

IWC Bureau Meeting

Minutes of the Meeting held 5-7 September 2017 at the Shimonoseki Aquarium, Japan

In person: Joji Morishita (Chair), Kazunari Tanaka, Yukiya Tsuno, Yuki Morita, Hiroyuki Morita, Takahiro Kamei, **Japan**
Andrej Bibic (Vice Chair) **Slovenia**
Ryan Wulff (Chair of F&A Committee), Carolyn Doherty, **USA**
Nick Gales, Deb Callister, **Australia**
Miguel Iniguez, **Argentina**
Horace Walters, **St Lucia**
Kate Wilson, Katie Penfold, **Secretariat**

By phone Ana Paula Simoes Silva (IWC67 Host) **Brazil** *for part of the meeting*

Apologies Benson Nutsukpui, **Ghana**

1, Welcome from the Chair

Joji Morishita welcomed participants, recalling that this is the second time Shimonoseki has hosted the IWC, as the 2002 Commission Meeting was held at the nearby conference centre. He noted that the Bureau is not a decision-making body and its role is administrative, focused on overseeing the work programme during the intersessional period and on advising the Chair and Secretary as necessary.

2 Appointment of Rapporteur

Kate Wilson (IWC Interim Secretary) agreed to act as rapporteur.

3. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted with no amendments.

4. Executive Secretary Recruitment

The Secretariat reported on progress of the recruitment against the agreed budget, and provided a brief analysis of applicants.

The recruitment was funded from the savings made on the Executive Secretary salary and is expected to fall within budget.

There were 93 applications including a substantial number of a high calibre. 24 countries were represented, from IWC Pay Groupings 2, 3 and 4, with 29% of applications received from female candidates.

The Bureau noted that the sifting process had been rigorous and agreed that the final selection would be achieved through discussion with the aim of achieving a consensus view, rather than voting or using any mathematical scoring process. This discussion could form the basis of candidate feedback if any is requested from interviewees. The Bureau also agreed that questions should be asked consistently although there should be space for supplementary questions, which are dependent on interviewee responses.

As previously, the interview panel will recommend a candidate to the Commission and a postal vote is required in order to confirm support for the proposed appointment. The Bureau was asked whether a solicitor should be appointed to administer the vote. The most recent Commission postal vote concerned the purchase of the Red House and this was administered in-house by the Secretariat. The last vote to appoint a new Secretary was in 2010 and was contracted to a solicitor.

Current legal costs are hard to predict as charges are hourly, but the best estimate is £1400 + tax. The Secretariat expressed a preference for managing the process in-house. As well as the cost saving, this minimises the bureaucracy involved in verifying the votes as they are received, and in following up with eligible Governments who have not voted in the event that vote numbers are too low to achieve quorum (see

paragraph below). The Bureau accepted this recommendation with the caveat that quarantine arrangements are put in place to ensure the integrity of the process within the Red House.

The Bureau discussed concerns over vote numbers. The Rules of Procedure require a simple majority of members to cast a vote in order for the decision to be adopted and a new Executive Secretary appointed. 44 votes are therefore required and, as of 5 September, there were 56 countries eligible to vote and 31 ineligible due to unpaid financial contributions.

The Bureau agreed that this is a slim margin and Contracting Governments should be reminded that unpaid contributions or lack of engagement could result in a response that is too low to allow the Commission to appoint a new Secretary.

The Bureau agreed that this message should be stressed in a Circular announcing the preferred candidate, which will be issued once the selection process has concluded. The Bureau also agreed to a voting period of one month and that, when two weeks of this period remain and if voting numbers are low, the Secretariat should contact any eligible countries whose vote has not been received, and should alert the Bureau, so that individual members can reinforce Secretariat efforts to increase the response rate. The need for inclusivity and efforts to engage Group 1 and 2 countries in the voting process was also stressed.

The Bureau noted that the vote and appointment process will be time-consuming and it would be advantageous for the new Secretary to be in post before the 2018 Scientific Committee. Therefore there was a balance to be struck between delaying the vote slightly to maximise the number of eligible voters and moving as quickly as possible to achieve a pre-Scientific Committee start date. It was agreed that the vote should be initiated by mid-October at the latest. The Secretariat was asked to establish what notice period would be required for each candidate and suggested that the formal job offer should be subject to agreeing an acceptable start date.

5. Meetings

a) 2018 and 2019 Scientific Committee

The Chair summarised developments since the last Bureau meeting, at which a proposal was put forward to use the Meeting Fund surplus, accumulated over a number of years, to meet the shortfall between the meeting budget and estimated costs of holding the 2018 meeting in Kenya. Responses to this proposal show that there was agreement across the Commission that more should be done to support developing country participation at meetings, but concerns were expressed on whether this was the most effective approach. It had not proved possible to resolve the funding issue quickly enough to organise a successful meeting in Kenya in 2018 and so agreement was reached (via Circular IWC.ALL.298) that the Kenya meeting would be postponed until 2019 and that the 2018 meeting would be held in Bled, as the Government of Slovenia had kindly agreed to a request from the Secretariat for the SC meeting to return to Bled for a Secretariat-hosted meeting. The Chair thanked the Governments of Kenya and Slovenia for their support and flexibility.

The Secretariat reported that there are no concerns regarding preparations for the 2018 meeting in Bled which are in-hand and well-rehearsed.

The Bureau agreed that further work is required to establish the cost and possible funding sources for the meeting in Kenya in 2019. It was noted that Rules of Procedure allow the Chair to extend Bureau meeting participation as required, and suggested that the Commissioner for Kenya be invited to attend the next Bureau meeting in May, if he is available.

The Secretariat was asked to continue work with the Government of Kenya and to look afresh at the scope to reduce costs for the 2019 meeting, including by extending the search outside Nairobi (assuming other locations meet the IWC meeting criteria). It was agreed that a revised cost estimate should be obtained and communicated to the Bureau before its next meeting in May, and that this information would inform a Finance and Administration Committee (F&A) Paper looking at ways to support developing country participation at IWC meetings.

The Bureau agreed that this paper should consider mechanisms for increasing participation of developing countries, and should incorporate both funding options for a 2019 Kenya meeting, and more general proposals. It was noted that there are a range of potential funding sources with remits to support developing country initiatives and these could be explored. It was also noted that smaller meetings (e.g. workshops) are easier to host and might help prepare a developing country for hosting a bigger meeting in the future, and that another approach is to support more participants from developing countries at IWC meetings, wherever they are held.

Joint Scientific/Conservation Committee Meeting

The Bureau also discussed the scheduling of other meetings recently held in conjunction with the Scientific Committee (SC), particularly the joint meeting of the SC and Conservation Committee (CC) which inevitably involves a number of key SC members. The Secretariat reported that a strong view has developed amongst some key parties that, if these meetings are to be held in conjunction with the SC, they should be held at the beginning, rather than the end when SC members are very busy completing the meeting report, and very tired.

The Bureau understood the rationale for this proposal and acknowledged that the SC meeting was a gruelling process, but noted that there was no good time to hold these meetings because the lead-in to the SC was also very busy for the people most affected. The Bureau also noted that one of the main objectives of the joint meeting is for the SC to provide an overview of its key conclusions and forthcoming workplan to the CC. This could not be done at the beginning of the meeting and therefore, under current funding arrangements, there was no choice but to hold the joint meeting at the end of the SC. The Bureau noted that there was a bigger question of whether separate CC meetings should be held, which has obvious funding implications and is not a matter for the Bureau but for IWC67.

b) 2018 Commission Meeting

i) Site Visit Report

Unfortunately, the Government of Brazil was unable to join this part of the meeting by teleconference for technical reasons. The Secretariat reported that it has not yet been able to conduct the Site Visit due to difficulties establishing a preferred location with the Government of Brazil which still has three locations under consideration: Florianopolis, Bahia and Sao Paulo. To help the Government of Brazil reach a decision, the Secretariat had conducted some research and recommended Florianopolis as the most suitable of the three proposed locations for an IWC Commission meeting. This selection was based on a greater choice of venues (other locations offered only one potential venue whereas Florianopolis offered a choice of two), as well as assessment of amenities, security and accessibility.

Some concerns over the suitability of Florianopolis had subsequently been raised by the Government of Brazil and the Secretariat has now agreed to visit both Sao Paulo and Florianopolis, because this can be achieved with minimal impact on the Secretariat travel budget.

The Secretariat raised concerns over the relatively short amount of time remaining to organise a meeting of this size and duration, and the need to receive confirmation that the previously agreed IWC67 dates are still workable, before Secretariat travel plans are finalised. The Bureau agreed that it is important this information is provided as quickly as possible so that planning can begin.

ii) Development of a draft agenda for IWC67.

The Secretariat presented a paper reflecting feedback received regarding IWC66 and offering some suggestions for the Bureau to consider in constructing the agenda for the next meeting.

Agenda: the thematic approach had been welcomed as much more accessible, particularly by media and the public who were less familiar with the breadth of work and structure of the IWC. Concern had been raised that plenary discussions and in some cases decisions, had taken place before relevant background information was received. The Bureau noted that, whilst there was a limit to the extent that the plenary discussion can be choreographed, some improvements could be made, particularly if this focused on key items. The Bureau

discussed the scope for a very brief summary of relevant background information and budgetary implications before the introduction of decision items: Schedule Amendments and Resolutions.

The Bureau noted that the wide-ranging nature of Resolutions made them particularly challenging in this context, and highlighted the need for flexibility, and the importance of allowing agenda items to stay open as long as consensus remains a realistic possibility. The importance of sharing information as early as possible was also highlighted.

The scope for greater Bureau support for the Chair during the meeting was also discussed. The Bureau also expressed interest in the results of the IWC66 Feedback Survey and asked for this to be circulated to inform the arrangements for IWC67.

Presentations: The Secretariat reported that questions had been asked regarding the length of presentations to plenary and when a presentation is appropriate, and asked whether it might be helpful to include some guidance on presentations in the Annotated Agenda. The Bureau noted that there are three main types of presentation to plenary: statements by politicians; invited expert presentations; and powerpoints.

At present, any government or observer wishing to give a presentation to plenary must notify the Secretariat before the Private Commissioners Meeting, so that the request can be discussed and placed under the right agenda item.

The Bureau agreed that it was not possible to be too prescriptive to either Contracting Governments or invited experts, and that the length of a presentation, particularly by an invited expert, would depend on the subject matter, knowledge-level of the audience, and how much space was available on the agenda item. Decisions should therefore continue to be taken on a case by case basis but the Bureau would offer support to the Secretariat, if needed in responding to presentation requests. The Bureau also agreed that guidance could be developed on notice periods for making presentation requests, to allow time for the Secretariat and potentially the Bureau to handle them. The Bureau noted that presentations not considered appropriate for plenary could be organised as side events, as has happened previously.

Risk: the Secretariat highlighted the Schedule Amendment on Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling (ASW) catch limit renewals as a key risk at IWC67, and suggested early action is taken to prepare for this discussion.

Noting that it is not a decision-making body, the Bureau agreed that, when constructing the Agenda, it was appropriate to identify risks and look at issues of process. The importance of early dialogue and information-sharing was stressed and the Bureau noted that the ASW Working Group is developing a timetable which maximises discussion time. The Bureau noted that the new 'Descriptions of the Hunts' webpages are in preparation and it's envisaged that these will be ready before next year's SC. The Secretariat reported that the Heads of Science and Programme Development are working together to support development of the webpages and wider ASWWG work.

The Bureau agreed that there were a number of ways to support this Agenda Item and it would be unwise to pin down one specific option.

c) Proposal for IWC67 F&A Paper giving guidance and timelines for hosting IWC Meetings.

The Secretariat proposed a new document to clarify the process for organising an IWC meeting. Whilst guidance for host governments already exists, the new document aims to confirm a clear and mutually agreed timetable which would begin with scoping work, to be conducted before the budget is set and before an offer to host is accepted by the Commission. The aim is to ensure that potential hosts, the Commission and the Secretariat achieve a clear, shared understanding of the costs and their respective responsibilities.

The Secretariat outlined a second key aim of this document as providing formal recognition that the Secretariat will maintain several 'live' alternative options in either the UK or other known and cost-effective venues. The document will also establish collectively understood points in the timetable at which the Secretariat would be expected to alert the Bureau and activate one of these alternative plans if progress has not been made in accordance with the timetable.

The Bureau agreed that this paper would be helpful and should be presented to the F&A Committee alongside the paper on ways to support meeting participation of developing countries (see 5a), and may need to draw some distinctions between developing and developed host countries. The Bureau also suggested that the paper should include guidance on scheduling to avoid, as far as possible, clashes with other relevant meetings, religious holidays and any other major known events.

It was noted that the meeting budget is currently set before the cost of the meeting is known. Although existing guidelines stipulate that notice of an offer to host the Commission meeting should be provided two years in advance, this has not been enforceable due to a lack of hosting offers. The Bureau noted that a Circular attempting to generate interest in hosting was issued two years ago and had received no positive responses which is why the Government of Slovenia had offered to host the Commission for a second time.

The Bureau also considered how best to maintain the momentum of the IWC work programme during the intersessional period. It was noted that IWC66 had agreed proposals on using technology to improve intersessional dialogue which would be taken forward in conjunction with the Operational Effectiveness Working Group, although progress has been slow due to current pressure on the Secretariat communications function. The Secretariat reported this has also led to suspension of work on some other mechanisms for increasing engagement and sharing information (for example the quarterly news bulletin and web news updates). The importance of giving clear timelines to Committee Chairs and Convenors, and early sharing of information in order to generate debate, were other points noted by the Bureau.

6. Financial Issues

a) Report on financial contributions

(See also discussion on votes under Item 4 above). The Secretariat reported that there are currently 31 countries with suspended votes and the Bureau clarified that reinstatement of vote is immediate once arrears have been cleared which means a country ineligible at the start of a postal vote period has the opportunity to make their payment and regain their vote within a one month postal vote period and in time to cast a vote.

The Bureau noted and thanked the Governments of the US and the UK for their generous voluntary contributions.

b&c) Update on the 2017 Financial Position and 2019/20 Budget Process

The Bureau agreed to a request from the Secretariat to take these two papers together. The Secretariat summarised the papers, highlighting an estimated 2017 overspend of £26000. This was attributed largely to rising UK inflation and static financial contributions from Contracting Governments.

The Secretariat reported that there was no longer enough income to deliver the IWC workplan, this was a long term problem, and strategic action was now required to understand how IWC is spending funds, and what action should be taken. Past practice has been an incremental approach to each of the existing budget lines according to inflation, and the Secretariat suggested two alternative approaches (Zero Based Budgeting and Activity-Based Costing) which are different methods of analysing activity in order to set budgets, and which might assist the Commission in addressing this issue.

The Bureau observed that such overspends have been narrowly averted a number of times in the past, due to several factors: increases in membership and therefore financial contributions; receipt of voluntary contributions; and countries clearing arrears with a single, large payment. The Bureau also noted that we have entered a new and unstable financial environment which is likely to be long-lasting as the true impact of Brexit is still unknown.

The Bureau assessed each of the risks flagged in paper BUR 17a6b. In a wide-ranging discussion the Bureau noted the following points:

- costed workplans are an important step which will help the Commission establish the feasibility of potential recommendations, and a template is being developed by the Intersessional Group on Strengthening Finance;

- the impact of the Brexit-vote has exacerbated the need for an IWC Currency Strategy (as recommended at IWC66);
- the need to tighten and standardise contract management and transfer associated risks (e.g. currency risk) wherever possible;
- recognition that the Red House warehouse will become a health and safety issue if action is not taken soon;
- the human and financial resource implications of increased reliance on technology.

The Bureau agreed that, although contributions have actually fallen in real terms due to the weakness in pounds sterling, a significant rise in member contributions was likely to be unpalatable to some governments and was therefore not a simple solution. The alternative options were summarised as either making cuts or reallocating funds, and the Bureau agreed that a root and branch review of IWC financial management and allocation of resources was required.

Noting that the response to this problem could be divided into micro and macro actions, the Bureau discussed each of the micro level mitigation recommendations made by the Secretariat in paper BUR17a 6b and agreed that, collectively, these measures will increase transparency and understanding of the financial position, and enable more robust and efficient financial management, helping the Commission to analyse and address the issue. Noting current Secretariat resource issues, the Bureau asked the Secretariat to implement each these recommendations as soon as practicable (see Annex A for the list of agreed mitigation recommendations).

The Bureau acknowledged that the macro-level response should wait until the Governance Review is received as this will make recommendations regarding financial management and performance which should inform the work. The need to alert all Contracting Governments to the situation was established as a priority. The Secretariat suggested that the earliest opportunity to highlight this issue was when the Bureau Minutes were circulated, shortly after the close of the meeting. It was agreed that the Secretariat should draft a document summarising the issue to be circulated with the Minutes.

The Bureau established the following timetable for the work required:

Mid-October (latest)	Circulate Bureau Minutes and introductory paper
End October	Governance Review Report submitted to Secretary and circulated to Operational Effectiveness Group and Bureau
	Bureau begin planning and drafting process for plan to be submitted to discussed at F&A, IWC67
1 March	Governance Review finalised and submitted
23 April (approx. – start of SC)	Bureau teleconference
7 May (approx. – end of SC)	Bureau in-person meeting
Post SC – date TBC	Mechanism established for relevant documents and proposals to be shared with all contracting Governments to maximise awareness and engagement
July 3 (Commission 60 day deadline)	Circulate F&A paper (plan)

The Secretariat was thanked for the finance papers which were comprehensive and easy to understand.

d) Risk and Currency Management Strategy

The Secretariat presented this paper which was produced in response to an F&A recommendation at IWC67 that 'an organisational risk management strategy will be developed and currency considerations will be included as part of that.' The paper proposed a way forward to implement this recommendation, focusing on financial risk management and the establishment of a Secretariat Risk Register as the first step towards a Risk Management Strategy. The Bureau supported this as standard practice and particularly important in the current financial circumstances.

The Secretariat emphasised that the aim of the proposed Investment Strategy should be to minimise risk not increase return, and the difference in return would be no more than a few thousand pounds. The Bureau noted that the first priority should be to ensure the security and liquidity of the organisation's cash and agreed, whilst acknowledging this would be time-consuming, that the Secretariat should take the first steps and start developing both a financial risk strategy and a Secretariat Risk Register.

7. Urgent Intersessional Issues

The Bureau agreed at its last meeting that the next Bureau meeting agenda should include an item on developing a process for dealing with urgent intersessional business.

The Bureau noted that the biennial cycle now in place means we should expect more issues to arise intersessionally, and that the Rules of Procedure allow the Chair to take decisions and direct the Secretariat in order to ensure the business of the Commission is carried out efficiently and in accordance with its decisions.

The Bureau agreed that it was not possible to prepare for every scenario but nevertheless it would be helpful to recognise and perhaps highlight at the next Commission Meeting what general options exist for initiating action in the intersessional period. These options ranged from a special meeting to a postal vote to consultation with the Chair and/or Bureau depending on the nature and seriousness of the issue.

The Secretariat highlighted the issue of urgent recommendations made by the SC which request letters sent from the Secretary during the intersessional period. The Secretariat asked whether it might be possible to set out a consistent approach to future requests that would allow these to be handled without reference to the Chair each time. The Bureau highlighted the importance of maintaining the distinction between science and policy/management issues which are the responsibility of the Commission, and agreed that the precautionary, case by case approach should continue.

8. NAMMCO Performance Review

The Secretariat reported that NAMMCO are conducting a Performance Review and have asked the IWC to nominate an expert to sit on their Review Panel, stipulating that nominees should not be nationals or residents of any NAMMCO member country, and should be internationally recognised and have long experience in their field of work. Against these criteria and subject to workload and availability which had not yet been clarified, the Secretariat Management Team had suggested that Caterina Fortuna, Chair of the SC should be nominated. The Bureau supported this recommendation, subject to workload and availability.

The Secretariat reported on the interim arrangements which have been put in place until a new, permanent Secretary is appointed. The Secretariat acknowledged that the last few months have been turbulent, but, with the exception of the communications programme, day to day work has been unaffected. The Secretariat also reported that its Management Team has introduced new working methods to improve internal communication and transparency, and develop multi-disciplinary team-working within the Secretariat. The Bureau confirmed the importance of team-working and expressed confidence in the interim arrangements.

10. Update on the Independent Review of the IWC

The Chair of the Governance Review Panel observed the Bureau meeting as part of the review process, and also gave an update on the work, confirming that interim findings will be presented to the Interim Secretary in October for initial circulation to the Bureau and Operational Effectiveness Working Group. This will be followed by a period of feedback and consultation before the final report is presented in March 2018.

The focus on an inclusive, transparent and consultative process was highlighted, as was the good response to the Governance Review Survey.

11. AOB

The importance of a staggered rotation of Bureau members was highlighted as several members will soon be due to step down. The Bureau agreed that a draft rotation table should be submitted for consideration by F&A at IWC67.

The Bureau noted with regret that the Government of Ghana had again been unable to attend the Bureau meeting, and noted the impact on the political and geographical balance of the Bureau. It was agreed that the Interim Secretary should write again to the Commissioner for Ghana, for advice on their continued membership of the Bureau.

The Chair closed the meeting, thanking members for a helpful and constructive discussion, stressing the importance of an effective Bureau and highlighting the good progress made at this meeting. The Chair also thanked the Shimonoseki City Aquarium for their welcoming and efficient hospitality. The Bureau members thanked the Chair for his excellent Chairmanship.

Annex A

Mitigating Actions to be undertaken by Secretariat (Table Reproduced from Bureau Document BUR17a 6b)

Action	Impact
1. Introduction of currency and cashflow management strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Introduction and implementation of a currency management and cashflow strategy would allow the IWC to maximise interest earned on its cash balances as part of a low-risk investment strategy. □ Foreign transaction charges would be reduced and better rates of exchange could be achieved through a planned approach to currency management. □ As requested by the Commission a report will be presented to F & A at IWC 67.
2. Introduce a procurement strategy, including purchasing from frameworks (lists of companies who have won tender exercises conducted by others)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Allows IWC to access goods for reduced rates. □ Introduces competition to IWC's existing suppliers. □ The Secretariat does not currently have the resources to do this, but may do when the vacant post in the Finance Department is filled.
3. Introduction of stricter financial controls and oversight	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ A much stricter system of financial controls for the IWC would increase accountability and would ensure that all expenditure was thoroughly scrutinised. □ It would also help IWC to demonstrate value for money to its Contracting Governments.
4. Increased financial reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Increased access to financial reports would allow for more effective and regular scrutiny of financial transactions by IWC's stakeholders.
Action	Impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ It would also provide IWC with a better understanding of its spending profile and cost behaviours. □ Better access to financial information would allow for trend analysis and for potential risks to be identified and dealt with more quickly. □ This could include reporting on spend type as well as spend by department (also known as 'subjective reporting' in order to offer a different perspective on resource demand. □ This could be done at Management Team, BSC and F&A levels as appropriate. □ The Secretariat does not currently have the resources to do this, but may do when the vacant post in the Finance Department is filled.

5. Budget process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ When recommendations are put to the Commission for consideration, they could include a 'budget requirement' section to demonstrate that the author has understood the financial implications of their request and also that they have considered the non-cash implications – for example demands on Secretariat staff time and whether this can be accommodated in existing workloads. These requests could then be considered as part of the budget process.
6. Inflation indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Incorporate an inflationary increase into the budget based on forecast inflation rather than current inflation. This can be assessed through an objective mechanism such as the OECD's forecast.
7. Introduction of a purchase order system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ A purchase order system is a mechanism commonly used by organisations to manage its spending. It is a type of financial control mechanism used in most organisations. □ Such systems help the organisation to proactively manage its spend, understand costs and prevent and detect fraud.
8. Produce an IT strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ IT spending at IWC has been in excess of budget for a number of years. An IT Strategy would ensure that spending is proactive and not reactive and would make the Secretariat better placed to respond to the Commission's priorities. □ It would also help to understand if there is a long-term need (or not) for additional funds in this area.
9. Review systems for claiming expenses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ UK data protection laws are changing and this will require IWC to change the way it processes payments and reimburses individuals who participate in Commission activities. □ This is also an opportunity to streamline processes, ensuring checks and balances are robust and also allowing IWC to explore options to reduce costs, particularly in relation to flights, but also bank charges, where there is certainly scope for cost reductions.
10. Potential use of unused reserves	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Potentially, unused reserves could be used to support additional spending requirements. However, this is a stop-gap and not a long-term solution. This should be a last resort action when all other options have been exhausted. Any reliance on reserves would threaten the long-term sustainability of the organisation.
11. Issue reminder letters to Contracting Governments before the payment deadline.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ This could potentially increase collection rates and encourage participation in IWC business.