e.g. relating to interest rates. Slovenia drew attention to the practice of other intergovernmental organisations which present budgets for each topic of work.

The Secretariat clarified that the combination of decreased interest rates, the freeze on annual country contributions, the payment arrears for some countries, and the very active work programme were combining to have a negative effect on the finances. In response to a query from Australia, the Secretary confirmed that provisions for severance pay had been made on the balance sheet, and that pension funds are held under a separate Trust. Therefore these items do not confer additional liability on the IWC's financial position.

The Bureau **agreed** that the Secretary should work with the Chair of the F&A Committee to develop simple visual displays of income, expenditure and balance for presentation at IWC66 to highlight these issues to the Commission. This could include a line to display the minimum cash reserve to maintain solvency. The Bureau further **agreed** that members would send any examples of financial reports to the Secretary and the Chair of the F&A Committee to support their preparation of financial graphics.

8.2 Report on uncollected financial contributions and suspended votes

The Secretary introduced document BUR/S15/11 which summarised outstanding financial contributions from Contracting Governments amounting to £772,885. He noted that approximately six governments had paid their contributions since the document had been prepared and that the contributions to cover the bridge period were not due until 2018. He explained that votes are suspended three months following the due date (i.e. votes become suspended for non-payment on 30 September each year), and the Secretariat writes regularly to countries in arrears to request payment.

The Chair emphasised the importance of regularly reminding countries to pay their contributions. Japan queried whether countries that hadn't yet paid their contribution for the bridge period were intending to do so by 2018 and the Secretary agreed this was the expectation. The USA noted that countries often pay their contributions at the meeting or in advance of a postal vote.

St Lucia recalled that there had been an agreement that, for countries in arrears of three years or more, subsequent contributions would be cancelled. The Bureau noted that Kenya was shown as having high levels of outstanding contributions (£212,964) and suggested that any future discussions with Kenya would include ways to help it regain its status as an active member.

The Secretary suggested that the document on arrears could be posted on a password protected section of the IWC website, and updated on a monthly basis. St Lucia suggested that the letters reminding governments that their contributions were due could include text that reminds them of the implications of non-payment, for example 'your vote will be suspended in three months'.

8.3 Examination of the Commission's agreed budget for 2016

8.3.1 Examination of 2016 budget

The Secretary introduced document BUR/S15/12 and referred to Financial Regulation D.1.(d) that in years when no biennial Commission meeting is held the Bureau shall review the second half of the two year budget.

The USA noted that figures on projected spend for 2016 remain close to budget. However, it noted that the deficits forecasted in the future periods (2017-2018) underscore the discussions held under the agenda item *First half Financial Statement and forecast for full year 2015* (Item 8.1 above). The Secretary concurred that while the current finances for 2015 and 2016, and particularly the size of the Commission's financial reserve are in a healthy state, that this situation has the potential to deteriorate quickly upon adoption of deficit budgets.

Discussion on funding for final review of the JARPN II programme

Australia and Japan recommended to the Chair that the funding for the 2016 JARPN II review workshop be released, on the basis that the Scientific Committee at its next meeting reviewed the procedural and timing issues associated with the conduct of Annex P reviews.

The Bureau **agreed** that the money for the JARPN II review workshop would be released, and the Annex P process would be discussed at the next Scientific Committee meeting.

9. SECRETARIAT

9.1 Executive Secretary's role description

Bureau members **agreed** to the Secretary's request that this item be postponed until the next Bureau meeting to allow more time for consultation with the Chair and Vice-chair.

9.2 Developing the Secretariat's operations and structure

9.2.1 Continued development of Secretariat operations and structure

The Secretary explained that he requested this item be added to the Bureau's agenda in order to discuss how the Secretariat should respond to the Commission's growing and changing work programme. Noting that Bureau members had already started to touch on this subject through discussions on the budget (e.g. under the agenda item *First half Financial Statement and forecast for full year 2015* (Item 8.1 above)) the Secretary noted this was a more appropriate place to discuss future development and requested the current item be removed from the Bureau's agenda.

9.2.2 Production approach for formal IWC Publications (*The Journal of Cetacean Research and Management, the Annual/Biennial Report of the IWC, Chair's Reports of Biennial Commission Meetings and workshop reports*).

The Secretary introduced document BUR/S15/15 which sought the Bureau's advice on three questions: (1) whether a printed (hardcopy) of the meeting report from IWC65 is required for all participants attending the 2016 meeting or whether publication via the website will be sufficient; (2) whether the Secretariat should continue with the preparation of an IWC biennial report (similar in style to a typical organisational annual report) in a format similar to that presented to IWC65 through Circular Communication IWC.CCG.1127; and (3) how best to publish reports from IWC intersessional work (e.g. workshops).

REQUIREMENT FOR HARD COPIES OF THE CHAIR'S REPORT OF BIENNIAL MEETINGS

Australia said that the IWC should be moving towards use of electronic documentation across the whole of its operations. It recognised the challenges to implement this, and proposed the development of a timetable to allow the IWC to better understand the scale of challenge and also the potential solutions. Australia suggested that a proposal to move to electronic documents should be brought to the next Commission, including a transition plan for the move. The USA agreed with this approach and added that it would be useful to understand budgetary implications of different timetable options. The Secretary noted that much work has already been done to reduce the use of paper, which has already led to cost savings.

St Lucia drew attention to the imbalance across different countries in accessing the internet. It suggested that, for IWC66, countries could be asked if they want hard copies of the Chair's Report, which would provide an indication of country preferences and could be included as part of the transition plan. Australia concurred with this approach, as part of the transition plan.

The Bureau **agreed** that the Secretariat should make the Chair's Report for IWC65 (in 2014) available in electronic format, and at the same time to distribute a request to Contracting Governments to ask if an additional hardcopy was required. The Bureau also agreed that the Secretariat should bring a proposal to IWC66 suggesting a move to digital documentation processes, with timetable and budgetary implications.

ANNUAL REPORT

The Secretary noted that a trial IWC annual report, similar in style to a typical organisational annual report and covering the period August 2012 to August 2013 was compiled by the Secretariat's communications team and distributed as Circular Communication IWC.CCG.1127. The Secretary commended this publication as a useful summary of the full range of work taking place across the IWC. It focussed on intersessional progress and described how the Commission was employing its available funds, and it also included annual whale catch statistics in recognition of the IWC's regulatory responsibilities. He noted that the current report is structured by Committee but asked whether a thematic approach might also be helpful.

Australia and the USA agreed it was a useful and important report. Australia suggested it may be useful to focus on selected themes and the Bureau **agreed** to the suggestion from Japan to include the table describing IWC responses to individual whale stocks (discussed under item 7.3 above) and to include links to the website. The Bureau also **agreed** to the suggestion from the USA to include a summary of the main decisions and discussions of the IWC, the content of which would be agreed through consultations between the Secretariat, the Chair and Vice-Chair.

INTERSESSIONAL REPORTS

The Secretariat asked the Bureau to consider how best to make reports from the Commission's intersessional work (e.g. workshops) available and whether the development of a new IWC Commission Report series, or similar, would be helpful. Japan suggested to include intersessional reports as annexes to the Commission biennial meeting report. This would be a similar system to that used by the Scientific Committee whereby reports of intersessional workshops are included as annexes to its annual meeting report. This approach would formalise the Commission's intersessional reports and make them easier to access. Japan noted that the move to electronic reports would avoid any increase in printing and distribution costs.

The Bureau **agreed** that intersessional reports would be published as annexes to the Commission meeting report, with extracts from these intersessional reports on the relevant webpages of the website.

SECRETARIAT'S OFFICES AND CONDITIONS OF THE COMMERCIAL LEASE

At the invitation of the Chair, the Secretary Introduced documents BUR/S15/16 and BUR/S15/17 and noted that the landlord of the Secretariat's office premises intended to sell the freehold of the building, and had offered it to the IWC at a purchase price of £1 million. The landlord had also offered the IWC a three month off market period, during which the building would not be placed on the open market, in order to allow the IWC to take a decision.

The Secretary indicated that initial investigations of the landlord's offer suggested that (1) it was a very fair valuation of the Red House; and (2) that repayments on a 25 year mortgage would be less than the Commission's current rental payments.

Following from this, the Secretary explained that the Commission now needed to decide whether or not it wished to purchase the building and accordingly requested the Bureau's advice on how to approach the Commission and whether to initiate a due diligence process at this stage.

He advised that the vendor would maintain the period of exclusivity if the IWC was taking these steps. In response to a query from Australia, the Secretary clarified that when the lease ends or if the lease is broken, the Commission would have to pay for dilapidations, estimated at approximately £135,000. The Secretary confirmed that any potential mortgage would need to be taken from the reserves, and it would likely be an 80% Loan-to-Value mortgage.

Australia highlighted the need to examine alternative scenarios, including the purchase of the Red House, the purchase of alternative premises, and the rental of alternative premises now and when the lease expires. In response to a point from St Lucia, the Secretary noted that the current rental lease expires in 2019 so the

Secretariat can occupy the premises until then. Australia noted that after 2019, there may be a rental increase and/or there may be a need to move.

Japan noted that the purchase of the building was a decision for the Commission, which would be challenging in a three month period. The Chair noted that a postal vote would be needed, and that consideration of the voting process and its rules was needed. The USA expressed concern regarding taking a decision by postal vote on an issue of this scale, which would have a significant impact on the IWC's reserves. Japan and the US highlighted the importance of clearly presenting financial scenarios to the Commission, and the need to formulate an appropriate question to put to the vote. Noting this, the USA asked the Secretary to contact the landlord to enquire if he would consider extending the off market period until October 2016 when the Commission is next scheduled to meet. In response, the Secretary said that the landlord could be approached in this way, but he had previously communicated his desire to sell the property in the near future i.e. prior to IWC66.

Australia and Ghana expressed concern that the complexity of the postal vote procedure should not inhibit the most appropriate course of action for the Commission.

St Lucia suggested that Commissioners should be informed as early in the process as possible, both about the terms of the landlord's letter and to alert them to the possibility of a postal vote. The Chair suggested that a reminder on the payment arrears should be sent ahead of the vote, to alert those countries whose voting rights are currently suspended.

AUTHORISATION FOR THE SECRETARIAT TO INVESTIGATE OPTIONS

Ghana suggested that the Bureau should advise the Chair to authorise the Secretariat to start a process of due diligence in regards to a potential purchase. This would allow costs to be established around each of the four options identified by Australia (above) and would communicate to the landlord that the Commission was acting in agreement with the off market period. The USA concurred that the Bureau authorise the Secretariat to authorise due diligence and the Secretary remarked that this would incur some limited charges for property valuation and other professional services.

OUTCOME OF DISCUSSIONS

After further discussions, the Bureau **agreed** the following actions:

- a) The Secretary will notify all Commissioners in respect of the landlord's intention to sell the freehold of the Red House and outline the options available to the Commission. This notification will take place through Circular Communication and will highlight the future need for a decision by postal vote on whether or not to purchase the building. The Communication will also indicate that the Secretariat is undertaking analyses to illustrate the full costs of different scenarios. The Secretary should distribute this Communication at the earliest opportunity, ideally within a week of the Bureau meeting.
- b) The Secretariat would contact the landlord to seek an extension to the duration of the off market period to enable the IWC to make a decision.
- c) The Secretariat would undertake an analysis of financial scenarios including alternative office accommodation options to support the decision making process, including an assessment of the risks, costs and benefits of each option.
- d) The Secretariat should circulate this analysis, including a conclusion/recommendation, to the Commission.
- e) One month after the scenarios analysis has been circulated, the issue of whether to buy the building should be put to a vote by postal ballot.

The Bureau noted the requirement to describe the process for the postal ballot in advance, including resolving the question of how quorum is applied. It **agreed** that the Operational Effectiveness group should examine the postal vote procedures at IWC66 and where necessary, improve and clarify the process.

10. BUREAU: DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING

The Bureau **agreed** to meet by teleconference at the end of the Scientific Committee meeting in June 2016 and to have an in-person Bureau meeting at 16.30 on the Saturday 22 October 2016 ahead of IWC66. If necessary, an additional phone call could be scheduled to discuss the potential sale of the Secretariat's offices.

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Bureau noted that the ICRW will celebrate its 70th anniversary next year and **agreed** that options to mark the occasion could be discussed during its next meeting.

The Bureau thanked the Chair and the Government of Switzerland for hosting the meeting and for their warm and welcoming hospitality.

Annex A

List of Participants

SWITZERLAND

Bruno Mainini (IWC Chair)
Martin Krebs

AUSTRALIA

Peter Woolcott
Chris Schweizer
Suzi Heaton

GHANA

Benson Nutsukpui

JAPAN

Joji Morishita (IWC Vice-Chair)
Tatsuo Hirayama
Sayuri Muraki
Hiroyuki Morita

ST LUCIA

Jeannine Compton-Antoine

URUGUAY

Carlos Rodriquez

USA

Ryan Wulff (IWC Chair of Finance and Administration Committee)
Melissa Andersen Garcia

IWC SECRETARIAT

Simon Brockington
Sarah Ferriss

Annex B

Bureau Agenda

- 1 Welcome from Chair and Bureau procedures
- 2 Appointment of Rapporteur
- 3 Adoption of Agenda
- 4 Minutes from last meeting
- 5 Confidential communications
- 6 Progress on Commission intersessional working
 1. Pilot six month performance report
 2. Finance and Administration Committee;
 - i. Working group on website guidance convened by the Bureau
 3. Conservation Committee;
 4. Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Sub-committee;
 5. Infractions Sub-committee;
 6. Working group on Whale Killing Methods and Welfare Issues;
 7. Scientific Committee
 8. Joint Conservation Committee / Scientific Committee Working Group
- 7 Preparation for IWC66 in 2016
 1. Duration and timing of sub-groups and Commission meeting
 2. Development of draft agenda for Private Commissioner's Meeting
 3. Development of draft agenda for IWC66
- 8 Financial Affairs
 1. First half Financial Statement and forecast for full year 2015
 2. Report on uncollected financial contributions and suspended votes
 3. Examination of the Commission's agreed budget for 2016
- 9 Secretariat
 1. Executive Secretary's role description (Discussion postponed till next meeting)
 2. Developing the Secretariat's operations and structure
 - i. Continued development of Secretariat operations and structure (Discussion postponed till next meeting)
 - ii. Production approach for formal IWC Publications (The Journal of Cetacean Research and Management, the Annual/Biennial Report of the IWC, Chair's Reports of Biennial Commission Meetings and workshop reports).
 3. Secretariat's offices and conditions of the commercial lease
- 10 Bureau: Date and place of next meeting
- 11 Any other Business

Annex C
List of documents

BUR/S15/01	Draft Agenda
BUR/S15/02	List of Documents
BUR/S15/03	Bureau Procedures Guidance (2014)
BUR/S15/04	Report from Bureau teleconference of 26 March 2015
BUR/S15/05	Pilot IWC Performance Report
BUR/S15/06	Progress update from Bureau working group on website guidance
BUR/S15/07	Duration and timing of meetings at IWC66
BUR/S15/08	Draft agenda for Private Commissioners' Meeting at IWC66
BUR/S15/09	Draft agenda for IWC66*
BUR/S15/10	First half financial statement and forecast for full year 2015
BUR/S15/10a	Notes to the 2015 financial statements
BUR/S15/11	Report on uncollected financial contributions and suspended votes
BUR/S15/12	Commission's agreed budget for the year ahead (2016)
BUR/S15/13	Proposed role description for Executive Secretary (discussion postponed)
BUR/S15/14	Continued development of Secretariat Operations and Structure (discussion postponed)
BUR/S15/15	Production approach for JCRM
BUR/S15/16	Secretariat offices and lease / purchase options
BUR/S15/17	Financial illustrations for possible Red House purchase

* A letter from NGOs that was relevant to discussions on the draft Agenda for IWC66 was also distributed at the meeting.

Annex D

Update on the Scientific Committee work plan and on progress on ongoing activities

Chair and Head of Science

Full details on the 2015-2016 work plan can be found summarised in a number of Tables contained in the last SC report. The most recent progress on the Scientific Committee work plan concerns the items listed below. The progress is mostly in term of organisational arrangements that need to be carried out during the intersessional period in order to meet each activity's objective.

In addition, the Data Availability Group is working on a request from some SC scientists to access data related to JARPA and JARPA II for *ad hoc* analyses.

General topic	Item	Intersessional	During the 2016 Annual Meeting
Aboriginal subsistence whaling management procedures	Development of SLA for bowhead whales	Validate code for <i>WG-Bowhead SLA</i>	Review Canadian catch information
	Development of SLA for common minke whales	Workshop; begin to develop framework and trial structure	Review progress; developers' work
	Development of SLA for fin whales	Workshop; review results	Expect to finalise SLA
	<i>Aboriginal Whaling Scheme</i>	Workshop; review results	Expect to complete
	Annual review of catch limits	No	To be completed
	<i>Implementation Reviews</i>	No	Prepare for gray whale <i>Implementation Review</i>
Small cetaceans	Voluntary Fund for Small Cetaceans	Develop call for new proposals and steering group develop recommended list for next meeting	Finalise list of new proposals for Commission and review progress with ongoing proposals
	Definition of 'viable'	Develop discussion papers and examine concept of target population level	Discuss and finalise definition in conjunction with relevant sub-groups of Committee
	Takes of small cetaceans	Encourage submission of data via web portal for national progress reports	Review information
	Review progress on past recommendations: <i>Vaquita</i>	Secretariat to send letters of concern to CITES (totoaba), China	Review progress including results of new survey
	Review progress on past recommendations: <i>Yangtze finless porpoise</i>	Secretariat to send letter to China including offer to provide advice	Review progress
	Review progress on past recommendations: <i>Hector's and Māui's dolphin</i>	(1) Review and develop consensus abundance estimates from aerial surveys	Receive reports on progress including new mark-recapture estimate and report from New Zealand on monitoring and management plans and develop work plan
	Review progress on past recommendations: <i>Franciscana</i>	(1) SCTT (Task Team) on FMA1; (2) Discussion of CMP by 'Consortium of Franciscana'	Receive reports and develop work plan
	Review progress on past recommendations: <i>'Bushmeat' workshop</i>	Develop detailed ToR, 'toolbox' of techniques to assist documenting takes and continue to plan for workshop	Review progress and develop plan for workshop
Special permit whaling	JARPN II final review	(1) Proponents to submit updated data list; (2) Follow revised Annex P with workshop in February 2016	Review Panel report and further consideration of effects of reduced sample size
	New proposals	If new North Pacific proposal is to be presented, follow revised Annex P	Receive reports
Sanctuaries	External experts for SOS and SAWS	(1) submit proposed names to Steering Group by 31 August 2015 (2) finalise list by 31 October 2015	Attend SAWS pre-meeting and SOS review
	SOS	Solicit documents including updated SC/66a/SAN1 to be submitted by 1 May 2016	Hold review during meeting and develop advice for joint SC/CC workshop prior to IWC66
	South Atlantic Sanctuary proposal	(1) Submission of revised proposal (if there is one) by 1 January 2016 (2) Submission of documents by 1 January 2016 (3) Hold pre-meeting on 3 June 2016	

Annex E
Draft IWC 66 Agenda
Thematic based

1. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS
2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA
3. SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE PRESENTATION
 - a. Main Recommendations
 - b. Future Work Plan
4. CONSERVATION COMMITTEE PRESENTATION

{NOTE: Agenda Items containing Schedule Amendments and Resolutions will be placed here. Changes will be noted in the 60 day draft annotated provisional agenda.}

5. ABORIGINAL SUBSISTENCE WHALING
6. SANCTUARIES
7. SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS
8. CETACEAN STATUS AND HEALTH
 - a. Whale Stocks
 - b. Small Cetaceans
 - c. Diseases and Health Issues
9. HABITAT
 - a. State of Cetacean Environment Report (SOCER)
 - b. Ecosystem modelling
 - c. Arctic
 - d. Climate change
 - e. Other habitat issues
10. IWC IN THE FUTURE
11. WHALE KILLING METHODS AND WELFARE ISSUES
12. UNINTENDED ANTHROPOGENIC IMPACTS
 - a. Pollution 2000+
 - b. Marine Debris
 - c. Bycatch/ Entanglement
 - d. Anthropogenic sound
 - e. Ship Strikes
13. SCIENTIFIC PERMITS
14. SAFETY AT SEA
15. OTHER CONSERVATION ISSUES
 - a. Conservation Management Plans
 - b. Whale watching
 - c. Voluntary conservation reports
 - d. Regional partnerships

16. OTHER MANAGEMENT ISSUES
 - a. Revised Management Procedure
 - b. Infractions
 - c. Catches by non-member nations
17. COOPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS
18. FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION
 - a. Financial statements
 - b. Administrative matters
19. ADOPTION OF COMMITTEE REPORTS
20. ELECTION OF OFFICERS
21. BUREAU MEMBERSHIP
22. TIMING AND VENUE FOR UPCOMING COMMISSION MEETINGS
23. OTHER MATTERS
24. ADOPTION OF OUTCOMES, DECISIONS AND REQUIRED ACTIONS