

Annex F

Report of the Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Sub-Committee

Friday 12 September 2014, Portorož, Slovenia

SUMMARY OF MAIN OUTCOMES

Item and Agenda Item	Main outcomes
Item 3 Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Management Procedure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Sub-Committee welcomed the progress made by the Scientific Committee on developing <i>SLAs</i> for Greenland hunts, especially the completed <i>Humpback SLA</i>. The Scientific Committee received a full report on conversion factors from Greenland and agreed that future reports should go to the Commission and be incorporated in need statements if necessary. The Scientific Committee reported that it had completed its <i>Implementation Review</i> for eastern gray whales. The Sub-Committee endorsed the SC Report and its recommendations.
Item 4 Aboriginal Whaling Scheme (AWS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Sub-Committee noted the Scientific Committee Report on this topic.
Item 5 Report of the <i>ad hoc</i> Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Working Group (ASWWG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Sub-Committee received the Chair's summary of the Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Working Group (ASWWG) meeting with hunters and discussed ways forward including a proposed expert workshop but was unable to reach conclusions given the inevitably short time the summary report was available. There is broad support for continuation of the ASWWG.
Item 6 Aboriginal subsistence whaling catch limits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Sub-Committee received management advice for all stocks subject to ASW hunts from the Scientific Committee and endorsed its report and recommendations. There was a full discussion of the proposed Schedule amendment for the Greenland hunts, the updated Greenlandic need statement and the related proposed Resolution by the EU. It was not possible to reach consensus and the Chair urged countries to work together towards developing a solution in time for discussions in Plenary.

The meeting took place in Portorož, Slovenia on Friday 12 September 2014. The list of participants is given as Appendix 1.

1. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

1.1 Appointment of Chair

Bruno Mainini (Switzerland) was appointed Chair.

1.2 Appointment of rapporteurs

Greg Donovan and Pablo Sinovas (Secretariat) were appointed rapporteurs.

1.3 Review of documents

The available documents are listed in Appendix 2.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

The adopted Agenda is given as Appendix 3.

3. ABORIGINAL WHALING MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE

3.1 Progress with the development of *Strike Limit Algorithms* for the Greenland hunts

3.1.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

Donovan, the Chair of the Scientific Committee's Standing Working Group on the AWMP (hereafter the Chair of the SWG) reported on the two years of work undertaken by the Committee on this topic (IWC/65/Rep1(2013)¹: 20ff and IWC/65/Rep1(2014)²: 18ff).

In 2008, the Committee developed and the Commission endorsed, a safe 'interim' approach to providing advice on Greenland hunts that is valid for up to two quota blocks. It is thus working to finalise long-term *Strike Limit Algorithms (SLAs)* for all of the Greenlandic hunts in time for the Commission's 2018 Biennial Meeting. Four *SLAs* are being developed, for humpback whales, bowhead whales, common minke whales and fin whales. The last two have some issues (e.g. stock structure, abundance) in common with RMP work and joint workshops have greatly furthered progress on those. A work plan to complete the *SLA* work by 2017 and 2018 at the latest has been developed. Details of the first two years of the plan are given in Table 10 of IWC/65/Rep1(2014).

Simultaneously with the work on common minke and fin whales, the Committee has been working to finalise *SLAs* for the humpback and bowhead whale hunts.

With respect to humpback whales, thanks to progress at an intersessional Workshop, the Committee was in a position in 2014 to review the results for four candidate *SLAs* for the set of *Evaluation* and *Robustness Trials*. The *Evaluation Trials* covered the broad range of plausible scenarios covering different need scenarios, productivity, survey frequency, survey bias, episodic events, stochastic events and environmental stochasticity. The trials also allowed for entanglements and vessel strikes throughout the migratory range of the West Greenland feeding aggregation, based on information on movements from photo-identification data and available information on the two sources of mortality. The full set of tabular and graphical results are available from the Secretariat.

After fully reviewing the performance on conservation (highest priority) and need satisfaction, the Committee

¹Published as: *J. Cetacean Res. Manage. (Suppl.)* 15. [2014].

²Published as: *J. Cetacean Res. Manage. (Suppl.)* 16. [2015].

agreed by consensus a *Humpback SLA* (originally known as *SLA3*) that meets the Commission's conservation and user objectives and recommended it to the Commission, subject to final validation of the code and archive running of the full set of statistics.

The Committee commended the work of its SWG, the developers and those who finalised the operating model and conditioning. It stressed that this successful conclusion could not have been achieved without assistance from the Commission's Developers' Fund, intersessional Workshops and an active intersessional Steering Group. It agreed that this process should be followed for the remaining *SLAs*.

The Committee also reviewed the results for four candidate *SLAs* for the Greenlandic hunt of bowhead whales. This case is more complex than for the humpback whale case for a number of reasons, primarily related to:

- (1) the *SLA* can only 'control' the Greenland hunt whereas there is a hunt by a non-member nation as well as from bycatches;
- (2) it cannot be assumed that Canadian abundance surveys will occur in the future; and
- (3) remaining stock structure uncertainty means that scenarios that may be overly conservative must be considered including stock structure questions and hunting from a non-member nation.

Necessary improvements were identified and it is expected to be able to produce a recommended *SLA* at the 2015 Annual Meeting.

The results from the trials for humpback and bowhead whales also confirmed the value of the interim approach.

The Committee is aware that Greenland expresses its need in terms of tonnes of edible products rather than numbers of individual whales by species and that it has indicated that flexibility is important given the variability in the environment. The Committee reiterated that work on a multispecies flexible approach could occur after the individual *SLAs* are completed.

3.1.1.1 CONVERSION FACTORS

At the 2014 Annual Meeting, the Committee welcomed the full report submitted by Greenland on conversion factors (i.e. average edible products obtained per strike by species) in response to initial recommendations by a Commission special expert group (Donovan *et al.* 2010³) and follow-up recommendations by the Scientific Committee. It noted that the provisional conversion factors (for fin, humpback and bowhead whales – the factor recommended for common minke whales was based on sufficient data) developed by the expert group appear to overestimate the amount of edible products actually obtained (although sample sizes are small), but were generally within the confidence intervals. It also noted the low numbers of lost whales in the Greenlandic hunts.

After receiving this full report, the Committee agreed that annual update reports are unnecessary for the work of the Scientific Committee. It suggested that collected data are submitted directly to the Commission when it meets and incorporated as necessary into need statements.

3.1.2 Discussion and recommendations

The Chair thanked the Committee for its excellent work in developing the *Humpback SLA*, recognising the importance of scientific advice to the work of the Commission on aboriginal subsistence whaling.

³Donovan, G., Palka, D., George, C., Levermann, N., Hammond, P. and Witting, L. 2010. Report of the small working group on conversion factors (from whales to edible products) for the Greenlandic large whale hunt. Paper IWC/62/9 presented to the IWC Commission meeting, 21-25 June 2010, Agadir, Morocco (unpublished). 54pp. [Paper available from the Office of this Journal].

Denmark also thanked the Scientific Committee, stating that it respected the integrity of its advice. It will continue to provide all necessary data and information.

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

3.2 Implementation Review for gray whales

3.2.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

The Chair of the SWG reported that the Scientific Committee agreed in 2010 that the Pacific Coast Feeding Group ('PCFG') of gray whales should be treated as a separate management unit. Through a series of workshops and work at Annual Meetings, the Committee reviewed a number of management regime options suggested by the Makah Tribe to ensure that the Commission's conservation and user objectives were met for the PCFG. Two acceptable 'variants' were identified in 2012 and reported to the Commission at that time. However, the Committee had noted that some final trials were required and these were undertaken after the 2012 meeting.

After reviewing the trial results the Committee, agreed by consensus, that the management plan met the Commission's conservation objectives provided that if struck and lost animals are not assumed to be PCFG whales, then a photo-identification programme to monitor the relative probability of harvesting PCFG whales in the Makah hunting grounds each year must be undertaken, with the results presented to the Scientific Committee for evaluation. The proposed management plan has been fully evaluated within the *SLA* framework.

The Committee agreed that the next *Implementation Review* should not occur until the completion of the rangewide assessment of gray whales that began with a workshop in 2013.

3.2.2 Discussion and recommendations

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

4. ABORIGINAL WHALING SCHEME (AWS)

4.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

The Chair of the SWG reported that in 2002, the Committee **strongly recommended** that the Commission adopt the Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Scheme (see IWC, 2003⁴). This scheme covers a number of practical issues such as survey intervals, carryover and guidelines for surveys. The Committee has stated in the past that the AWS provisions constitute an important and necessary component of safe management under AWMP *SLAs*. It **reaffirmed** this view as it has for the previous 12 years.

4.2 Discussion and recommendations

In discussion, the USA noted that as in past years, it cannot support adoption of an AWS at this time. It believes that the current Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Management regime set forth in Schedule paragraph 13(a) has worked well for guiding the IWC in its management of subsistence hunts for over 30 years. It believes that any AWS tool must be a true improvement over the IWC's current procedure and fit within the Scheme set forth in Schedule Paragraph 13(a). This paragraph provides the context and guidance required by the Commission for reviewing the Scientific Committee's advice under any Revised Aboriginal Whaling Management Procedure.

⁴*Ann. Rep. Whal. Comm. 2002: 74-75 [2003].*

The Sub-Committee noted the Scientific Committee's report on this issue.

5. REPORT OF THE *AD HOC* WORKING GROUP ON ABORIGINAL SUBSISTENCE WHALING

5.1 Chair's summary of the pre-meeting

The Chair of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling (ASWWG), Dr. Michael Tillman, provided a summary of the meeting between the ASWWG and native hunters that took place on 10 September 2014. Details of the meeting can be found in Part 1 of the ASWWG Chair's Report of this meeting (see Appendix 4, originally IWC/65/ASWRep01).

He also summarised discussions during the closed session of the ASWWG. Details of this meeting and the action items for 2014-16 can be found in Part 2 of the ASWWG Chair's Report (see Appendix 4, originally IWC/65/ASWRep01). During this meeting the ASWWG discussed ongoing issues before the group, and identified two action items for completion during the 2014-16 intersessional period. These actions items included:

- (a) the USA and Denmark, with assistance from the IWC's Head of Science to develop a proposal for a workshop to address the long term issues before the ASWWG that are of greatest concern and to further define or develop explanatory statements that provide the required context to understand these issues in order to facilitate meaningful discussion and develop potential solutions; and
- (b) Japan, with assistance from the USA and the IWC Head of Science to prepare a report on the issue of local consumption versus commercialism, taking into consideration input provided by the native whalers and the ASW countries.

As an outcome of (a), a proposal for an expert workshop to assist the ASW Sub-Committee and the Commission with respect to improved procedures for considering ASW catch limits, with a focus on consideration of need, can be found at Appendix 4, Adjunct 2.

The Chair of the ASWWG indicated that a full ASWWG report will be completed during the 2014-16 intersessional period, at which time all members of the ASWWG will be invited to review and suggested revisions to the report before it becomes final. At that time, it will be forwarded to the IWC Secretariat for posting on the IWC website.

5.2 Discussion and recommendations

The Chair thanked the ASWWG for its work, noting that he found the meeting with hunters valuable. In particular he thanked the Chair of the ASWWG for getting his summary document together in such a short period of time.

During the discussion, some countries identified areas for improvement and clarification in Appendix 4. The Chair of the ASWWG agreed to incorporate clarifications and prepare a revised version for consideration in Plenary.

Several countries thanked the Chair of the ASWWG but noted that they needed more time to fully consider the report and work plan before reaching conclusions, noting that they may comment in Plenary discussions of this item.

In addition, Mexico noted that they believed that the comments of range states should be required when discussing subsistence hunts, including matters related to whalewatching on the same populations. Chile supported Mexico noting that any discussions of aboriginal subsistence whaling should take into account the Commission's resolution on non-lethal uses of cetaceans. Argentina, Mexico and Chile stated that

they believed that it was premature to substitute the word 'indigenous' for 'aboriginal'.

Russia noted the importance of receiving the views of hunters in the ASW process. It noted the importance of flexibility on the question of standardising reporting given the variability in the cultural and other aspects of the different hunts. It also commented that with respect to the 'stinky' whale issue, a further option to that considered in Appendix 4 was for such inedible whales to be treated as 'struck-but-lost'.

In conclusion, the Chair commented that there was broad support for the continuation of the ASWWG, thanked its Chair for offering to update the draft prior to Plenary and noted that discussions would continue in Plenary after countries had more time for reflection.

6. ABORIGINAL SUBSISTENCE WHALING CATCH LIMITS

Before discussing this Item, the Chair noted that he intended to address papers related to the proposed Schedule amendment for the Greenland hunt, the new Greenlandic need statement and the proposed resolution by the EU after receiving the report of the Scientific Committee on all subsistence hunts. That discussion can be found under Item 6.8.

6.1 Bering-Chukchi-Beaufort (B-C-B) Seas bowhead whales

6.1.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

The Chair of the SWG reported that the Committee had agreed a new abundance estimate of 16,892 (95%CI 15,705-18,928) for 2011 (and an average annual increase of 3.7% (95% CI: 2.8-4.7%). It reaffirmed that the *Bowhead SLA* is the appropriate management tool for the B-C-B bowhead whales and repeated its advice that the strike limits adopted by the Commission for the six-year block 2013-18 (i.e. 336 with a maximum of 67 in any one year) will not harm the stock.

6.1.2 Discussion and recommendations

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

6.2 North Pacific gray whales

6.2.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

The Chair of the SWG reported that the Committee reiterated that the *Gray Whale SLA* is the appropriate management tool for the eastern North Pacific gray whales and repeated its advice that the strike limits adopted by the Commission for the six-year block 2013-18 (i.e. 744 with a maximum of 140 in any one year) will not harm the stock. It also agreed that the Makah management plan (including maintenance of an ongoing research programme) recommended at SC/65a was the appropriate tool for the management of that hunt if it takes place.

6.2.2 Discussion and recommendations

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

6.3 Common minke whales off Greenland

6.3.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

6.3.1.1 WEST GREENLAND

The Chair of the SWG reported that in 2009, the Committee was able to provide management advice for this stock for the first time. This year, using the Commission's agreed interim approach (IWC, 2009⁵) and last year's revised estimate

⁵Ann. Rep. Int. Whal. Comm. 2008: 16 [2009].

of abundance (16,100 CV=0.43), the Committee advised that an annual strike limit of 164 will not harm the stock. The Committee welcomed information from Greenlandic samples that contributed to its work on stock structure of North Atlantic common minke whales and encouraged continued sample collection (and see Item 9.5 below).

6.3.1.2 EAST GREENLAND

The Chair of the SWG reported that the catches of minke whales off East Greenland are believed to come from the large central stock of common minke whales. The most recent strike limit of 12 represents a very small proportion of the central stock which numbers around 40,000. The Committee repeated its advice of last year that an annual strike limit of 12 will not harm the stock.

6.3.2 Discussion and recommendations

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

6.4 Fin whales off West Greenland

6.4.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

The Chair of the SWG reported that based on the agreed 2007 estimate of abundance for fin whales (4,500, 95%CI: 1,900-10,100) and using the agreed interim approach, the Committee repeated its advice that an annual strike limit of 19 whales will not harm the stock. The Committee welcomed information from Greenlandic samples that contributed to its work on stock structure of North Atlantic fin whales and encouraged continued sample collection.

6.4.2 Discussion and recommendations

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

6.5 Bowhead whales off West Greenland

6.5.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

The Chair of the SWG reported that based upon the agreed abundance estimate for 2012 (1,274, CV=0.12) and the agreed interim approach, the Committee repeated its advice that an annual strike limit of two whales will not harm the stock.

6.5.2 Discussion and recommendations

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

6.6 Humpback whales off West Greenland

6.6.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

The Chair of the SWG reported that based on last year's revised and agreed estimate of abundance for humpback whales (2,704 CV=0.34) and the agreed interim approach, the Committee agreed that an annual strike limit of 10 whales will not harm the stock.

Furthermore, the Committee recommended that the new *Humpback SLA* (agreed above under Item 3.1.2) should be used to provide management advice by the Committee in the future, following completion of the usual final validation/checking process. The Committee noted that the *Humpback SLA*, if used now, would provide the same management advice as the interim approach for within this period, i.e. that an annual strike limit of 10 whales will not harm the stock.

6.6.2 Discussion and recommendations

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

6.7 Humpback whales off St Vincent and The Grenadines

6.7.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

The Chair of the SWG reported that the Committee has agreed that the animals found off St Vincent and The Grenadines are part of the large West Indies breeding population (abundance estimate 11,570 95%CI: 10,290-13,390). The Commission adopted a total block catch limit of 24 for the period 2013-18. The Committee repeated its advice that this block catch limit will not harm the stock.

6.7.2 Discussion and recommendations

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

6.8 Consideration of matters related to the proposal for catch limits for the Greenland hunt

6.8.1 Presentation of documents

6.8.1.1 DENMARK/GREENLAND

Denmark introduced two papers, its proposed Schedule amendment (IWC/65/06) and its new need statement (IWC/65/17). With respect to strike limits the proposal for West Greenland was for 164 common minke whales, two bowhead whales, 19 fin whales and 10 humpback whales for each of the next four years. In addition for East Greenland the proposal was for 12 common minke whales. The proposed strike limits are, as in previous requests, consistent with the advice of the Scientific Committee. Denmark also welcomed the significant achievements by the Scientific Committee on developing *SLAs* for the Greenland hunts and its acknowledgement of progress on conversion factors.

Denmark noted that the proposal was supported by a comprehensive need statement with new and additional information which explains the needs related to the multispecies opportunistic hunt and satisfies all IWC requirements.

The representative from Greenland summarised the need statement on behalf of the people of Kalaallit Nunaat – Greenland with 17 towns and 73 settlements along the coast with a population of about 56,000 in 2014. She noted that there are four important elements in work of the Sub-Committee:

- (1) to receive information from the Scientific Committee;
- (2) to consider nutritional, subsistence and cultural needs;
- (3) to consider the use of whales taken; and
- (4) to provide advice to the Commission.

Greenland sincerely wished for a consensus solution that maintained its trust in the IWC as an international management organisation.

The discussion of the Greenlandic need statement dates back to the late 1970s and considerable documentation has been presented and discussed over the years. Major improvements in data, information, research and management measures have been accomplished since that time. These are considered in the need statement and the need in tonnes for West Greenland endorsed by the IWC in 1990 and 1991 arose from consideration of average yearly catches for the 20-year period prior to the moratorium and conversion factors for edible products. The situation in East Greenland is for a single species hunt so is expressed in numbers and there are no plans to change the request.

Using the new conversion factors from the IWC expert group report gives a potential of 654 tonnes. Using the population for West Greenland in 2014 this corresponds to one monthly dinner for a family of five but in reality based on actual numbers landed from 2008-12 it amounts to 594 tonnes or one monthly dinner for a family of four. The proposed quotas for 2015-18 suggest edible products

between 145 and 205 tonnes less than the documented actual need for West Greenland of 799 tons. Allowing Greenland to obtain sufficient whale products to fulfil the documented need will also protect the global climate and the environment by rationally using local resources.

The hunt will be sustainable and well-regulated. Furthermore, Greenland will continue to work actively on improving the welfare aspects and continue to submit data and be committed to other IWC relevant activities. It hopes that the IWC will be able to take management decisions based on the best available scientific knowledge and with respect for the cultural, nutritional and socio-economical needs of Kalaallit and in this respect also fulfils the obligations of the IWC Convention.

Denmark concluded that in the longer term, it wished to see a more stable, less politicised and truly six-year quota block management of ASW based on objective, scientifically based information that allows for the hunters and authorities in ASW countries to plan and use resources in a meaningful and effective way. It wished to thank all those who have engaged constructively in the intense dialogue and consultations over the past year in overcoming the very difficult situation faced by them and the IWC, including the engagement of the Bureau, the Chair, and a large number of IWC members, and with the assistance of the Secretariat.

It noted that its proposal is part of a package solution agreed with the EU that addresses both short-term and long-term issues. As such Denmark believed that it is a sensitive and carefully balanced compromise, developed to address a number of broad concerns among IWC members. Denmark encouraged all Contracting Governments to support the Schedule proposal as part of the package by consensus. Its sincere hope was that a solution could be found at this meeting to allow the IWC to continue managing subsistence whaling of Greenland and for Denmark to remain an active partner in the conservation and management of the world's large whales, including participation in the ASW Sub-Committee.

6.8.1.2 EUROPEAN UNION

Italy introduce the proposed resolution (IWC/65/15) on behalf of those EU Member States that are members of the IWC. It noted that the EU and its Member States support aboriginal subsistence whaling to satisfy aboriginal subsistence needs. The proposed Resolution is part of a broader package on aboriginal subsistence whaling and was drafted in the light of progress made on a number of matters since IWC/64, including the updated Greenlandic need statement and Schedule proposal as well as advice from the Scientific Committee.

The proposed Resolution aims to strengthen the IWC management of ASW through a more consistent and long-term approach. It further aims to stimulate the proactive participation of all Contracting Governments in the work of the ASW Sub-Committee and its related Working Groups. It also contains a number of requests to the Scientific Committee and to the ASW Sub-Committee to set a substantive mid-term work plan (2014-18), recognising that the former is in line with the work plan already proposed by the Committee itself. The latter is also in accord with the proposal for an expert workshop developed in ASW65/ASWRep01 Addendum as referred to under Item 5.1 above.

Italy emphasised that great care went into developing the content and wording of the Resolution with the aim of addressing all relevant issues and problems in a balanced way. The sponsors very much hope that this Resolution is received positively and it is willing to work with all IWC members to try to reach consensus.

6.8.2 Discussion and recommendations

There was considerable discussion and a short summary is provided here. A number of countries expressed concern over some issues that meant that they were unable to support the proposed Schedule amendment and Resolution as they stood.

Argentina noted that while it supported ASW in general it had a number of concerns, shared by other members of the 'Buenos Aires Group' primarily related to: (a) the fact that the catches taken since 2012 had not been recognised as infractions by Denmark, as it had already raised in the Infractions Sub-Committee; and (b) the strong commercial component of the Greenland hunts compared to other ASW hunts. In addition, it believed that the present ASWWG should be allowed to continue its work at its present pace and it referred to its comments in that group regarding: (a) whalewatching (i.e. that whalewatching companies and all the range state countries of a population hunted under ASW should participate in discussions and provide their view on the potential impacts on the availability of whales for other communities and other uses e.g. whalewatching); and (b) that need requests must be in terms of numbers of whales not tonnes of edible products. It was thus not able to support consensus.

This view was supported by Panama and Mexico, the former referring to whalewatching in the Dominican Republic and the latter to the fact that the need statement referred to the full population of Greenland not only aboriginals. Peru and Chile also concurred with the views of the three countries above. Chile raised additional concerns at the calculations in the need statement, particularly related to the amount of edible products consumed (which it believed conflicted with a study from the University of Southern Denmark) and the use of projected human population numbers rather than true consumption today, thereby overestimating need. It also reiterated concerns over sales to tourists and commercialisation and believed catches of small cetaceans must also be considered as part of the need statement. Uruguay concurred with the above concerns, noting in addition that it believed that the Scientific Committee was spending too much time on the *SLA* process and other matters related to direct exploitation which meant that it was not dedicating sufficient effort to conservation issues on non-lethal problems.

Monaco, whilst expressing sympathy for the above views but also for the situation of Denmark/Greenland, believed that more effort was required to reach consensus. It noted that the consideration of multi-species harvesting in the need statement should take all species into account including fish and seals as well as all cetaceans. It commented that the waters of West Greenland were rich and that careful consideration should be made before migratory species are taken, noting that humpback whales migrate between Greenland and the Caribbean. Australia agreed with Monaco and requested information from Denmark on the consultation process with range states.

A number of other countries expressed support for the proposed Schedule amendment and Resolution.

The USA commended Denmark for their extensive outreach and consultations over the last two years. The proposal was in agreement with Scientific Committee advice and request was sufficiently documented in the updated needs statement; it hoped the proposed Schedule amendment would be adopted by consensus. The USA also echoed the comments by Denmark regarding the existing long-term issue of the politicisation of ASW catch limits. These extended discussions unnecessarily took time away from discussion of conservation and other important issues. It also supported adoption of the Resolution which addresses

issues raised with respect to the Greenland hunt and on long-standing ASW issues and concerns. It considered the proposed resolution to be consistent with the ASWWG's recommendations and the work of the ASW Sub-Committee.

The Russian Federation also welcomed the new documents and strongly supported solving ASW issues by consensus. With respect to the Resolution it noted discussions in the ASWWG about the need for flexibility when considering levels of 'standardisation' with need statements, given the variety of cultural and practical aspects of the various ASW hunts. It believed that the Resolution is applicable only to Greenland and will thus support the consensus.

Sweden referred to its support for ASW and for Greenlandic hunts and agreed with the USA view that the proposal was sustainable and met IWC requirements in its updated need statement. It recognised the need to be careful with respect to 'standardisation' and definitions of need. Finland concurred with Sweden.

Norway stated that in its view there are only two types of whaling: sustainable or unsustainable. As the proposal was clearly sustainable it was not concerned about the need statement and it would thus support it.

Japan commented on the excellent progress made by Denmark, Greenland and the EU. It agreed with Norway and Sweden and supported the proposal. It believed sustainability is the key concept and warned against arrogant attitudes that wish to dictate what people in other countries or communities should eat.

In its closing comments, Denmark thanked all of the countries for their views on this issue that it recognised was complex. It stressed that it had provided the need statement for information not approval. The issue of need is complex

and there are many aspects involved; consideration of the full complexity is a matter for the government concerned. It is clear that this is not commercial whaling but hunting carried out by aboriginal subsistence communities and in line with previous definitions agreed by the IWC. It has tried extremely hard to address all concerns that have been expressed at previous meetings and during its extensive consultation process, which had included as many Commission members as possible including a telephone conference with the Buenos Aires group and had received no concrete suggestions that it had not tried to accommodate. It truly hoped that the Commission could move forward positively on this issue by consensus.

In its closing remarks, Italy on behalf of the EU thanked all those who had supported the proposed Schedule amendment/Resolution package. It reiterated that great care and time had gone into drafting the Resolution after serious consideration of the revised need statement. It urged those countries opposing consensus to consult and reconsider and try to move forward. The UK and France supported this view.

In conclusion, the Chair noted that there was no consensus on the proposed Schedule amendment/Resolution at present. He reiterated the importance of the issue to the IWC and urged countries to work together towards developing a solution in time for discussions in Plenary.

7. OTHER MATTERS

No other business was raised.

8. ADOPTION OF REPORT

The report was adopted by correspondence on 14 September 2014.

Appendix 1

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

ARGENTINA

Miguel Iñíguez
Juan Pablo Paniego

AUSTRALIA

Donna Petrachenko
Yvette Blackman
Matthew Collis
William de la Mare
Pam Eiser

AUSTRIA

Andrea Nouak
Michael Stachowitsch

BELGIUM

Fabian Ritter

CHILE

Barbara Galletti Vernazzani

DENMARK

Gitte Hundahl
Amalie Jessen

Leif Fontaine

Nette Levermann
Øle Samsing

FINLAND

Penina Blankett

FRANCE

Marie-Anne Mortelette
Martine Bigan
Vincent Ridoux

GERMANY

Walter Duebner
Karl-Hermann Kock
Andrea Koplin

GHANA

Mike Akyeampong

ITALY

Caterina Fortuna
Maria Francesca Granata

JAPAN

Joji Morishita
Dan Goodman
Glenn Inwood
Hideki Moronuki
Takaaki Sakamoto
Yoshihiro Takagi

KOREA, REPUBLIC OF

Duhae An
Yong Rock An

MEXICO

Joel Hernandez-Garcia
Jorge Maksabedian de la Roquette
Yolanda Alaniz

MONACO

Frederic Briand

NEW ZEALAND

Jillian Dempster
David Lundquist

Erin Morriss
Anita Perkins
Alexandra Smithyman

NORWAY

Øle-David Stenseth
Egil Øen
Guri Breigutu
Kathrine Ryeng
Truls Soløy
Einar Tallaksen
Lars Walløe
Hild Ynnesdal

PANAMA

Gabriel Despaigne

PERU

Julissa Macchiavello

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Valentin Ilyashenko
Nikolay Etytegin
Igor Mikhno
Maria Vorontsova
Olga Yetylina
Kirill Zharikov

SLOVENIA

Andrej Bibič
Tilen Genov

SOUTH AFRICA

Herman Oosthuizen
Ed Couzens

SPAIN

Carmen Asencio

SAINT LUCIA

Jeannine Compton-Antoine

SWEDEN

Jacob Hagberg

SWITZERLAND

Bruno Mainini
Martin Krebs

TANZANIA

Zahor El Kharousy
Hosea Gonza Mbilinyi

UK

Nigel Gooding
Claire Bass
Nicola Clarke
Jennifer Lonsdale
Donna Mackay
Jamie Rendell
Beatriz Roel
Mark Simmonds

USA

Ryan Wulff
Greig Arnold
Doug DeMaster
Harry Brower
Robert Brownell
Roger Eckert
Melissa Garcia
Michael Gosliner
Ira New Breast
Lisa Phelps
Allison Reed
DJ Schubert
Scott Smullen
Michael Tillman

URUGUAY

Rodrigo Garcia

CHAIR OF THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

Toshihide Kitakado

SECRETARIAT

Simon Brockington
Greg Donovan
Kate Wilson
Andrea Cooke
Pablo Sinovas

Appendix 2
LIST OF DOCUMENTS

IWC/65/ASW		Agenda Item
01	Draft Agenda	
02	List of Documents	
Rep01	Chair's Report from <i>Ad Hoc</i> Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Working Group Meeting with Native Hunters	5.1
Relevant Commission documents		
IWC/65		
15	Draft Resolution on Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling (ASW) (submitted by Italy, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom)	6
16	Proposed Schedule Amendment for Greenland Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling (submitted by Denmark)	6
17	Utilization of large whales in Greenland – a need statement (submitted by Denmark)	6
Rep01(2013)	Report of the Scientific Committee (2013)	
Rep01(2014)	Report of the Scientific Committee (2014)	

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. Aboriginal Whaling Management Procedure
 - 3.1. Progress with the development of *Strike Limit Algorithms* for the Greenland hunts
 - 3.1.1. Report of the Scientific Committee
 - 3.1.2. Discussion and recommendations
 - 3.2. *Implementation Review* for gray whales
 - 3.2.1. Report of the Scientific Committee
 - 3.2.2. Discussion and recommendations
4. Aboriginal Whaling Scheme (AWS)
 - 4.1. Report of the Scientific Committee
 - 4.2. Discussion and recommendations
5. Report of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling
 - 5.1. Chair's summary of the pre-meeting
 - 5.2. Discussion and recommendations
6. Aboriginal subsistence whaling catch limits
 - 6.1. Bering-Chukchi-Beaufort (B-C-B) Seas bowhead whales
 - 6.1.1. Report of the Scientific Committee
 - 6.1.2. Discussion and recommendations
 - 6.2. North Pacific gray whales
 - 6.2.1. Report of the Scientific Committee
 - 6.2.2. Discussion and recommendations
 - 6.3. Common minke whales off Greenland
 - 6.3.1. Report of the Scientific Committee
 - 6.3.2. Discussion and recommendations
 - 6.4. Fin whales off West Greenland
 - 6.4.1. Report of the Scientific Committee
 - 6.4.2. Discussion and recommendations
 - 6.5. Bowhead whales off West Greenland
 - 6.5.1. Report of the Scientific Committee
 - 6.5.2. Discussion and recommendations
 - 6.6. Humpback whales off West Greenland
 - 6.6.1. Report of the Scientific Committee
 - 6.6.2. Discussion and recommendations
 - 6.7. Humpback whales off St Vincent and The Grenadines
 - 6.7.1. Report of the Scientific Committee
 - 6.7.2. Discussion and recommendations
 - 6.8. Consideration of matters related to the proposal for catch limits for the Greenland hunt
 - 6.8.1. Presentation of documents
 - 6.8.2. Discussion and recommendations
7. Other matters
8. Adoption of Report

Appendix 4

CHAIR'S REPORT FROM *AD HOC* ABORIGINAL SUBSISTENCE WHALING WORKING GROUP MEETING WITH NATIVE HUNTERS

Wednesday 10 September 2014, Portorož, Slovenia

BACKGROUND

In April 2013, the Association of Traditional Marine Mammal Hunters of Chukotka, the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission, and the Makah Tribe submitted a letter to the Chair of the Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Working Group (ASWWG) indicating their interest in providing input on the issues under consideration by the ASWWG. These native groups viewed these issues to be of paramount importance because of their impact on the subsistence uses of whales.

They requested that the ASWWG convene a meeting with native hunters to hear their perspectives on aboriginal subsistence whaling and the issues the ASWWG was discussing, so that this input may inform ASWWG deliberations. The ASWWG subsequently agreed to do so.

The ASWWG agreed to organise the meeting into a series of open sessions (see the agenda in Appendix 1) to hear the native hunters' views, clarify and share information, air views and enable a dialogue between disparate parties. The ASWWG also agreed to have a closed session to consider some old business that it had not been able to bring to closure by intersessional correspondence.

REPORT

The ASWWG agreed that, for the purposes of reporting to the ASW Sub-Committee meeting scheduled two days after the ASWWG meeting, the Chair, assisted by the rapporteurs, should provide a short Chair's Report. This would not be a verbatim report nor would it attempt to summarise the extensive presentations made by representatives of the native hunting groups during the ASWWG's open sessions. In the Chair's view, attempting to make such a summary would be a disservice to the native hunters' extensive and comprehensive input since time would not be available for full review and comment. The Chair's Report would instead provide his initial impressions gained from the meeting and emphasise some salient points. Accordingly, the Chair's Report does not necessarily reflect the views and impressions of all participants. The ASWWG also agreed that the Chair should work with the rapporteurs to prepare a full report of the meeting that would be circulated for review and comment in accord with the ASWWG's usual intersessional process. When this had been completed to everyone's satisfaction, the final report would be submitted to the IWC Secretariat for distribution to all Contracting Governments and posted on the IWC's website.

SUMMARY

1. Open sessions

Members of the ASWWG, other Contracting Governments, and Observers met with representatives of native hunting organisations including the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission, the Makah Tribe, KNAPK (Organization of Fishermen and Hunters in Greenland), and the Association of Traditional Marine Mammal Hunters of Chukotka to engage in a dialogue about ASW issues. Hunters from St Vincent and The Grenadines were invited but were unable to participate. The agenda for the meeting is given in Appendix 1. In particular, the native hunters were asked to provide input on the following seven long-term issues that the Commission had asked the ASWWG to address:

- standardised needs statements;
- removing ASW catch limits from political discussions;
- changing the term 'aboriginal' in ASW;
- obtaining adequate information for ASW catch limits;
- ensuring local consumption versus commercialism;
- improving operational efficiencies; and
- improving welfare of the hunt.

The presenters were each allowed a 30-minute period to express their views on the issues and to answer questions for clarification. ASWWG members and observers were then given opportunities to ask additional questions, make comments, and engage in a dialogue with the native hunters after completion of the presentations. This generated a number of substantive questions, comments, and statements related to ASW that triggered additional dialogue and identified possible action items. As noted above, the full report will elaborate the presentations and subsequent exchanges more fully. The Chair, however, noted some commonalities from the presentations by native hunter representatives as follows.

- Native people have the right to hunt and sustainably utilise whales and other wildlife.
- Native whaling has occurred for thousands of years.
- Native whaling provides food for entire communities including community sectors that aren't able to engage in whaling themselves but that may rely on or support the native whalers; through hunting and food sharing traditions, such hunts bind communities together.
- Whaling is expensive and includes costs associated with equipment, maintenance of that equipment, fuel, support for whaling crew members, and training. Requirements imposed by the IWC have made it even more expensive, particularly the use of penthrite grenades, which are expensive (\$1,000 each) and can only be used once.
- Establishing requirements for standardised needs statements is not warranted and, if pursued, should be done with great caution. Any template must provide broad flexibility to all ASW countries to determine and document need consistent with their practices and processes since all ASW communities and their hunts are different in terms of histories, traditions, culture, and methods of harvesting whales.
- Consensus that politics must be removed from decisions concerning ASW catch limits, as politics must never be used to threaten a community's food supply and security.
- While there was no strong opposition to changing the word 'aboriginal' to 'indigenous', most native hunters do not believe that this is a high priority issue.
- Clarification is needed as to the meaning and context of some of the long-term issues such as what additional

information beyond that currently included in needs statements is required to document ASW catch limits adequately and how local consumption and commercialism are defined and whether that issue is applicable only to Greenland or to all ASW countries.

- Native whalers are concerned about operational efficiency and preventing suffering of the whales and strive to improve their hunts by utilising modern technology and through ongoing education and training.

The Chair also noted the extensive ASWWG discussion on whether ASW whaling should be restricted to using traditional hunting methods. Participants generally agreed that use of improved hunting methods such as the use of modern weapons and vessels should be allowed as appropriate to further a variety of IWC goals including reducing the numbers of whales struck and lost, reducing the time to death of struck whales, and promoting hunter safety.

2. Closed session

In a subsequent closed session, the ASWWG members discussed specific topics previously raised intersessionally by the Governments of Japan and Argentina. These topics included Japan's request for input on setting priorities for the seven long-term issues and Argentina's concern that some whale stocks subject to ASW in one country are subject to whalewatching in another country.

2.1 Japan's request for input

In one of his initial circular letters to the ASWWG, the Chair had requested that members submit their views on prioritising the seven long-term issues. Japan had responded that, before doing so, it would prefer to obtain the views of countries with ASW on the following three points.

- Changing the term 'aboriginal' in ASW.

The Chair noted that this issue had first been raised during the 'Future of the IWC' discussions where some Commission members had expressed concern that the term 'aboriginal' had a negative or discriminatory connotation.

In the ASWWG's ensuing discussion of this topic, ASW hunters indicated that, while they generally did not oppose such a change, it was not a priority issue for them. There was also general agreement that, if the term were changed, the Secretariat would need to review all relevant IWC documents in order to amend them consistent with the change in terminology.

One ASWWG member supported retaining the term 'aboriginal' due to how the two terms (aboriginal and indigenous) are interpreted in Latin America.

- Ensuring local consumption versus commercialism and whether the amount of commercialism allowed under the current definition should remain.

In the ensuing discussion of this topic, ASW countries provided input on how their respective national legislation addresses this issue. In some countries the sale of whale meat and other edible products is not permitted but the making and selling of handicraft from non-edible parts of a whale is permitted. Other countries have legislation they believe is consistent with IWC regulations or have promulgated directives to prohibit the export of whale meat. Several ASW countries indicated that this is an important issue that should be given priority with some linkage to the issue of politics in ASW discussions. One ASW country indicated that it may be difficult to come to a conclusion on this issue given that commerciality of some form exists in each ASW

country. When such commerciality or exchange is on a small scale, it appears not to be controversial. However, additional guidance on when the sale of whale products results in an ASW hunt becoming commercial would be useful. Should it be based on a percentage of products in commercial trade? It was suggested that a survey be developed and distributed to individual ASW communities to obtain their input on this question. The commerciality of non-edible portions of whales (i.e. the potential use of glands for medical research purposes) was identified as another issue to consider. Ultimately, such issues directly relate to the sustainable use of whales.

At the conclusion of this discussion, Japan offered to prepare a paper exploring these issues, taking into account the information shared by the ASW countries.

- Establishing priorities for addressing long term issues.

During the discussion of this topic, most participants opted not to prioritise the entire list of seven long-term issues. Nevertheless, it appeared that several issues are of higher concern and importance than others. These issues are: standardised needs statements, removing ASW catch limits from political discussions, and local consumption versus commercialism. One ASW country indicated that all of the issues are important and observed that those of less concern are linked to those of higher concern. Another issue highlighted by ASW hunters and ASW countries as a concern are the costs associated with the equipment and training used to improve the efficiency and humaneness of the hunts. Yet another country raised the issue of unusable whales (e.g. stinky whales) and how it was important to take into consideration such whales in calculating a country's need. It was suggested that the Scientific Committee could analyse how this may be accommodated by, for example, using a fixed number of animals, a fixed percentage of the total catch limit, establishing a carry-over provision to accommodate for unusable whales, and/or to consider such whales as 'struck and lost.'

2.2 ARGENTINA'S CONCERN THAT REVIEWS OF ASW QUOTAS CONSIDER POTENTIAL IMPACTS ON THE AVAILABILITY OF WHALES FOR OTHER COMMUNITIES AND OTHER USES (E.G. WHALEWATCHING)

Argentina expressed concern that some whale stocks subject to ASW in one country are subject to whalewatching in another country. In addition to the present meeting it suggested a similar meeting with whalewatch operators and countries that support whalewatching in order to ascertain their input on how whaling, including ASW whaling, may impact whalewatching. Though the present meeting was not organised to address this specific topic, there was considerable discussion about the interactions between whaling and whalewatching.

In the ensuing discussion of this topic, some participants indicated that whalewatching and whaling are not mutually exclusive and that, in some places, there may be interest in 'whaling watching.' Others thought this to be a complex issue that may not be appropriate for the ASWWG. Some participants recommended obtaining the advice of the Whalewatching Sub-committee on this issue and perhaps

undertaking joint work to address this concern. Others noted that there are a variety of issues that affect whales, not just ASW, and that all of these activities can impact whalewatching, a further indication of the complexity of this issue. Some participants did not understand Argentina's concerns and indicated that, if resolution of this issue involves ceasing ASW to benefit whalewatching, any agreement is unlikely. Those engaged in ASW generally believed that the food security needs associated with ASW should take priority over the commercial aspects of whale watching. It was also suggested that the concern about the impacts of ASW on whalewatching could be viewed in reverse in that there may be instances where whalewatching may impact ASW. For some native whalers, the resolution of conflict is a key part of their culture and that, through such resolutions, they believed whale hunting and whalewatching could coexist.

A representative of the Scientific Committee noted that science can provide advice on where animals go, how many there are, what types of conflicts may occur, and how those conflicts may impact populations, but it cannot resolve these types of social conflicts between ASW and whalewatching.

As to how to proceed, some participants suggested reviewing the advice of the Working Group on Whale Watching on this issue or referring this issue to that working group. It was generally agreed that this issue should not be referred to the Scientific Committee. Argentina reiterated its interest in having another meeting like this one with indigenous whalers but to invite whalewatch operations and representatives of countries that have an active and growing whalewatching industry to participate. It was suggested that a particular case study (e.g. St Vincent and The Grenadines) might be used to further explore these issues but that additional input from whalewatchers would be needed. No consensus view emerged, however, on how to proceed.

The Chair concluded that there was an impasse on this issue and suggested that this discussion be noted in the Chair's Report of this meeting and brought to the attention of the ASW Sub-Committee, but that no recommendation would be made.

Action items

As a result of its deliberations, the ASWWG agreed on two action items.

- The USA, Denmark, and the IWC's Head of Science will develop a proposal for a workshop to address those long-term issues that are of greatest concern and to further define or develop explanatory statements that provide the required context to understand these issues in order to facilitate meaningful discussion and develop potential solutions; this proposal will be submitted to the ASW Sub-Committee for consideration (see Adjunct 2 for the proposal).
- Japan, assisted by the USA and the IWC's Head of Science, will work intersessionally to prepare a report on the issue of local consumption versus commercialism, taking into consideration input provided by the native whalers and the ASW countries.

Adjunct 1

Agenda for Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Working Group Meeting with Native Hunters

10 September 2014

Background

In April 2013, the Association of Traditional Marine Mammal Hunters of Chukotka, the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission, and the Makah Tribe submitted a letter to the Chair of the Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Working Group (ASWWG) indicating their interest in providing input on the issues under consideration by the ASWWG. These native groups viewed these issues to be of paramount importance because of their impact on the subsistence uses of whales. They requested that the ASWWG convene a meeting with native hunters to hear their perspectives on aboriginal subsistence whaling and the issues the ASWWG is discussing, so that this input may inform ASWWG deliberations. The WG subsequently agreed to do so.

Agenda

- 09:00 Welcome and introduction – Dr. Michael Tillman, ASWWG Chair
- Welcome
 - ASWWG role and responsibilities
 - Introduction of ASWWG members
 - Meeting objectives
 - Outline for the meeting, including roles of participants
 - Rapporteurs

Presentations by Native Hunters

(20-25 minute presentations, each followed by 5 minutes for clarifying questions. When making their presentations, native hunters should use their time to address the issues that the Commission has assigned to the Working Group in its Terms of Reference. Since the Working Group is well acquainted with the hunts, there should be no need to educate participants about them.)

- Present views and opinions related to the short- and long-term issues identified by the ASWWG
 - Present other information the speaker deems appropriate related to ASW in that nation
- 09:15 Greenland Fishers and Hunters Organization (KNAPK)
- 09:45 Association of Traditional Marine Mammal Hunters of Chukotka
- 10:15 Break
- 10:30 Bequian hunters
- 11:00 Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission (AEWC)
- 11:30 Makah Tribe
- 12:00 Lunch
- 13:30 Discussion: ASWWG members' opportunity to ask questions, discuss information with native hunters and provide views
- 14:30 Discussion: Observers' opportunity to ask questions, discuss information from morning presentations and provide views
- 15:30 Wrap up – Dr. Michael Tillman, ASWWG Chair
- 15:45 Break
- 16:00 Closed-door meeting of the ASWWG members

Adjunct 2

Outline proposal for an expert workshop to assist the ASW Sub-Committee and the Commission with respect to improved procedures for considering ASW catch limits, with a focus on consideration of need

OBJECTIVES

The Commission will be reviewing catch limits for aboriginal subsistence whaling at its 2018 Biennial Meeting. The Commission has recognised a number of issues to be addressed that will assist the Commission in its consideration of such catch limits, recognising that the Rule of Procedure E states that the 'Commission shall make every effort to reach its discussions by consensus.' To this end it established an *Ad-Hoc* Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Working Group in 2011.

Recognising the complexity of the topics assigned to that group and the need to agree to a revised process by the 2016 Biennial Meeting if it is to assist in reviewing catch limits at the 2018 Biennial Meeting, the proposal here is for an expert workshop to take place, probably in 2015, to *inter alia* develop a proposal or options for circulation well in advance of the 2016 meeting for consideration by the ASW sub-committee and Commission in 2016. In making this proposal, the positive experience from the previous expert Workshop held in 1979 was considered.

While the Workshop may consider aspects of all of the issues summarised on p.62, an important focus must be on

consideration of 'need statements' in the broad sense. In no particular order at this stage, topics to be considered under this will include but not necessarily limited to:

- (a) types of need (e.g. cultural and nutritional);
- (b) cultural and sociological variation across whaling communities with regard to conditions of the hunt and methods of distribution of products, including evolution through time;
- (c) description of the methods used to present information on need to the Commission in an informative manner including an account of types of need and how they are characterised as well as cultural and sociological variation;
- (d) consideration of approaches to objectively review 'need statements' presented to the Commission; and
- (e) food security considerations.

EXPERTISE

The Workshop will require experts on at least the following:

- (1) the present and past subsistence whaling operations including representatives of whaling communities;

- (2) anthropologists and sociologists with expertise in the appropriate geographical regions and subsistence communities; and
 (3) nutritionists with expertise in native diets.

The possibility of collaboration with appropriate inter-governmental organisations and other stakeholders should be investigated.

STEERING GROUP

There is insufficient time at this meeting to develop a full list of participants, agenda, venue, precise dates, budget etc. necessary to ensure a successful workshop. It is therefore proposed that a Steering Group be established comprising

the existing ASW Working Group (Argentina, Austria, Denmark, Japan, Russian Federation, Switzerland and the USA as well as the Head of Science and two Scientific Committee members). Past experience has shown that workshops function best when: (1) there are no more than about 40 participants; (2) sufficient time is allowed for the Workshop itself to develop its recommendations and finalise its report – for a complex issue such as this then four days may be appropriate; (3) papers on specific topics are requested, developed and submitted well in advance of the workshop; and (4) sufficient funding is necessary to support participation and costs associated with involvement of experts and other participants.

Adjunct 3

List of Participants

ARGENTINA

Juan Pablo Paniego
Miguel Iñíguez

AUSTRIA

Andrea Nouak

AUSTRALIA

Pam Eiser

DENMARK

Gitte Hundahl
Nette Levermann
Amalie Jessen
Øle Samsing

JAPAN

Joji Morishita
Takaaki Sakamoto
Dan Goodman
Naohito Okazoe

NORWAY

Lars Walløe

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Valentin Ilyashenko
Masha Vorontzova
Olga Etylina

SWITZERLAND

Bruno Mainini

UK

Nicola Clark
Mark Simmonds

USA

Michael Tillman
Michael Gosliner

Ira New Breast
Ryan Wulff
Doug DeMaster
Roger Eckert
DJ Schubert

ALASKA ESKIMO WHALING COMMISSION

Harry Brower, Jr.
Jessica Lefevre
Chris Winter
Robert Suydam
Price A. Leavitt, Sr.
Taquik Hepa

ASSOCIATION OF TRADITIONAL MARINE MAMMAL HUNTERS OF CHUKOTKA

Nikolay Etytegin

KNAPK (ORGANIZATION OF FISHERMEN AND HUNTERS IN GREENLAND)

Leif Fontaine

MAKAH TRIBE

Keith Johnson
Brian Gruber
Greig Arnold

ANIMAL WELFARE INSTITUTE

Sue Fisher

CENTRO DE CONSERVACIÓN CETACEA (CHILE)

Elsa Cabrera

CETACEAN SOCIETY INTERNATIONAL

Heather Rockwell

DOLPHIN CONNECTION

Nancy Azzam

EASTERN CARIBBEAN COALITION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS

Marlon Mills

ENVIRONMENTAL INVESTIGATION AGENCY

Jennifer Lonsdale

FUNDACIÓN CETHUS

Carolina Cassani

HUMANE SOCIETY INTERNATIONAL

Rebecca Regnery

INSTITUTO DE CONSERVACION BALLENAS (ARGENTINA)

Roxana Schteinbarg

WHALE AND DOLPHIN CONSERVATION

Vanessa Tossenberger
Astrid Fuchs

WORLD ANIMAL PROTECTION

Joanna Toole

IWC SECRETARIAT

Greg Donovan
