

# REPORT OF THE CONSERVATION COMMITTEE

ST. HELIER, JERSEY 6 JULY 2011

## 1. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

A list of participants is given in Appendix 1.

The Committee paused in silence to remember Dr. Robbins Barstow who died recently. Robbins was one of the most significant voices for whale conservation during the 1980s and 1990s. As a long-serving member of the US Delegation, Robbins shall forever be remembered for his idea that whales were more valuable as subjects of whale-watching and other non-lethal uses. Foreseeing the future, economic potential of these then newly emerging non-lethal uses, he coined the phrase “Whales Alive” to express a complex concept in a simple, straightforward manner. To develop his idea, Robbins championed the proposal that the IWC should co-sponsor a Whales Alive Conference. Held in 1983, the Conference’s findings and recommendations ultimately established the intellectual and scientific basis for considering that whales are more valuable alive than dead, an idea that has held currency with many ever since.

### 1.1 Appointment of Chair

Lorenzo Rojas-Bracho (Mexico) was elected Chair.

### 1.2 Appointment of rapporteur

Allison Reed (USA) and Cherry Allison (Secretariat) were appointed rapporteurs.

### 1.3 Review of documents

A list of documents is given as Appendix 2.

## 2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The adopted agenda is given as Appendix 3.

## 3. INVESTIGATION OF INEDIBLE ‘STINKY’ GRAY WHALES

During the meeting of the Conservation Committee at IWC/57 in Ulsan in 2005, it was agreed that a research programme be established to address the issue of inedible ‘stinky’ gray whales caught by Chukotkan aboriginal subsistence hunters.

The USA noted that no work had been done this year as no new samples had been received, but they looked forward to working on the issue should new samples be obtained in the future.

In view of the lack of discussion on this item over the past two years, Austria questioned whether the matter was now less urgent than was considered in 2005. The matter was deferred until Russia was available to comment.

## 4. SHIP STRIKES

In 2005, the Conservation Committee agreed to address the issue of whales being killed or seriously injured by ship strikes, recognising that this is also a matter addressed by the Scientific Committee. Ship strikes appear on the Scientific Committee agenda because the Revised Management Procedure (RMP) requires that recommended catch limits take into account estimates of mortality from all factors including, for example, ship strikes and bycatch. In practice these issues are also examined in a broader conservation and management context than simply the RMP. The role of the Ship Strikes Working Group (SSWG) is to develop more detailed proposals and co-ordinate any work initiated.

### 4.1 Report of the joint IWC/ACCOBAMS Workshop

A co-chair of the Workshop, Alexandre de Lichtervelde (Belgium), introduced the report of the joint IWC/ACCOBAMS Workshop on ship strike mitigation (IWC/63/CC8) that was held in Beaulieu-sur-Mer, France in September 2010. The 45 participants represented a wide range of stakeholders, including the maritime industry. The focus of the workshop was on reducing ship strikes in the Mediterranean Sea and the Canary Islands.

Fabian Ritter, scientific advisor to the Belgian delegation, presented the technical parts of the report, particularly the scientific recommendations.

The data requirements for studies of ship strikes include absolute abundance and stock structure, as well as data on trends and the identification of ‘high risk areas’. For both the Mediterranean Sea and the Canary Islands regions, the available data on abundance and stock structure are insufficient at present to allow a proper quantitative assessment of the level of threats posed by ship strikes.

Much of the information on numbers of cetaceans struck comes from carcasses (e.g. 150 records in the IWC ship strikes summary database originate from stranded animals). With respect to strandings and necropsies, the Workshop discussed a new histochemical method for examination of evidence of ante-mortem or post-mortem trauma (as developed by the University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria under the European LIFE+ INDEMARES Project) and recommended that collaborative studies should be undertaken. It also recommended that stranding networks standardise examination, documentation and reporting protocols. The Workshop further recommended additional studies on carcass drift modelling, as the drift characteristics of carcasses may be of value in evaluating whether the proportion of reported whales that are stranded due to ship strikes is representative of the actual proportion of mortality due to collisions (see IWC/63/CC8 Item 5.2.1.1).

With reference to direct observations, the workshop recommended that every effort is made to improve reporting of collisions and that countries examine the potential use of dedicated observers. It is important that data should be submitted using the IWC web-based interface and the workshop strongly recommended continued work to facilitate further development of the centralised database and to encourage reporting of all collision events. Where national or regional reporting systems exist, the Workshop agreed that these should be the first point of contact, at the same time ensuring that all reports be made available from a single source (see IWC/63/CC8 Item 5.2.1.2).

Data on shipping density and movements are of value in identifying potential 'hotspots' of vessel-whale strikes. Recent developments in electronic navigation and reporting systems – including AIS, LRIT and VOS - have greatly increased the available data on shipping movements and density. The Workshop therefore recommended that collaborative efforts between cetacean and shipping experts be undertaken (see IWC/63/CC8 Item 5.3).

Some priority recommendations on data requirements were made and these can be seen in the report (IWC/63/CC8 Item 5.4).

Concerning risk assessment, shipping and whale data overlays can be a first step in identifying areas of higher probability of encounters between whales and vessels. Modelling may be used to predict relative or absolute cetacean densities in areas, or for seasons, with low survey effort. The Workshop recommended that overlays of whale and shipping densities should be created for areas where they have not been fully developed (e.g. the Canary Islands). It also recommended that methods be developed to clarify uncertainties in models for policy advisors and decision makers (see IWC/63/CC8 Item 6).

The report considered five possible mitigation measures for reducing collision risk: routing measures, speed restrictions, mandatory ship reporting systems, dedicated observers and technological approaches. Up to now, the two most obvious measures are the separation of whales from vessels and speed restrictions. Other measures or combination of measures should be studied on a case by case basis. Further, raising awareness of mariners is important and existing training modules should be adapted. It is essential that the expected risk reduction for any mitigation measure is quantified as far as possible, and data subsequently must be collected that allow monitoring of the effectiveness of measures (see IWC/63/CC8 Item 7).

Within the Mediterranean Sea and the Canary Islands, the workshop recommended six priority areas for data collection to allow improved risk assessment of ship strikes: (1) the Strait of Gibraltar; (2) the Pelagos Sanctuary; (3) the area south west of the island of Crete; (4) the area around the Balearic Islands; (5) the area between Almeria and Nador at the eastern side of the Alborán Sea; and (6) the Canary Islands. Item 8.1.2 of IWC/63/CC8 proposes conservation actions for some of the priority areas, taking into consideration the type of vessels and the objective of maritime security (see IWC/63/CC8 Item 8.1).

In order to improve reporting of ship strikes, two interlinked courses of action were suggested: (1) to strengthen the stranding networks and (2) to encourage reporting to the IWC database. Stranding networks are potentially an important source of ship strikes data if (but only if) full necropsies are conducted. Since the Workshop was held, the IWC stranding networks list has been updated and constitutes a useful tool to foster collaboration between networks and get more and detailed data. Reporting is also considered in the joint IWC/ACCOBAMS 2-year work plan (see IWC/63/CC8 Item 8.1.3).

The Proposal for a joint IWC/ACCOBAMS 2-year work plan contains four main items: (1) the development of a protocol for investigating and documenting ship strikes; (2) the undertaking of the long-planned Mediterranean basin wide survey (the ACCOBAMS Survey Initiative); (3) improved reporting to the IWC database; and (4) development of modelling techniques. Another important component of the plan is the establishment of a Joint stranding investigation working group (Mediterranean Sea) to develop protocols for necropsies that assist in determining cause of death (see IWC/63/CC8 Item 9).

In conclusion, it was noted that Contracting Governments will be responsible for implementation of many of the Workshop recommendations, either acting domestically or at international level through other IGOs like the IMO. In some other cases, the Secretariat is requested to act. The involvement of SSWG members with interests in the geographic area covered by the Workshop in implementing its recommendations will be valuable. Funding might be needed to help some key countries gather data.

De Lichtervelde thanked the Steering Committee, Vincent Ridoux (the co-chair of the Workshop) and the IWC Secretariat for their great help during the year-long preparation for the Workshop. He hoped that the Workshop would act as a template for other regional workshops in the future.

#### *Conclusion*

The Conservation Committee thanked the Chairs of the workshop and the Steering Committee which included the Executive Secretary of ACCOBAMS, for their hard work and congratulated them on the success of the Workshop. It **endorses** the report of the workshop and its recommendations, including the joint IWC/ACCOBAMS 2-year work plan (see Appendix 4) and **commends** them to the Commission.

#### **4.2 Report from the Scientific Committee**

General comments on co-operation between the Scientific Committee and the Conservation Committee are considered under Item 10.3 of this report.

The Chair of the Scientific Committee summarised the relevant parts of the Scientific Committee report (IWC/63/Rep 1). Comments on the joint IWC/ACCOBAMS workshop are given under Item 7.7.1 and focused on those parts of the report dealing with estimating mortality. The Scientific Committee endorsed the workshop recommendations on that topic and highlighted the formation of the joint Stranding Investigation Working Group. It also endorsed the holding of a further workshop of cetacean and shipping experts to examine the difficult questions of analysis and modelling of shipping and cetacean data. An intersessional group was established to develop a proposal for such a workshop. With respect to shipping data, the Scientific Committee welcomed the increased scope and availability of satellite AIS data (data transmitted from ships giving information on for example position, course and speed).

The IWC has been developing a centralised ship strikes database since 2007 and the database has now been running for two years. Unfortunately, submissions of new data have been sparse, even from member countries that provide summary information in their progress reports. The Scientific Committee recommended continued development of the database and that all collision data be reported to the database, especially by IWC member countries holding such data. In order to be more proactive, the Scientific Committee further recommended the appointment of a part-time dedicated ship strike data coordinator whose tasks will include data gathering, communication with potential data providers and data management. The Scientific Committee hoped that Conservation Committee members may be able to assist with outreach activities, including co-operation with IMO.

The Scientific Committee was pleased to receive information on ship strikes in specific areas, namely Hawaii and the Pelagos Sanctuary in the Mediterranean (see IWC/63/Rep 1, Items 7.7.4 and 5).

The important topic of the estimation of mortality was also discussed by the Scientific Committee. Efforts will be made in future to investigate how information from the well-studied North Atlantic right whale might be used to assist examination of ship strike mortality of other species. It was agreed that the North Atlantic fin whale might be an appropriate case study to further explore the development of quantitative risk models and a working group has been established to report back next year on progress.

Much of the available information on ship strikes comes from stranded animals, but extrapolating from these to total numbers of ship strikes within a population or area is difficult. It is clear that strandings will provide an underestimate of total ship strike mortality; however, it could potentially be a serious underestimate – in one study it was estimated to be only 2% of total. Putting tags, e.g. telemetry tags, on floating carcasses could provide valuable additional information to estimate proportions of carcasses that are eventually discovered onshore.

The Scientific Committee were also pleased to hear of work being undertaken by the USA on criteria to help determine cause of death of stranded animals, as well as work by NAMMCO and ICES on good practice in monitoring bycatches.

#### *Conclusion*

The Committee thanked the Scientific Committee for its report on ship strikes. . In particular, the Committee **recommends** the appointment of a part-time dedicated ship strike coordinator.

#### **4.3 Report from the Ship Strikes Working Group (SSWG)**

The Chair of the Ship Strikes Working Group, Alexandre de Lichtervelde (Belgium), presented a progress report of activities conducted over the past year (IWC/63/CC13). He regretted that, as reported by the Scientific Committee, although ship strikes data are submitted by some members through other reports, no data were submitted this year directly to the centralised database. Co-operation and data exchange with national or regional databases on ship strikes is very important, on the basis of common criteria to define a ship strike. A paid part-time data coordinator is crucially needed, as requested by the Scientific Committee. The proposed ship strikes data co-ordinator would also play a key role in raising awareness.

Obtaining access to good shipping data is important both to estimate risk and develop mitigation measures. ASCOBANS has been mapping high risk shipping areas using data available through the Internet, and, as proposed by

the SSWG Chair, the Secretariat has contacted the European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA) to request details of the procedure to access shipping data. Their response is still awaited.

With respect to strandings, he noted that the updated IWC list of stranding networks now contains Email addresses to facilitate access and collaboration; the list is available in the ship strikes section of the IWC website.

Although more attention is paid to large vessels, the workshop had also drawn attention to ship strikes within the sailing sector. An important recent development is a declaration adopted at the first International Congress on Oceanic sailing and the Environment held in Barcelona on the occasion of the world race and referring to collaboration with the SSWG. The sailing sector offers a great opportunity to raise awareness on ship strikes given the important media coverage of ocean races and the keen interest of the sector to become involved in environmental issues.

The SSWG welcomed reports of national developments in some countries and it is particularly interested to learn more about the management plans under development by Spain for the Canary Islands. It was also pleased to hear of related work by IGOs and NGOs. This included information from: ACCOBAMS (e.g. an event to promote REPCET<sup>1</sup> among maritime operators); and WWF (on collaboration with a major shipping company in the Atlantic area).

In summary, the Chair of the SSWG noted that the last 12 months have been rich in preparatory actions and new developments; he believed that is now time for action, taking account of the need for additional research and coordination and for more data.

#### *Conclusion*

The Committee thanked the Chair of the SSWG for his report and noted the importance and relevance of the work of the SSWG to the Conservation Committee.

#### **4.4 Committee discussions and recommendations**

A number of countries reported on their activities related to ship strikes.

Australia (IWC/63/CC12) reported on its national ship strike database and associated web-based questionnaire. These are closely based on the IWC data collection questionnaire so as to ensure that the data collected in Australia is compatible with the IWC ship strike database. Attempts to submit data from Australian waters directly to the IWC will be redirected back to the national-based portal to ensure all reporting will have national verification. Australia offered to share the web-based software with other members to assist with efficient and standardised delivery of ship strike data to the IWC database.

Argentina introduced IWC/63/CC10 which reported on a collision of a southern right whale with a 161m container ship in Puerto Madryn, Argentina on 3 August 2010. The Prefectura Naval Argentina investigated the event and developed and implemented Disposición Madr, RIA N° 069/09 (later modified by Disposición Madr, RIA N°80/10) to reduce ship strikes with southern right whales in the Peninsula Valdes nursery ground (see also IWC/61/CC12rev).

IWC/63/CC14 details various efforts by the USA to reduce the threat of ship strikes, including operational measures for vessels, education and outreach programmes, technological research, and research and monitoring activities (see also IWC/63/CC13). In January 2010, it convened a workshop in Long Beach, California to identify research needs and management options to reduce ship strikes of large whales (primarily blue, fin, and humpback whales) in its west coast waters. In addition, the United States Coast Guard is currently conducting a Port Access Route Study of key ports in both southern and northern California to assess the feasibility of modifying shipping routes, which will, among other things, assess possible adverse effects on large whale species of moving routes.

Germany drew attention to ASCOBANS activities on ship strikes, which included mapping ship traffic over the year in areas of the North Sea around the British Isles and the development of stranding schemes which has been established in a number of ASCOBANS countries over the past 15-20 years. Expertise developed in the latter scheme could potentially be used in other areas.

Several countries commended Alexandre de Lichtervelde for his hard and productive work on ship strikes over many years.

---

<sup>1</sup> See IWC/63/CC8

## 5. SOUTHERN RIGHT WHALES IN CHILE AND PERU

At its meeting in 2008, the Conservation Committee had received reports from a Workshop on the status of southern right whales from Chile-Peru and from the Scientific Committee. At that meeting the Conservation Committee: (1) stated the importance of continuing work on the status of right whales and recommended that this issue remain a high priority in the future work of the Scientific Committee; and (2) agreed the item be retained on the Conservation Committee's agenda.

### 5.1 Update on progress

The Chair of the Scientific Committee reported that last year it was agreed that only important or urgent papers on southern right whales would be considered at this year's meeting in the light of the forthcoming Southern Right Whale Assessment Workshop that will be held in Puerto Madryn, Argentina, in September 2011. The Committee looks forward to the report of workshop at next year's meeting. The Scientific Committee also recommended expansion of the Southern Ocean right whale catalogue, as approved last year by the Commission.

Chile referred to the measures taken at national level to protect the Critically Endangered Chile-Peru population of southern right whales (which probably numbers less than 50 mature individuals). It introduced a draft proposal for a national action plan for its recovery (IWC/63/CC21rev) aimed at strengthening the conservation policy of Chile. The proposal gives details on historical catches off Chile, legal framework, current known status, actual and potential threats, advances in public awareness, and a set of suggested actions to improve coordination among different stakeholders. The draft plan promotes the effective implementation of conservation measures at a national level, such as the development of contingency plans and strategies to increase scientific knowledge and capacity building, among others. This proposed national action plan is expected to make an important contribution to discussions of the future southern right whale assessment and to the development of a Conservation Management Plan for South American southern right whale populations proposed at this year's meeting by Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Peru.

Brazil congratulated Chile on its efforts to develop an action plan and the Committee agreed this item be retained on the Conservation Committee's agenda.

## 6. WHALEWATCHING

At IWC/59 in 2007, it was noted that while the Scientific Committee's Whalewatching Sub-committee deals exclusively with scientific aspects of whalewatching, the Conservation Committee could usefully address aspects related to management, including the implementation of the Scientific Committee's recommendations in this area, socio-economic aspects and international co-operation. Accordingly, in 2008 the Conservation Committee established an intersessional correspondence group to look at all aspects of whalewatching. This group made a series of recommendations to IWC/61 in 2009 which included setting up a Standing Working Group on Whalewatching (SWG-WW).

The SWG-WW presented its preliminary strategic plan for the five-year period 2010-2015 at IWC/62 in 2010. Following IWC/62 a Workshop was held in Argentina in November 2010 to commence discussion and initiate work on the key themes identified in the strategic plan.

### 6.1 Report of the November 2010 workshop on whale watching

Argentina presented IWC/63/CC6, the Report of the Whale Watching Workshop held in Puerto Madryn, from 3 to 5 November 2010. The Workshop was supported by the Governments of Australia, United States, the Province of Chubut and the NGO WSPA and was chaired by Lorenzo Rojas Bracho; participants from 13 countries attended. The workshop conclusions are relevant as a basis for the development of the IWC 5-year Strategic Plan (see Item 6.2). Three key elements were identified: (1) research and assessment; (2) management; and (3) capacity building and development. These elements will aid countries in building sustainable whale watching industries.

The Workshop recommended the development of a 'living' web-based Handbook on Whalewatching as one of the primary methods for achieving the objectives of the strategic plan. The following points were made:

- (1) the IWC should play an important advisory role while management responsibility lies with national governments;
- (2) local issues require local solutions;
- (3) co-operation with other relevant international, national and regional bodies and organisations should be improved/established;
- (4) the handbook should be frequently updated and monitored; and
- (5) consideration should be given by the Commission to developing formal 'conservation' and 'user' objectives for whalewatching.

The Workshop recognised the following areas to be considered by the Handbook: operational types; socio-economic implications; regulations, voluntary frameworks and compliance mechanisms (management); science and monitoring; education, communication and training; and capacity building. It was stressed that there are many different kinds of

whalewatching operations and scenarios and the Handbook must try to provide information and advice relevant to all of these. However, while the Handbook can draw attention to various relevant factors and issues and provide examples from various case studies, the responsibility for economic, business and social development lies with industry, national governments (and their subsidiaries), not the IWC. Cooperation with other organisations with expertise on socioeconomic aspects will be explored.

The IWC has been working on science and monitoring since mid-1990's through the Scientific Committee. At present there is insufficient information available to provide unequivocal advice on the scientific aspects required for the development of formal guidelines for whalewatching. The Workshop suggests that the SWG-WW consider requesting the Commission to ask for guidance from the Scientific Committee on how this might be achieved. Considerably greater care should be given to deciding whether, and under what conditions, whalewatching operations should be allowed on endangered populations, in accordance with a precautionary approach.

The Workshop recognised that the Handbook itself represents a valuable educational tool. It noted that there are several potential target audiences for education (and training) and the Handbook web-design should take this into account. The need for a mechanism to facilitate communication amongst whalewatching operators and between operators and regulators was also recognised.

Finally the Workshop recognised the importance and complexity of capacity building and suggested this should be considered further by the SWG-WW prior to the 2011 Annual Meeting.

#### *Conclusion*

The Committee thanked the workshop chair and participants for the excellent workshop report.

#### **6.2 Report from the Conservation Committee's Standing Working Group on Whalewatching**

Argentina presented IWC/63/CC3, the Report of the Standing Working Group on Whalewatching. The Working Group was established to progress the recommendations of the report of the Intersessional Correspondence Group (IWC/61/CC9) which identified the following three key elements that the Commission could seek to promote as part of an integrated body of work to assist countries in building sustainable whalewatching industries: research and assessment; management; and capacity building and development. In undertaking its work, the Working Group was charged with preparing a Five-year Strategic Plan for Whalewatching (hereafter the Strategic Plan).

The proposed Strategic Plan set out objectives and actions designed to facilitate responsible development of the sector by Contracting Parties. The SWG-WW report included a set of recommendations seeking endorsement of the Strategic Plan and establishing an on-going role for the Working Group over the life of the Plan.

#### **SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED STRATEGIC PLAN**

Last year at IWC62, the SWG-WW had submitted a draft strategic plan (IWC/62/CC8) and recommended that a workshop be held. The conclusions of that Workshop (IWC/63/CC6 and see Item 6.1 above) provided the basis for the further development of the Strategic Plan.

The SWG-WW, together with officials from France and New Zealand, met in Paris in March 2011 to finalise the proposed Strategic Plan (Appendix A of IWC/62/CC3) for the consideration of the Conservation Committee and the Commission.

Five objectives - research, assessment (monitoring), capacity building, development and management - formed its key components. Within the framework of these objectives, the proposed Strategic Plan identified a suite of short term actions (which can be delivered within two years of the adoption of the Strategic Plan) and medium term actions (delivered over five years). Only one long-term action - an integrated research plan - was identified.

The SWG-WW also identified elements of the Strategic Plan that would benefit from review by the Scientific Committee prior to final approval.

#### **FUTURE ROLE OF THE STANDING WORKING GROUP ON WHALEWATCHING**

The finalisation of the proposed Strategic Plan completes the work of the SWG-WW under the terms of reference set out in IWC/61/CC9. However, the SWG-WW envisages an important on-going role relating to oversight of the delivery of actions and products under the Strategic Plan, including population of the Handbook. Therefore it developed the draft revised terms of reference for the future (Appendix B IWC/62/CC3).

It was proposed that its membership should be expanded to include two members of the Scientific Committee. While the Working Group would continue to report annually to the Commission via the Conservation Committee, the SWG-WW thought that the broadened membership would better ensure that management actions proposed are based on the best available science.

#### **PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SWG-WW**

The SWG-WW proposed three recommendations for consideration by the Conservation Committee:

- (1) the Strategic Plan for Whalewatching 2011-2016, as amended following consideration of scientific elements of the Plan by the Scientific Committee (see Item 6.3);
- (2) the revised terms of reference for the SWG-WW; and
- (3) expansion of the SWG-WW's membership to include two members from the Scientific Committee.

#### *6.1.1 Conclusion*

The Committee thanked Miguel Iniguez (Argentina) for his presentation. Discussion of the plan itself and the recommendations can be found under Item 6.4.

### **6.3 Report of the Scientific Committee**

The Chair of the Scientific Committee summarised the relevant parts of the Scientific Committee report (IWC/63/Rep 1, Item 15). Whalewatching is another matter relevant to general discussions of co-operation between the Conservation and Scientific Committees (see Item 10.1).

#### **POSSIBLE EFFECTS OF WHALEWATCHING ON CETACEANS**

A number of papers on possible effects of whalewatching on cetaceans were considered. Concerns raised included possible foraging disruption of common minke whales off Iceland; energetic concerns for killer whales off British Columbia; and unregulated whalewatching in the Dutch Caribbean.

The Norwegian whalewatching industry is one of the largest in Europe and has been growing over the past 10 years. To investigate the impacts of whalewatching off Andenes, Norway, a before/after land-based exposure experiment is being designed. The Scientific Committee welcomed this experiment as a potentially important contribution to the LaWE project (see below) and also recommended similar research be undertaken in other areas of Norway where increased development of whalewatching is anticipated.

#### **LAWE ('LARGE-SCALE WHALEWATCHING EXPERIMENT')**

The objective of the LaWE project is to understand the mechanisms and possible effects of whalewatching on cetacean populations, in order to define a framework for integrated and adaptive management. This should account for uncertainties and include monitoring and feedback mechanisms. It is large scale because multiple control sites and whalewatching sites will be used to account for environmental and biological variability under a well-designed collaborative experiment. The data will be used to develop models relating whalewatching exposure to reproduction and/or survival. Such models can then be used to determine the effectiveness of mitigation measures employed to reduce the effects of whalewatching.

In response to a call by the intersessional steering group for researchers to join the LaWE project, to date 35 research groups holding relevant data have said they are willing to participate and share their data. The necessary analyses can now be undertaken to define the number of sites needed for the LaWE project. However, these data need to be put into a common database and quality checks carried out. In the long term, this database should be held within the IWC Secretariat, but for now there is an available research assistant who can initiate the work.

In contrast, it was noted that very few government-affiliated data holders had indicated a willingness to participate in the LaWE project. The Committee recommends that Commissioners encourage their relevant government agencies to participate.

#### **COMMERCIAL WHALEWATCHING AND ASSOCIATED DATA COLLECTED, AND PLATFORMS OF OPPORTUNITY**

Good progress is being made with the online database for world-wide tracking of commercial whalewatching and associated data collected (see IWC/63/Rep 1, Item 15.3.3). A beta version of the database is now available for testing. The ACCOBAMS inventory of currently existing whalewatching activities can contribute to the IWC worldwide database.

Information from platforms of opportunity is discussed under Item 15.4.2 of IWC/63/Rep1. The development of the Pacific Whale Foundation's 'Whale and Dolphin Tracker' software was welcomed. This web-based data management system can provide real-time relative abundance and distribution data. Results were also received from a study using platforms of opportunity in the waters of La Gomera (Canary Islands).

#### **SWIM-WITH-WHALE OPERATIONS**

The Scientific Committee has been looking at swim-with-whale operations for some time. A swim-with-whale questionnaire has been developed but has not yet been fully tested. Thanks to travel funds made available by the Pacific Whale Foundation, testing should occur during the 2011/2012 season in the Dominican Republic, where there are several swim-with-whale operators.

#### **WORLDWIDE COMPENDIUM OF WHALEWATCHING GUIDELINES AND REGULATIONS**

The Scientific Committee received an updated compendium of whalewatching guidelines and regulations from around the world and reaffirmed the value of this document which is published on the IWC website (see item 15.4.3 of IWC/63/Rep1). Information on the effectiveness of whalewatching guidelines was received including a report of an

extensive awareness campaign that had resulted in an increase in the number of and accuracy of collision reports between whalewatching vessels and whales.

A number of issues are suggested for next year's work including: (1) an in-depth review of models of cetacean behaviour that can simulate and test population consequences of disturbances, such as whalewatching; (2) a review of, and where appropriate, revision of the general IWC whalewatching guidelines that were developed in 1996; (3) the development of the LaWE project; and (4) if requested, a review of the scientific aspects of the Conservation Committee and Commission work on whalewatching.

#### SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE DISCUSSIONS OF THE PROPOSED STRATEGIC PLAN

Item 15.4.1 of IWC/63/Rep 1 summarises discussions on scientific aspects of the reports from the Commission's Intersessional Whalewatching Workshop and the Conservation Committee's Working Group on Whalewatching, noting that neither of these had yet been discussed by the Conservation Committee or the Commission. The Scientific Committee therefore offered only general, overarching comments, recognising that a more formal, comprehensive review can be conducted next year if requested. This issue is another matter relevant to general discussions of co-operation between the Conservation and Scientific Committees (see Item 10.1).

The Scientific Committee's work on whalewatching is a recognition of the importance of rigorous science in the management of responsible whalewatching. The approach of establishing a Joint Working Group was welcomed as it is important that the Scientific Committee is adequately represented in discussions of a strategic plan to ensure that scientific components are achievable. Therefore the chair and co-chair (who is also a member of the LaWE steering group) of the Sub-committee on Whalewatching have been nominated to serve on this joint Working Group, along with at least one of the Chair of the Scientific Committee, the Vice-Chair or the Head of Science.

At this stage, no attempt was made to review the extremely ambitious scale of the science-related work programme in the proposed draft Strategic Plan for Whalewatching 2011-2016. After the Conservation Committee and the Commission have reviewed the proposed Strategic Plan, the Scientific Committee looks forward to providing scientific advice on the nature and scale of the Plan through the joint Working Group and during any future review processes. The Scientific Committee are also happy to assist in reviewing the terms of reference for the joint Working Group once the Conservation Committee has conducted its review.

#### 6.3.1 Conclusion

In response to a question from Sweden, the Chair of the Scientific Committee noted that the Pacific Whale Foundation's 'Whale and Dolphin Tracker' software is free and that a link to it will be added to the IWC website.

In conclusion, the Committee thanked the Scientific Committee for its work on whalewatching. Discussion of the proposed Strategic Plan occurs under Item 6.4 below.

#### 6.4 Strategic Plan for Whalewatching 2011-2016 and the Terms of Reference for the Standing Working Group on Whalewatching and 6.5 Committee discussions and recommendations

The proposed Strategic Plan and the Terms of Reference for the SWG-WW were discussed in light of the reports under Items 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3. The Conservation Committee thanked the workshop participants and the SWG-WW (especially Argentina and Australia) for their work.

Australia noted that whalewatching is highly relevant and important to most IWC Members, and that the strategic plan and the work of the standing working group should receive broad support. Australia further noted that it is difficult to discuss the detailed scientific aspects of the proposed Strategic Plan until it is the subject of a more formal review by the Scientific Committee next year. It is important to establish a process this year by which these aspects can be accommodated within the workplan of the Scientific Committee.

Belgium noted that cetaceans contribute more to the economy of coastal communities every year but at the same time whalewatching can have a severe impact on local cetacean populations. They welcomed the development of the Handbook which will be a key tool for integrating scientific knowledge and a resource for whalewatching tourism. In this way the Conservation Committee can contribute to whale management in an effective manner

In conclusion, the Conservation Committee **endorses** and **commends** to the Commission:

- (1) the proposed Strategic Plan, noting that aspects of it will need to be formally reviewed by the Scientific Committee before final adoption;
- (3) the new terms of reference for the SWG-WW;
- (4) the Scientific Committee's views on expanded membership of the SWG-WW.

Finally, the Committee thanked Australia for its work in chairing the SWG-WW up until now and welcomed Ryan Wulff (USA) as its new Chair.



## 7. WHALE SANCTUARIES

### 7.1 Report from the Scientific Committee

The Scientific Committee did not receive any documents relevant to proposals for IWC Sanctuaries this year. The item will remain on the Scientific Committee Agenda for future meetings.

### 7.2 Committee discussions and recommendations

#### 7.2.1 IWC Sanctuaries

Brazil noted that together with Argentina it has submitted a proposal for the creation of a South Atlantic Sanctuary for whales (IWC/63/6rev). Both countries strongly believe that the sanctuary issue should be kept on the agenda and the matter raised to see if there was the political will for a further discussion in the plenary. Argentina considered that this is a very important conservation measure that would be added to other protection measures in existing sanctuaries. As in previous years Chile expressed support for the proposal.

Norway commented that it sees no scientific reason or conservation advantage in establishing sanctuaries of this kind.

#### 7.2.2 Other

France reported that the Agoa sanctuary for marine mammals in the French Caribbean has been officially created as announced at the last meeting of the parties to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW) of the United Nations Environment Programme in the Wider Caribbean. The sanctuary covers 138,000 sq. km. An inventory of species is being undertaken along with aerial surveys to estimate abundance and to identify the presence of fishing boats, sailing ships, etc. A steering committee has been established and both human and financial resources have been provided to ensure good governance of the sanctuary and improve scientific knowledge.

On a more general level and via the regional activity centre of the SPAW protocol, France hopes to generate interest among the region's other nations in setting up cooperative approaches such as advocated by the Action Plan for Marine Mammals in the Wider Caribbean Region. The Dominican Republic, the Netherlands and the USA have responded to the call for regional cooperation which could take the form of twinning operations being set up between sanctuaries and/or marine protected area in the coming months and especially at the second international conference on Marine Protected Areas and marine mammals in November 2011 in Martinique (see also Item 10.5).

The Conservation Committee thanked France for this information.

## 8. CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT PLANS

At IWC/61 in 2009 the Conservation Committee endorsed the formation of a small, specialist group (SSG) to construct a list of candidate conservation management plans (CMP). This group reported to IWC/62 in 2010 and provided a draft framework for producing CMPs. A number of comments were received and the SSG is working towards the presentation of a final proposal to the Conservation Committee at IWC/63.

At IWC/62 there was also discussion on future CMPs. A number of candidates were suggested including the Chile-Peru population of southern right whales, and also the possibility of including all South American right whales given the recent and unexplained die off of right whale calves in Argentinean waters. At IWC/62 members of the Conservation Committee proposed that a workshop to consider the first CMP proposal be arranged to immediately follow the Scientific Committee Right Whale Assessment Workshop which will be held in Argentina in September 2011.

The Scientific Committee also addresses CMPs as part of its work on Whale Stocks. It had previously agreed an approach for developing CMPs, and at IWC/62 in 2010 it commended to the Commission a CMP for the western North Pacific gray whale which had been developed through collaborative work with IUCN.

### 8.1 Report from the Scientific Committee

#### *Western North Pacific gray whales*

The Chair of the Scientific Committee reported that the Scientific Committee has been discussing conservation plans since its 2008 meeting. Last year, it had strongly endorsed the draft conservation plan for western gray whales and agreed that it should form a model for the development of other conservation management plans. The urgent need for a co-ordinator was noted. This year, the strong endorsement of the draft Western North Pacific Gray Whale plan was repeated (see Item 10.4.2 of IWC/63/Rep 1). The Committee had also welcomed the undertaking in 2010 of an international collaborative telemetry study (see Item 10.4.1 of IWC/63/Rep1) and made recommendations for additional work this summer. Such a research action is part of the plan.

#### *Arabian Sea humpback whales*

Another potential candidate for such a plan is the Arabian Sea population of humpback whales. This is a small isolated population that is vulnerable to human activities. It numbers perhaps less than 100 animals although not all areas in the

region have been covered. Concern has been expressed previously about this population and recommendations made for continued and new research.

This year (Item 10.2.2.2 of IWC/63/Rep 1) the Scientific Committee agreed that sufficient data exist on Arabian Sea humpback whales and possible anthropogenic threats to them, to begin the process of developing a Conservation Management Plan. Following the model for western gray whales, it is believed that progress will best be achieved through a dedicated intersessional expert workshop to be held prior to next year's meeting. The workshop should engage relevant range state government departments responsible for marine conservation in the Arabian Sea. Their willingness to be involved in the process should be determined and they should be familiarised with and provide with feedback on their capacity for CMP implementation. An intersessional email group has been established to evaluate the desire of the range States to support a CMP as well as the possibilities of convening such a workshop.

The Scientific Committee recommends that any draft CMP should include the priority research actions recommended last year including expanded photo-identification studies. It also agreed the following: (1) although humpback whales are the priority, other less-well studied large whale species should also be considered; (2) collaborative research should be undertaken in cooperation with range state partners, with a view to increasing awareness and capacity and to reducing dependence on external expertise; (3) research priorities would ultimately be best determined via the CMP process; and (4) stranding networks should be established in this region to provide better information on anthropogenic effects.

#### *Southern right whales*

In addition the question of regional CMPs for southern right whales will be considered as part of the work of the same intersessional Workshop.

## **8.2 Report from the small specialist group**

### *8.2.1 Proposed framework for Conservation Management Plans*

#### **PRESENTATION OF THE REPORT**

Australia presented the report of the small specialist group (IWC/63/CC5). Since 2008, many IWC member countries have been involved in the initiative to develop Conservation Management Plans (CMPs) as a flexible, tailored management tool that can be applied to improve conservation outcomes for whales through the targeted management of human activities. At IWC61, the Commission established a Small Advisory Group within the Conservation Committee to oversee development of this initiative. At IWC62, the Small Advisory Group was directed to develop clear policy principles for CMPs and to produce agreed guidelines which would assist countries wishing to develop their own CMPs and assist the determination of conservation priorities for the implementation of CMPs.

After extensive work, the Small Advisory group developed guideline documents on CMPs for the consideration of the Commission. The objective of these documents is to provide the Commission with an integrated approach to improve conservation outcomes for cetaceans and to address the most urgent cetacean conservation issues. They propose a framework and process to assist those member countries wishing to produce a CMP, based on the best available science and management advice as well as providing advice to the IWC on how to engage on this issue into the future. The CMP guidelines include three annexes: a nomination template which can be submitted either by IWC member countries or by the Commission itself (see Appendix 5); a template for a conservation management plan (see Appendix 6); and funding principles and processes to guide IWC support for CMPs (see Appendix 7).

The templates are intended to assist proponents in the preparation of a nomination and the subsequent development of a CMP. The proposed funding principles and processes seek to guide the provision of IWC funding support for CMPs, should the Commission elect to assist the development or delivery of key components. This is addressed in more detail under item 8.2.2.

Nominations would be submitted to the IWC Secretariat with formal advice being sought from the Scientific Committee and the Conservation Committee. Each Committee would assess the nomination using its respective expertise as a baseline.

The guiding documents also include recommendations aimed at strengthening the IWC's future engagement on this important issue, including reconstituting the Small Advisory Group as a Standing Working Group of the Conservation Committee (hereafter the SWG-CMP). Recognising the close linkages with the work of the Scientific Committee, the Small Advisory Group has proposed that membership of the SWG-CMP be drawn from both the Scientific and the Conservation Committees.

If established, the first task of the SWG-CMP will be to develop a work programme. The Small Advisory Group believes that an important component will be to establish a list of priority candidate cetacean species and populations. It should focus on the most urgent conservation issues where management of human-cetacean interactions is likely to have the most positive outcome. This could most effectively be achieved with leadership from the Scientific Committee.

In concluding its presentation, Australia thanked the members of the Small Advisory Group and all other individuals and IWC member countries that have been instrumental in advancing the CMP initiative and developing these documents.

#### DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Many countries thanked Australia and the Small Advisory Group for the proposed framework, believing it to be a good basis for the development of CMPs. Several countries including Belgium, USA, Spain and the UK offered assistance to the SWG-CMP.

Spain believed the initiative would be very useful in improving the conservation of endangered populations. Its Government is currently developing CMPs for threatened species, including bottlenose dolphins, fin whales and sperm whales and these will be based on the templates.

The Committee **endorses** the establishment of the SWG-CMP with membership to be drawn from both the Scientific Committee and the Conservation Committee. It further **endorses** the terms of reference (see Appendix 8). Australia agreed to continue as Chair of the new group.

#### 8.2.2 *Management of voluntary funds for Conservation Management Plans*

##### PRESENTATION OF REPORT

Australia presented the section of the report of the Small Advisory Group (Annex 1 of IWC/63/CC5) on the management of voluntary funds for CMPs. A key component of the package of guiding documents described under Item 8.2.1 are the CMP Funding Principles and Processes.

It is expected that funding for CMPs will be drawn from a range of sources. It is assumed that proponents of a CMP, including signatory range states to the nomination and subsequent plan, will be the primary source of funding for the development and implementation of the plan. However, parties to a CMP nomination may not always have sufficient resources or expertise to nominate, develop and implement a CMP. In such circumstances, funding support, particularly for coordination purposes, may be available from the IWC. There are currently two streams of IWC funding that may be available for this purpose: voluntary contributions from member states for conservation purposes - including through voluntary contributions to the IWC to support the undertaking of CMPs; and the Scientific Committee Research Fund. The proposed principles in Appendix 7 were developed for use by relevant Working Groups and Committees in developing their advice on funding requests to the Commission.

The report suggests the following funding principles:

- (1) Eligibility is limited to CMPs generated within the Commission;
- (2) Eligibility for support is informed by the capacity to pay - with priority generally given where participating range states include a majority of Group 1 and Group 2 member states;
- (3) Funding recommendations will be made on the basis of conservation priority and cost effectiveness;
- (4) Funding to employ a coordinator may be sought for a maximum of two years;
- (5) Funding for the implementation phase is primarily for coordination and governance activities. It requires demonstration by participating range states of formal governance arrangements and funding commitments for key actions; and
- (6) Any funding requests for research-related actions will be referred to the Scientific Committee.

The report also proposes funding processes.

For research-related funding it is proposed that consideration be in accordance with the existing Rules of Procedure of the Scientific Committee.

For submissions to access voluntary contributions, the following is proposed:

- (1) Submissions should be received by the Conservation Committee in sufficient time for them to be considered prior to the next annual meeting;
- (2) Submissions will be reviewed by the proposed Standing Working Group on CMPs;
- (3) The Working Group will make recommendations to the Conservation Committee; and
- (4) The Conservation Committee will recommend to the Commission those funding requests it judges best meet the funding principles, in priority order.

Together with the CMP nomination template and the CMP template, these funding guidelines and processes are intended to form a framework for the rigorous and timely delivery of CMPs, based on the best available science and management advice. In that context, the funding principles and processes seek to guide appropriate provision of IWC funding support for CMPs, should the Commission elect to support the development or delivery of key components of a plan.

#### **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

In response to a question from the USA, Australia noted that the funding principle should not preclude funding of CMPs that involve collaboration with an IGO (for example IUCN). The important aspect is that the range states would support the funding for the initiative.

The Committee **endorsed** the proposed funding principles with the important clarification that principle (1) be amended to read ‘within the Commission or by the Commission in co-operation with appropriate IGOs’ or similar – this is in accord with, for example, the draft western North Pacific gray whale plan that was developed in co-operation with IUCN. It was noted that given the range of anthropogenic threats facing cetaceans, co-operation with relevant IGOs as well as national authorities could be beneficial.

#### **8.3 Committee discussions and recommendations**

Argentina presented IWC/63/CC4 on behalf of Brazil, Chile, Peru and Argentina on the Nomination of a CMP for the South American populations of southern right whales. The Peninsula Valdes population was increasing at a rate of approximately 6.8% from the early 1970s to 2000 (Cooke et al. 2001, 2003) and may now number around 6,100 whales (Rowntree pers. comm.). By contrast, the southern right whales from Chile and Peru, are estimated to number less than 50 mature whales (IWC/62/Rep 4).

Small numbers of strandings have been recorded in the Peninsula Valdes region since 1971. However, since 2003, when the Southern Right Whale Health Monitoring program (SRWHMP) was established, a total of 366 right whale deaths have been recorded, with peaks in 2003 (31), 2005 (47), 2007 (83), 2008 (95) and 2009 (79). A continuation in this high mortality rate would likely result in a population decline. In 2010, a workshop met in Puerto Madryn, Argentina to investigate the causes of this high mortality of southern right whales. Over 90% of the deaths have been of first-year calves. After thorough investigation of a range of possible causes, the workshop agreed three leading hypotheses: (1) reduced food availability for adult females; (2) biotoxins; and (3) infectious disease.

Southern right whales were classified as “Least Concern” but the Peru-Chile subpopulation was classified as “Critically Endangered” by IUCN (Reilly, 2008).

Considering the critical situation of southern right whales from Peru and Chile and the high and the unusual and unsustainable mortality rate of the Argentinean population, the IWC recognized the merits of developing a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) for the South American populations of southern right whales at IWC62. The discussions at IWC62 effectively replicate the approval process for the development of a CMP.

The Committee was informed that Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Peru and Uruguay will submit a draft CMP nomination at IWC63. The development of the CMP will link directly to the September 2011 assessment workshop for Southern Right Whales referred to earlier. In order to incorporate significant existing and/or emerging threats in the preparation of the CMP of South American Southern Right Whales, a drafting group will be established to prepare the draft of the CMP in late September for submission to IWC64. Each range state will designate one expert to be part of the drafting group. Funding will be sought from the IWC CMP fund to support a coordinator to develop and implement the Plan.

Belgium and Australia commended the work described by Argentina and strongly supported the initiative, including a request to fund a coordinator.

Belgium also welcomed the information from the Scientific Committee regarding Arabian Sea humpbacks whales and in particular the recommendation on stranding networks to be established in the region. A Belgian scientist is willing to build capacity on necropsies. Belgium suggested that a steering committee be formed to engage range states in the development of a regional CMP, in addition to a regional workshop to develop priority research, and volunteered to be part of such a steering committee. Reference was made to the intersessional group established by the Scientific Committee to establish the willingness of regional authorities and institutes, and thus the feasibility of a workshop.

The USA agreed with the recommendations of the Scientific Committee on Arabian Sea humpbacks and, in accord with the report of the Scientific Committee, stressed the need to engage the Sultanate of Oman and other relevant range States prior to moving forward to determine their willingness to be involved in the process. They are pursuing multiple avenues of diplomatic outreach to Oman and other States to assist in familiarising them with Conservation Management Plans.

#### **9. NATIONAL REPORTS ON CETACEAN CONSERVATION**

Several countries had submitted voluntary national cetacean conservation reports: UK (IWC/63/CC9), Argentina (IWC/63/CC10), Australia (IWC/63/CC11), USA (IWC/63/CC14), France (IWC/63/CC16), Brazil (IWC/63/CC18), Mexico (IWC/63/CC19) and Chile (IWC/63/CC20). The Committee welcomed these reports but did not have time to review them in detail.

## 10. OTHER MATTERS

### 10.1 Collaboration between the Scientific Committee and the Conservation Committee

The Chair of the Scientific Committee noted that the Committee had referred to the issue of collaboration with the Conservation Committee in a number of places within its report. The effective conservation of cetaceans requires both scientific and management input and there are now a range of issues of direct relevance to both the Scientific Committee and Conservation Committee.

The Scientific Committee believes that an important consideration for the Commission is the development of mechanisms that allow effective communication between, and joint roles for, these two committees. One possible mechanism to achieve this, at least in some circumstances, is joint steering groups with appropriate representation from both committees, for example the proposed joint groups for whalewatching and conservation management plans.

These joint steering groups are likely to be an important mechanism for interaction between the Scientific Committee and the Conservation Committee. The Scientific Committee representation on these joint groups is expected to vary with the issue and the required expertise. In addition to relevant sub-committee convenors and members with special expertise, the Scientific Committee recommends that (at least initially) joint groups should also include at least one of the Chair of the Scientific Committee, the Vice-Chair and the Head of Science.

The Scientific Committee is happy to assist the Commission to develop practical guidance on how best to facilitate interactions between the two Committees including the formation and functioning of issue-specific joint groups.

The Conservation Committee **endorses** the Scientific Committee recommendation to develop a mechanism to allow effective communication and joint roles for the two committees and **recommends** that it be done on a case by case basis. It was noted that it is important that the sequence in which the committees meet should be born in mind so as to avoid delays of a whole year because of meeting timings.

### 10.2 Progress under the Voluntary Fund for Small Cetacean Conservation Research

The Chair of the Scientific Committee's sub-committee on Small Cetaceans updated the Committee on the current status of the Voluntary Fund for Small Cetacean Conservation and Research. After providing brief background information on the recent contributions to this Fund, she summarised the process that led to the strong recommendation for funding nine high-standard research and conservation projects. Full details of the evaluation process can be found in IWC/63/Rep1 (see item 14.3 and Annex L). All of the research projects are aimed at improving conservation outcomes for small cetacean species and populations threatened or especially vulnerable to human activities. In the PowerPoint presentation ([http://iwcoffice.co.uk/documents/commission/IWC63docs/SMFund\\_CC.pdf](http://iwcoffice.co.uk/documents/commission/IWC63docs/SMFund_CC.pdf)) particular emphasis was given to the conservation and capacity building aspects of each project. It was also stressed that all projects had full support (and in some cases direct participation) from local or national authorities. This aspect was considered necessary to increase their potential conservation aspects. The existing funding is sufficient to cover six projects fully and a further three only for their first year. An additional £45,000 is still required. Moreover, in order to keep this Voluntary Fund alive for future calls (e.g. in 2013), the IWC Member Governments, IGOs and NGOs are kindly invited to consider additional funding.

The Conservation Committee **congratulates** the Scientific Committee on its work and looks forward to receiving reports on progress and the final outcomes. The importance of voluntary contributions to continue this work was highlighted and the process described was seen as an excellent way of determining which projects should be funded. Several countries noted the importance of continued contributions to the small cetacean fund in order to continue the very practical, strategic and direct support of small cetacean conservation initiatives.

### 10.3 Consideration of report of Intersessional Correspondence Group (ICG) on Strengthening IWC Financing

At IWC/62 in 2010 the Commission endorsed a recommendation from the F&A Committee that it convene a small group to work by correspondence to examine ways to integrate conservation funding into the overall budget of the IWC. The terms of reference stated the group would 'develop proposals for strengthening the financing of conservation with a view to striking a balance between funding for conservation and funding for management'.

The convenor of the ICG, Alexandre de Lichtervelde (Belgium), introduced the Group's work in the context of the Conservation Committee. Ways to integrate conservation funding into the overall budget were examined including both core budget and voluntary funding; this is necessary to respond to increased threats to cetaceans. He noted that the presentation on the use of the Small Cetaceans Voluntary Fund in Item 10.2 highlighted the funding gaps in existing projects.

The Group identified four main sources of external funding: international financing mechanisms, philanthropic organisations, private sector and collaboration with other IGOs. This is stage one of the initiative; stage two will take place after Commission endorsement; consequently, no external funds are being sought at this time. However, if money is sought, its use must be made clear. Again, the presentation on the use of the Small Cetaceans Voluntary Fund was very informative on possible projects. It would be useful to construct a list of the type and size of projects that could benefit from external funding as a guide when developing a further a course of action and identifying the possible target funders. To this end a provisional list of projects is given in in Appendix 2 of the ICG report.

De Lichtervelde was thanked for his work on this topic which will be discussed further by the F&A Committee.

#### **10.4 Establishment of Conservation Committee Vice-Chair**

Belgium proposed that the Conservation Committee consider the establishment of a Vice-Chair (IWC/63/CC15). They considered this is justified by both the increasing number of issues being dealt with by the Committee and the increasing need for intersessional work. The position would provide support for the Conservation Committee Chair.

The proposal was supported by several countries and is **recommended** to the Commission. As no candidates were put forward, unless a candidate is proposed at the Plenary, the Committee **agrees** to defer the election until discussion during IWC64.

#### **10.5 Other**

##### *The Honolulu Commitment*

The USA introduced IWC/63/CC 7, the Honolulu Commitment, to draw attention to the results of the Fifth International Marine Debris Conference that relate to the health of the marine ecosystem and the conservation of cetaceans. Co-organized by the USA's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and UNEP, the Conference took place 20-25 March 2011, in Honolulu, Hawai'i. It brought together 440 participants from 38 countries and included representatives from government and major industries, as well as leading marine researchers.

The Conference refined and endorsed the Honolulu Commitment, which outlines 12 actions to reduce marine debris. These include:

- (1) improving global knowledge of the scale, nature, source and impact of marine debris;
- (2) collaborating with global, regional and sub-regional organizations to enhance the effectiveness of multilateral initiatives aimed at preventing, reducing and managing marine debris; and
- (3) encouraging relevant intergovernmental fora to express support for the Honolulu Commitment.

The USA also welcomed the Scientific Committee review of marine debris at this year's annual meeting and the establishment of a small group to gather more data on plastics and their potential effects on cetaceans.

Several nations strongly supported the initiative and thanked the USA for its work on this issue. Brazil noted the discussions taking place in IMO on pollution from ships and debris. Belgium commented on the amount of work involved but noted that the involvement of stranding networks will allow work on many issues at the same time including cetacean diseases, ship strikes and marine debris.

The Conservation Committee **agreed** to forward the following recommendations to the Commission for its consideration:

- (1) To endorse the Honolulu Commitment;
- (2) To establish a standing agenda item on Marine Debris in the Conservation Committee; and
- (3) To request the Scientific Committee continue reviewing the potential threats of marine debris to cetaceans.

Australia drew attention to the related discussion at the Whale Killing Methods and Associated Welfare Issues Working Group meeting concerning entanglement and the proposed entanglement workshop and suggested that the marine debris agenda item include entanglements as a key topic. The USA also considered that the implementation of the short- and long-term actions recommended by that Working Group are relevant to the Conservation Committee. They will work with countries to the most appropriate way to efficiently address this topic.

##### *ICoMMPA*

France introduced IWC/63/CC17, giving information on the second International Conference on Marine Mammal Protected Areas (ICoMMPA) in Fort-de-France, Martinique from 7-11 November 2011. The purpose of the Conference is to continue the initial work initiated in Hawai'i in 2009, by developing the theme of the degradation of habitats and the decline of species. The conference is being co-organised by France (Agency for Marine Protected Areas) and the USA (National Oceanographic Atmospheric Administration), with the generous cooperation of Australia, Spain, UNEP and Martinique.

As a co-sponsor the USA supported this proposal, congratulated France for its work and looked forward to the report of the workshop.

#### **11. ADOPTION OF REPORT**

At the close of the meeting, Iceland reiterated its position from previous years; namely that it does not agree with the establishment of the Conservation Committee and for this reason has not participated in the discussions. Therefore Iceland's silence should not be taken as acceptance of any comment made or decision reached.

The report was adopted 'by post' on 11 July 2011.

## Appendix 1

### LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

#### **ARGENTINA**

Miguel Iniguez

#### **AUSTRALIA**

Donna Petrachenko  
Nick Gales  
Stephanie Ierino  
Peter Komidar  
Pam Eiser

#### **AUSTRIA**

Andrea Nouak  
Michael Stachowitsch

#### **BELGIUM**

Alexandre de Lichtervelde  
Fabian Ritter  
Els Vermeulen

#### **BRAZIL**

Marcus Henrique Paranaguá

#### **CHILE**

Barbara Galletti

#### **DENMARK**

Nette Levermann  
Ole Samsing

#### **FINLAND**

Penina Blankett

#### **FRANCE**

Martine Bigan  
Vincent Ridoux

#### **GERMANY**

Walter Duebner  
Karl-Hermann Kock

#### **ICELAND**

Asta Einarsdottir

#### **ITALY**

Caterina Fortuna

#### **KOREA**

Dae Yeon Moon  
Kab-Yong Jeong

#### **LUXEMBOURG**

Pierre Gallego

#### **MEXICO**

Lorenzo Rojas Bracho

#### **NETHERLANDS**

Peter Bos

#### **NEW ZEALAND**

Andrew Bignell  
Caroline McDonald  
Louise Chilvers  
Karena Lyons

#### **NORWAY**

Lars Walløe

#### **SOUTH AFRICA**

Herman Oosthuizen  
Ed Couzens

#### **SPAIN**

Santiago Lens  
Anna Tejedor

#### **SWEDEN**

Bo Fernholm

#### **SWITZERLAND**

Martin Krebs

#### **UK**

Richard Pullen  
Beatriz Roel  
James Gray  
Trevor Perfect  
Anju Sharda  
Jolyon Thompson  
Jennifer Lonsdale  
Mark Simmonds  
Vassili Papastavrou

#### **USA**

Doug DeMaster  
Robert Brownell  
Roger Eckert  
Mike Gosliner  
Brian Gruber  
Ira New Breast  
Lisa Phelps  
Allison Reed  
Rollie Schmitt  
Michael Tillman  
Ryan Wulff  
Eugene Brower  
Harry Brower

#### **Chair of SC**

Debra Palka

#### **IWC Secretariat**

Cherry Allison  
Simon Brockington  
Greg Donovan

**Appendix 2**  
**LIST OF DOCUMENTS**

<b>Conservation Committee documents</b>	<b>Agenda item</b>
IWC/63/CC	
1 Draft Agenda	
2 List of Documents	
3 Report of the Working Group on Whalewatching (submitted by Argentina)	6.3
4 Nomination of a Conservation Management Plan for South American population of Southern Right Whales ( <i>Eubalaena australis</i> ) (submitted by Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Peru)	8.2.1
5 Report of the Small Advisory Group on Conservation Management Plans (submitted by Australia on behalf of the Small Advisory Group on Conservation Management Plans)	8.2.1
6 Report of the Workshop on Whalewatching	6.1
7 The Honolulu Commitment (submitted by USA)	10
8 Report of the Joint IWC/ACCOBAMS Ship Strike Workshop	4.1
9 United Kingdom Voluntary National Cetacean Conservation Report, 2011	9
10 Argentina: Voluntary National Cetacean Conservation Report	9
11 Australia: Voluntary National Cetacean Conservation Report	9
12 Australia: Country Report on Ship Strikes	4
13 Ship Strikes Working Group. Sixth Progress Report to the Conservation Committee	4
14 United States Voluntary National Cetacean Conservation Report, 2011	9
15 Proposal for a Conservation Committee Vice-Chair (submitted by Belgium)	10.2
16 France Voluntary National Cetacean Conservation Report 2010	9
17 Information on the second International Conference on Marine Mammal Protected Areas, Martinique, November 2011 (France)	7
18 Brazil: Voluntary National Cetacean Conservation Report, 2011	9
19 Mexico: Voluntary National Cetacean Conservation Report, 2011	9
20 Chile: Voluntary National Cetacean Conservation Report, 2011	9
21rev Draft proposal for an Action Plan for the recovery of eastern South Pacific southern right whales in Chile (submitted by Chile)	5



## Appendix 3

### AGENDA

1. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS
  - 1.1. Appointment of Chair
  - 1.2. Appointment of Rapporteurs
  - 1.3. Review of documents
2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA
3. INVESTIGATION OF INEDIBLE ‘STINKY’ GRAY WHALES
  - 3.1. Report on Progress
  - 3.2. Committee discussions and recommendations
4. SHIP STRIKES
  - 4.1 Report of the joint IWC/ACCOBAMS workshop
  - 4.2 Report from the Scientific Committee
  - 4.3 Report from the Ship Strikes Working Group
  - 4.4 Committee discussions and recommendations
5. SOUTHERN RIGHT WHALE POPULATION OF CHILE-PERU
  - 5.1 Update on Progress
6. WHALEWATCHING
  - 6.1 Report of the November 2010 workshop on whale watching
  - 6.2 Report from the Conservation Committee’s Standing Working Group on Whalewatching
  - 6.3 Report of the Scientific Committee
  - 6.4 Strategic Plan for Whalewatching 2011-2016 and the Terms of Reference for the Working Group on Whalewatching
  - 6.5 Committee discussions and recommendations
7. WHALE SANCTUARIES
  - 7.1 Report from the Scientific Committee
  - 7.2 Committee discussions and recommendations
8. CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT PLANS
  - 8.1 Report from the Scientific Committee
  - 8.2 Report from the Conservation Committee’s Small Specialist Group
    - 8.2.1 Proposed framework for Conservation Management Plans
    - 8.2.2 Management of voluntary funds for Conservation Management Plans
  - 8.3 Committee discussions and recommendations
9. NATIONAL REPORTS ON CETACEAN CONSERVATION
  - 9.1 Introduction of national reports
  - 9.2 Committee discussion and recommendations
10. OTHER MATTERS
  - 10.1 Collaboration between the Scientific Committee and the Conservation Committee
  - 10.2 Progress under the Voluntary Fund for Small Cetacean Conservation Research
  - 10.3 Consideration of report of Intersessional Correspondence Group on Strengthening IWC Financing
  - 10.4 Establishment of Conservation Committee Vice-Chair
  - 10.5 Other
11. ADOPTION OF REPORT

## Appendix 4

### PROPOSAL FOR A JOINT TWO-YEAR WORK PLAN TO ADDRESS SHIP STRIKE ISSUES

As decided by the IWC and ACCOBAMS, a two-year work plan has been developed to reduce collision risks in the ACCOBAMS area. Both organisations have been working for several years on the issue of ship strikes. The following four actions are proposed, subject to endorsement by ACCOBAMS and IWC Parties at their forthcoming meetings of contracting Parties.

#### 1) Development of a protocol for investigating and documenting ship strike injuries and mortalities in cetaceans

Recognising the benefits of collaboration across national boundaries and the need for consistent documentation of human interactions with cetaceans, the Workshop **recommended** that the IWC and ACCOBAMS Scientific Committees establish a Joint Stranding investigation Working Group to carry out the actions listed below.

- (1) Review existing protocols (such as those used in the USA or UK) and tools for determining the presence or role of human interactions in the stranding of cetaceans, with particular emphasis on ship strikes, developing consistent terminology, diagnoses, reporting, and evidence collection.
- (2) Identify, develop, review, and validate tools, techniques and/or methods to address key issues relative to stranding investigations such as: (i) time from death; (ii) role of injury in the death; and (iii) time of injury related to death and to promote the use of such validated tools to give a systematic diagnostic approach to the problem of mortalities due to human interaction, with particular emphasis on ship strikes.
- (3) Develop a tiered approach that addresses the various experience levels of network participants and the multidisciplinary approach required for a definitive diagnosis. The developed methodology will be addressed to participants at different levels in the stranding networks (volunteers, biologists, veterinarians, pathologists).
- (4) Develop and implement training using these agreed approaches and/or protocols (initial emphasis should be given to specific priority ACCOBAMS areas).
- (5) Build capacity in range states with no strandings programmes to include human interaction detection, documentation and reporting.
- (6) Plan and hold a range-wide stranding coordination meeting for ACCOBAMS members. This type of regional cooperation should become a model for other agreements between IWC and regional conservation bodies that require evaluation of human impacts on cetaceans.

#### 2) Mediterranean basin wide survey in the summer of 2012

Given the essential need for baseline data to assess potential effects of ship strikes and other anthropogenic threats to cetaceans, a consolidated and concerted effort must be made, especially by Parties to ACCOBAMS, to obtain the necessary resources to ensure that the previously endorsed basin wide survey in ACCOBAMS waters is undertaken by the summer of 2012. The IWC Scientific Committee will continue to supply scientific support.

#### 3) Improved reporting to the IWC global ship strike database

Given the identified need for ship strike data worldwide to be able to assess potential conservation problems, a strong commitment should be given by IWC and ACCOBAMS Parties to actively encourage reporting of ship strikes to the IWC global database. In this regard, the Workshop also **recommended** that efforts be made to encourage IMO member states to make it mandatory to report ship strikes of cetaceans by vessels in their waters or under their flags. In addition, the Workshop **recommended** that governments should facilitate and develop mechanisms to ensure reporting of ship strikes by non-merchant vessels to the IWC database. It was noted that the IMO has sections on its website related to databases on environmental issues. A link to the IWC database on the IMO site would facilitate reporting. The Workshop **recommended** that IWC Secretary approach the IMO to discuss links between the web sites for both reporting and information dissemination.

#### 4) Development of appropriate modelling techniques to identify high priority areas

The IWC and ACCOBAMS should obtain funding and organise a workshop of experts in cetacean and shipping distribution to agree on appropriate analytical and modelling techniques to facilitate the identification of potential 'hotspots' for more detailed future consideration.

## Appendix 5

### CMP NOMINATION TEMPLATE

Nomination of a Conservation Management Plan for

<insert name of nominated cetacean population(s), threat or critical habitat>

This Nomination was prepared by

<insert proposing member government(s) or Committee(s) as appropriate>

<Date>

*Notes on using this template:*

- *Text in blue is for guidance only and can be kept in the template for reference*

#### CMP Nomination - Key issues

The following issues should be addressed in the CMP Nomination.

*Scientific Rationale for a CMP*

(a) Information on the cetacean population(s)

Insert a summary of the underlying scientific rationale for developing a CMP. This should include relevant information in the following areas: taxonomy and biological data of the species/population, its distribution and population estimates, trends and structure (if available), specific habitat use and characteristics and migration.

(b) Information on known and suspected threats to the population

Insert a summary of the threats affecting the target species/population and, to the extent possible, an assessment of their relative importance at the population level<sup>1</sup>. Where possible, summarise information on known or potential mitigation measures to identified threats. This can be provided in a summary table.

Actual/Potential Threat	Cause or related activity	Evidence	Possible Impact on population (may be an educated guess)	Priority for Action	Actual/possible mitigation measures
<i>e.g. bycatch</i>	<i>Set net fishing Bottom trawls</i>	<i>Strong</i>	<i>Possible high Mortality +/-or serious injury</i>	<i>High, RES and MIT</i>	<i>Pingers; change in gear</i>
<i>e.g. other direct mortality</i>	<i>Ship strikes from commercial vessels</i>	<i>Moderate</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Low</i>	
<i>e.g. chemical pollution</i>	<i>Industrial development, sewer discharges</i>	<i>Moderate</i>	<i>Moderate</i>	<i>medium</i>	<i>Strict implementation of existing measures</i>

<sup>1</sup> The principles of the Precautionary Approach should be used when considering conservation management actions in the CMP nomination. Insufficient information relating to a particular characteristic of the nomination need not preclude the development of a CMP. Obtaining scientific data or developing effective mitigation measures can form key actions as part of an initial plan – as noted, a CMP is a living document.

*CMP Objectives and Outcomes*

Outline the overall objectives of the CMP and anticipated short, medium and long term outcomes in terms of anticipated recovery or conservation benefits, where short, medium and long-term will normally be of the order of 5, 10 and 15 years. Include a description on the relationship between the CMP objectives and outcomes and the IWC's objectives.

*Agreed and anticipated delivery partners*

Provide information on the agreed (and any anticipated) stakeholders who will be involved in developing and implementing the plan. These should include relevant range states, either within or outside of the IWC, and stakeholders who are involved in the threats.

*Process to be adopted when developing a CMP*

Provide an outline of the procedural steps that will be undertaken by relevant range states (and others) when developing and implementing the plan.

*Timeframe for CMP Development and Implementation*

Provide a timeframe for the development and implementation of the CMP (as far as is possible) incorporating the IWC's procedural rules for the submission of documents.

*Resource Requirements for Development of a CMP*

In the event that resources will be sought from or through the IWC for the development of the CMP itself, the nomination will need to include both a budget and an outline of the proposed governance arrangements for managing any funds.

-----

## **CMP Nomination – Supporting Information**

*Recommendations*

Outline any recommendations that might require the attention of the IWC before finalisation of the CMP. This may include urgent actions that can be undertaken immediately during development of the CMP, such as appointment of a CMP Steering Group or Co-ordinator, urgent mitigation measures, or areas where support and resources may be required during the development of the CMP.

*Nomination Submission Information*

This nomination for a Conservation Management Plan for <insert name of nominated cetacean population, threat or critical habitat> has been submitted to the IWC Secretariat at least 60 days prior to <insert number of forthcoming IWC Annual Meeting> in accordance with the Commission's document submission procedures.

**Submit Nomination to:**

The International Whaling Commission Secretariat  
The Red House  
135 Station Road  
Impington  
Cambridge  
Cambridgeshire, CB24 9NP  
United Kingdom

*References*

Insert a list of references used to compile the information contained within the CMP Nomination.

## Appendix 6

### CMP TEMPLATE

A Conservation Management Plan for

<insert name of nominated cetacean population(s), threat or critical habitat>

This Conservation Management Plan was prepared by

<insert proposing member government(s) or Committee(s) as appropriate>

<Date>

*Notes on using this template:*

- *Text in blue is for guidance only and can be kept in the template for reference*

#### Table of Contents

List of Figures (as necessary)

List of Tables (as necessary)

#### Executive Summary

Provide a general overview of the plan. This section should include:

- Why a CMP is needed: Scene setting for a CMP – including a brief description of the target population, its habitat, and threats that impact the population.
- An overall goal of the CMP which would act as the mission statement for the plan.
- An overview of how the CMP is structured and what is detailed in each section.
- A *Summary Table of High Priority Actions* could also be included. High priority actions usually fall into the following categories:
  - co-ordination (COORD);
  - public awareness and capacity building (PACB);
  - research essential for providing adequate management advice or filling in knowledge gaps (RES);
  - monitoring (MON); and
  - mitigation measures (MIT).

#### 1. Introduction

This section should briefly address the following questions:

- Why is active management needed for the identified cetacean population, threat or critical habitat?
- Why is a CMP the most appropriate management tool to achieve the stated conservation objectives?

This section should include:

- The scope, context and policy setting of the CMP.
- A detailed map of the known distribution of the population/critical habitat
  - If a CMP is being designed for a particular threat the map should include an outline of the area where the threat is encountered by the target cetacean population.
  - If the CMP is being designed for a particular critical habitat, the map should include the extent of the critical habitat.
- This section should also reference any current or previous conservation management actions relating to the draft CMP including conservation plans, legislation as well as any relevant peer reviewed papers or related documentation.

## 1.2 Overall Objectives of the CMP

To maximise the success of a plan and it ensure that required changes are identified promptly; the measurable short, medium and long-term objectives should be identified. Thus, the monitoring of the target population, human activities affecting it, mitigation measures, and the effectiveness of those measures is essential.

Objectives of a CMP will not only relate to the conservation of the population but also to the interests of relevant stakeholders.

Insert the overall short, medium and long term objectives of the CMP.

## 2. Legal Framework

Insert a list of relevant international conventions, agreements and legislation and management arrangements that the plan may relate to. Supporting information can be contained on Appendices.

[Please note that the below are examples only]

*2.1 International Conventions and Agreements*

*2.2 National Legislation and Management Arrangements*

*2.2.1 Participating Range State A*

*National legislation with respect to the population of X whales*

*2.2.2 Participating Range State B*

*National legislation with respect to the population of X whales*

*2.2.3 Participating Range State C*

*National legislation with respect to the population of X whales*

*2.2.4 Participating Range State A*

*Area X Fisheries Management Plan*

*2.2.5 Participating Range State B*

*Marine Protected Area X Operational Management Plan*

## 3. Governance

### 3.1 Coordination of a CMP

As a CMP may cover a large geographical area and involve several jurisdictions, it is important to establish an appropriate management structure for the CMP that identifies key stakeholders, their roles and responsibilities and the interaction between them during the development, implementation and review stages of the plan.

Insert an outline of the governance framework under which the CMP would be conducted, from the development stage through to the implementation and review stages.

### 3.2 Timeline for a CMP

Identify the various stages of a CMP with tasks and indicative timings for each stage as well as outlining which parties may be involved with the tasks identified.

## 4. Science

### 4.1 Biology, Status and Environmental Parameters

Insert concise background information on the nominated population(s), including:

- population structure;
- abundance and population trends;
- distribution, migration and movements; and
- basic biology (feeding, reproduction and survivorship).

Identify any knowledge gaps that exist in current data.

## 4.2 Critical Habitats Associated with the X Whale

If habitats are identified that are deemed as critical for the recovery and/or protection of a target cetacean population, the extent of these habitats and the purposes that they are used for should be outlined here.

## 4.3 Attributes of the Population to be Monitored

The ultimate success or failure of any CMP depends on improvements in the conservation status of the target population(s) – this can only be achieved by monitoring. Depending on the objectives of the CMP and the nature of the threats a population faces, a variety of candidate ‘attributes’ of the population can be considered for monitoring over time, to determine the success of the overall plan and/or individual actions and to amend the CMP where necessary.

This section should include a description of the attributes of the population that will be monitored (e.g.: abundance (relative and/or absolute), reproductive rates, survivorship, health, prey status, range) and an evaluation of the feasibility of detecting trends with current methods given that changes occur (e.g. using power analyses).

## 5. Threats, Mitigation Measures and Monitoring

### 5.1 Identification of Threats

This section should provide a summary of the known or suspected threats (both direct and incidental) to the nominated cetacean population/critical habitat. This should be summarised in tabular form (such as that seen below) but should also include a discussion of each explaining the rationale behind the summary. Where appropriate, reference should be made to actions within the CMP. Note: the first five columns in the table will form part of the nomination process.

Table: Summary of actual and potential threats to the nominated population.

Actual/Potential Threat	Cause or related activity	Evidence	Possible Impact	Priority for Action	Relevant Actions	Party Responsible
<b>Directly lethal threats</b>						
<i>e.g. Entrapment in set nets</i>	<i>Set net fishing</i>	<i>Strong</i>	<i>Mortality +/- or serious injury</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>RES-01</i>	<i>Participating range states</i>
<i>e.g. Entanglements in Other Types of Fishing Gear</i>						
<b>Sub-lethal threats</b>						
<i>e.g. Noise, pollution, etc</i>						

### 5.2 Mitigation Measures and Monitoring

This section should include identified mitigation measures to address key threats and how the mitigation measures will be monitored. For example:

#### 5.1 *Entrapment in Set Nets*

*Undertake the following mitigation measures (MIT-01, 02, 03) and the following monitoring measures (MON-01, 02) to facilitate the conservation of species A in the area designated XYZ.*

*Undertake the following public awareness raising measures PACB-01, 02 to promote the conservation of species A in the area designated XYZ.*

#### 5.2 *Entanglements in Other Types of Fishing Gear*

## 6. Actions

These form the key component of any CMP. While there may be overlap, these can generally be incorporated under the following categories:

- co-ordination (COORD);
- public awareness and capacity building (PACB);
- research essential for providing adequate management advice or filling in knowledge gaps (RES);
- monitoring (MON); and
- mitigation measures (MIT).

It is important that actions be realistic and effective. They should be well specified (usually 1-2 pages for each action) and generally include the following information, where relevant:

- (1) Description (including concise objective, threats to which relevant and how, rationale, target data or activity, method, implementation timeline);
- (2) Actors (responsible for implementation and relevant stakeholders);
- (3) Evaluation (actors responsible);
- (4) Priority (importance to the plan and feasibility);
- (5) Costs (where appropriate).

### 6.1 Summary and Implementation of Actions

Insert a tabular summary of all actions here, referring to the 1-2 page detailed summaries (see above). In addition, include here an implementation strategy or designate responsibility for developing and implementing an implementation strategy along with a Management Framework.

Outline how the actions will meet the short, medium or long term objectives of the plan.

### 6.2 Stakeholder Engagement, Public Awareness and Education

Insert here a strategy and information on stakeholder engagement, public awareness and any education activities that will be undertaken during the CMP implementation stage (e.g. via websites, meetings etc.).

### 6.3 Reporting Process

A CMP should be considered a living document and once the implementation stage begins, a process of reporting and review is essential to determine how well the CMP is meeting its overall objectives and implementation timelines and milestones.

Insert process for reporting on CMP progress to the IWC (including a timeframe).

## 1. Bibliography

As a CMP should be based upon best scientific knowledge and guided by the principles and practices of adaptive management, it is important for a CMP to identify any published works relevant to effective implementation of the plan.

Insert bibliography here.

## 2. Appendices

Insert additional background and contextual information in appendices. For example, the original CMP nomination could be supplied here.



## Appendix 7

### CMP FUNDING: PRINCIPLES AND PROCESSES

The assumption is that the proponents of a CMP and any range states that are signatories to the nomination and subsequent plan will be the primary source of funding to support its development and implementation.

Consideration by the Commission on whether to support a CMP, and to what degree, is informed by the capacity of participating range states to pay; conservation priority; the cost effectiveness of agreed actions; and funding availability.

The following guiding principles have been developed for use by relevant Working Groups and Committees in developing their advice on funding request to the Commission.

#### Funding principles

1. Eligibility is limited to CMPs generated within the Commission - that is by its committees or member states.
2. Eligibility for support is informed by capacity to pay, with priority generally given to CMP processes where participating range states include a majority of Group 1 or 2 member states<sup>1</sup>.
3. Funding recommendations will be made on the basis of conservation priority and cost effectiveness.
4. For the nomination and plan development phase, funding to employ a coordinator may be sought for a maximum of two years.
5. For plan implementation, funding support is primarily for coordination and governance activities. It will be considered on a case by case basis, and requires demonstration by participating range states of formal governance arrangements and funding commitments for key actions.
6. Funding requests for research-related actions under CMPs will be referred to the Scientific Committee.

#### Funding Processes

##### *Accessing Voluntary CMP Contributions*

At IWC61 (2009) a voluntary contribution in the order of GBP 300,000 was made to support the undertaking of CMPs in the IWC (IWC/61/CC23). Additional voluntary contributions can reasonably be anticipated in the future.

The following process provides for the disbursement of these funds:

1. Submissions to access voluntary contributions to support any stage of the CMP process must be received by the Conservation Committee in sufficient time for them to be considered at or before the annual meeting of the IWC.
2. Submissions will be reviewed by the Standing Working Group on Conservation Management Plans (CMP Working Group), using agreed funding principles.
3. The CMP Working Group will make funding recommendations to the Conservation Committee in priority order, and may recommend supporting requests in full or in part.
4. The Conservation Committee will recommend in priority order to the Commission those funding requests it judges best meet the funding principles.

##### *Accessing the Research Fund*

The following process applies to parties seeking funds from the Scientific Committee's Research Fund:

The **Rules of Procedure** of the Scientific Committee state:

#### **“G. Financial Support for Research Proposals**

1. The Scientific Committee shall identify research needs.
2. It shall consider unsolicited research proposals seeking financial support from the Commission to address these needs. A sub-committee shall be established to review and rank research proposals received 4 months in advance of the Annual Meeting and shall make recommendations to the full Committee.
3. The Scientific Committee shall recommend in priority order those research proposals for Commission financial support as it judges best meet its objectives.”

A *pro forma* for applying for money under the Research Fund can be found on the IWC website at:

[http://iwcoffice.org/documents/sci\\_com/handbook/ResearchProposal.pdf](http://iwcoffice.org/documents/sci_com/handbook/ResearchProposal.pdf)

---

<sup>1</sup>Capacity to pay is determined by a country's Gross National Income (GNI) and Gross National Income Per Capita (GNIPC), as estimated by the World Bank. For the 2008/09 financial year, Group 1 member states had a GNI <US\$11,850,000,000 and GNIPC <US\$11,850. Group 2 member states had a GNI >US\$11,850,000,000 and GNIPC <US\$11,850. Capacity to pay group listings are provided by the IWC Finance and Administration Committee in their annual report.

## Appendix 8

### DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE STANDING WORKING GROUP ON CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT PLANS

The Standing Working Group on Conservation Management Plans (the CMP Working Group) is responsible for the provision of advice on the nomination, development and implementation of CMPs endorsed by the International Whaling Commission (IWC).

The CMP Working Group will be comprised primarily of members of the Conservation Committee, but will also include members from the Scientific Committee and members from other IWC bodies as appropriate. The Chair will be elected from Group members and may hold the position for a period of up to four years.

The CMP Working Group will report annually to the IWC through the Conservation Committee.

Conservation Management Plans are intended to be a practical and flexible management tool for the IWC to manage human and cetacean interactions for those populations, threats or habitats of greatest conservation concern and where there is a reasonable expectation that the plan will deliver real conservation gains. The CMP Working Group will support development of comprehensive plans tailored to address the species, habitat or threats of the most pressing need and with the greatest likelihood of success.

Duties of the CMP Working Group may include, but are not limited to:

- Recommending priority cetacean populations, threats or habitats suitable for the preparation of a CMP.
- Providing up-to-date guidelines and templates to support the nomination, development, implementation and monitoring of CMPs.
- Establishing appropriate criteria to assess the merits of proposed CMPs.
- Providing appropriate guidance to proponents of CMPs to support best practice nomination, development and implementation.
- Facilitating provision of data and expert advice from relevant IWC Committees and sub-committees, as appropriate.
- Reporting to the Conservation Committee on the status of existing CMPs.
- Advising the Commission, through the Conservation Committee, on funds or other resources requested to support the nomination, development, or implementation of a CMP.
- Undertaking other activities as directed by the Commission or Conservation Committee.