

## Annex H

# Report of the Working Group on Whale Killing Methods and Associated Welfare Issues

Thursday 11 September 2014, Portorož, Slovenia

### SUMMARY OF MAIN OUTCOMES

Item and Agenda Item	Main outcomes
Item 3 Data provided on whales killed	The Working Group welcomed the reports from several Governments on their hunting operations or events requiring euthanasia.
Item 4 Information on improving the humaneness of whaling operations	The Working Group welcomed reports from Norway and the USA on their contributions to improvements in whaling operations. NAMMCO provided a summary of its manuals for hunters that focussed on safety for hunters and rapid death for the target species of the hunts.
Item 5 Welfare issues associated with the entanglement of large whales	The Working Group thanked the Secretariat for its report on progress, especially with respect to matters related to entanglements, including training workshops and capacity building, the development of a global database and convening future workshops. It recommended that this work continue, including the post of technical advisor to the Secretariat.
Item 6 Whale welfare	The Working Group endorsed the Report of the Workshop on Euthanasia Protocols. It discussed the work of an intersessional Working Group on Welfare especially in the context of the terms of reference and a revised action plan. Consensus was not reached but discussions will continue informally before consideration at Plenary.

### 1. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The list of participants is given in Appendix 1.

#### 1.1 Appointment of Chair

Michael Stachowitsch (Austria) was appointed as Chair.

#### 1.2 Appointment of Rapporteurs

Greg Donovan, Andrea Cooke, Harriet Gillett, Tim Inskipp and Pablo Sinovas of the Secretariat were appointed as rapporteurs.

#### 1.3 Review of documents

The list of available documents is given in Appendix 3.

### 2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

The draft Agenda available prior to the meeting was adopted unchanged. It is given in Appendix 2.

### 3. DATA PROVIDED ON WHALES KILLED

The Chair introduced Agenda Item 3, noting that this allows Contracting Governments to provide the information specified in Resolutions 1999-1 and 2001-2. Resolution 1999-1 encouraged reporting of data on whales killed including the number killed by each method, the number killed instantaneously, times to death, number of whales targeted and missed, number of whales struck and lost, calibre of rifle where used, number of bullets used and methods to determine unconsciousness/time to death. Resolution 2001-2 encouraged governments to submit information on variance data on times to death (to the extent possible) and comparative data from the killing of other large mammals.

This item also allows reporting of data relevant to administration of euthanasia. The Chair noted that the report of the IWC's recent Workshop on Euthanasia would be discussed under Item 6.1. Data on whales killed and whale killing

methods were provided by New Zealand, USA, Denmark (on behalf of Greenland), the Russian Federation, St Vincent and The Grenadines and Norway. The Chair thanked them for presenting the information to the Working Group.

#### 3.1 New Zealand

New Zealand presented IWC/65/WKM&AWI03rev1, which refers to the years 2013-14, and noted also IWC/65/WKM&AWI15. New Zealand's annual reports relate exclusively to the euthanasia of stranded cetaceans beyond all hope of rescue. For the 2013/14 reporting period, the methods used were rifles of various calibre and a 12-bore shotgun. The species involved were long-finned pilot whales ( $n=47$ ), short-finned pilot whales (3), pygmy sperm whales (2), Gray's beaked whale (1), Cuvier's beaked whale (1), common dolphin (1), bottlenose dolphin (1). All dolphins died immediately except a dolphin for which TTD was 20 seconds and several pilot whales which required multiple gunshots over 2-4 minutes.

New Zealand advised that it took welfare seriously. Stranded cetaceans beyond all hope of rescue are euthanised only by trained personnel of the Department of Conservation. New Zealand noted that even for such personnel it was difficult to place a rifle shot that will result in instant death for a stranded whale at close range, therefore harpoon shots at sea would likely increase difficulty and TTD.

New Zealand further noted that it believes that the full IWC has full competence on cetacean welfare issues and encouraged members to submit full data sets to the Commission to improve animal welfare.

#### 3.2 USA

The USA presented IWC/65/WKM&AWI09, noting that the efficiency of the hunt has improved from an average of 77% over the last 10 years to 81% in 2012 and 80% in 2013. Data

for 46 bowhead whales landed in 2013 were presented. The primary methods used were the penthrite projectile alone or the black powder projectile alone from the darting gun with a black powder projectile from a darting gun also used as a secondary/backup method where necessary (93%). The most common combination was a black powder projectile from a darting gun with the black powder projectile from a shoulder gun (80%). Time to death was estimated to be instant for 15% of the whales. The prevailing environmental conditions of the hunt make estimating time to death using cessation of movement difficult.

### 3.3 Denmark/Greenland

Greenland presented IWC/65/WKM&AWI06 (with data for 2012) and IWC/65/WKM&AWI07 (with data for 2013). Methods used are penthrite grenades with high calibre rifles as the secondary killing method apart from in the collective rifle hunt for common minke whales (which comprised 35% of the common minke whale catch in 2012 and 54% in 2013). In 2012, the median time to death (TTD) for common minke whales off West Greenland ( $n=148$ ) was five minutes with about 30% estimated to die instantly; in 2013 ( $n=175$ ) the corresponding figures were 10 minutes and 24%. In 2012, the median TTD for humpback whales ( $n=10$ ) was 13 minutes; in 2013 ( $n=8$ ) it was 15 minutes. In 2012 ( $n=5$ ) 25% of fin whales were estimated to die instantly; in 2013, the median TTD for fin whales was 10 minutes with 44% estimated to die instantly.

### 3.4 Norway

Norway presented IWC/65/WKM&AWI11. In addition to information on whales taken in 2012 and 2013 and weapons used (penthrite grenades using 50mm or 60mm harpoon cannons with high calibre rifles and round nosed, full metal jacket bullets as back-up weapons) they reported on obligatory shooting tests for gunners and the inclusion of observers on board and at processing plants in some seasons. Norway noted that research and developments on whale killing methods being undertaken have been continuously reported to the IWC and that from 2008 similar reports have been presented to NAMMCO.

### 3.5 St Vincent and The Grenadines

IWC/65/WKM&AWI10 was submitted by St Vincent and The Grenadines (who were not present at the meeting). The method used was the harpoon but no humpback whales were taken (two were struck and lost).

### 3.6 Russian Federation

The Russian Federation presented IWC/65/WKM&AWI04. In addition to information on whales taken in 2013, they noted that there had been no difference in hunting methods (i.e. harpoon with float then darting gun or rifle), but due to climate change hunters have to go further into the open sea. The mean TTD for gray whales ( $n=127$ ) was reported as 35 minutes while the single bowhead killed took an estimated 45 minutes.

### 3.7 Working Group discussion and recommendations

There were no discussions or recommendations.

## 4. INFORMATION ON IMPROVING THE HUMANENESS OF WHALING OPERATIONS

This item allows Contracting Governments to provide information specified in Resolution 1997-1 and supported by Resolution 2001-2. Resolution 1997-1 concerns steps being taken to improve the humaneness of aboriginal whaling

operations. Resolution 2001-2 encourages all Contracting Governments to provide appropriate technical assistance to reduce time to unconsciousness and death in all whaling operations.

Two Contracting Governments (Norway and the USA) provided information on this item. A presentation was also given by NAMMCO.

### 4.1 Norway

Norway presented the relevant section of IWC/65/WKM&AWI11. This details work that Norway has undertaken with NAMMCO members and other countries (Canada, Japan, Russia, USA) to transfer knowledge from Norway to hunters, inspectors and other personnel in order to improve methods and techniques for hunting of whales. In cooperation with NAMMCO and the USA's Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission (AEWC), Norway has improved manuals for the maintenance and use of whale hunting weaponry.

### 4.2 USA

The USA presented document IWC/65/WKM&AWI08. They highlight two points from this comprehensive document: the effects of environmental change on the timing and nature of the hunt and the use of penthrite.

With climate change, the USA noted increased offshore oil and gas exploration and increased shipping especially in the Bering Strait. These activities can threaten subsistence hunting and lead to reduced efficiency in subsistence whaling operations. The document summarises some of the work of the AEWC to maintain hunt efficiency in areas subject to these threats and increase human safety.

The USA reported success in the implementation of the penthrite projectile modified for use in the hand-held darting gun. The AEWC is now looking at modifications to darting guns. These modifications are important to ensure high performance for the projectile and safety for hunters. The USA thanked Egil Øen for his contributions in this area.

### 4.3 Report from NAMMCO

NAMMCO presented the manual for the instruction on the maintenance and use of weaponry and equipment deployed in hunting of baleen whales in NAMMCO member countries. This document is available from <http://www.nammco.no>.

The illustrated manual summarises methods to improve hunters' safety and animal welfare. It covers use and safety information on weapons and equipment and the technical structure of weapons, their function and maintenance. The manual is in English and in the languages of the hunters.

### 4.4 Working Group discussion and action arising

Australia appreciated the presentation by NAMMCO and efforts by members of the Commission to develop methods for humane killing. However, in its opinion these activities should complement, rather than displace, the role of the IWC with regard to killing methods. Australia reiterated its view that the IWC is the intergovernmental organisation responsible for all aspects of whales and whaling.

## 5. WELFARE ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH THE ENTANGLEMENT OF LARGE WHALES

In 2010 and 2011 the IWC held two Workshops which developed a series of recommendations for responding to the welfare concerns caused when whales become entangled in fishing gear and marine debris. At IWC/64 in 2012 the Commission endorsed these recommendations which included promoting the establishment of national entanglement response networks.

A dedicated co-ordinator has been attached to the Secretariat since 2011 to implement these recommendations.

The IWC's separate work programme of the effects of marine debris, including abandoned, lost or otherwise discarded fishing gear, is reported through the work of the Conservation Committee.

### 5.1 Secretariat report on progress

The Secretariat presented document IWC/65/WKM&AWI14 (overview of the work of the technical adviser assigned to the Secretariat to assist with reducing conflicts between cetaceans and marine resource users: July 2012 to Sept. 2014).

The initiative to address the welfare issues associated with large whale entanglement in manmade material was begun by Australia, Norway and the USA.

Implementing this work through the IWC has been helpful in getting the attention of authorities and it has helped encourage the collection of better data. The work has been particularly successful when undertaken in collaboration with relevant IGOs with a regional presence (e.g. FAO-COFI, CMS, UNEP). Key accomplishments were outlined, including: capacity building workshops at nine locations for over 350 trainees representing at least 18 countries; entanglement apprenticeships; and presentation of the work at a wide range of regional meetings.

Future plans include development of a global database on entanglement, further capacity building and convening an entanglement prevention workshop.

### 5.2 Discussions and action arising

#### 5.2.1 Work related to entanglement response

Norway, Mexico, the UK, Argentina, the USA, Belgium and Australia thanked the Secretariat, and in particular congratulated David Mattila, for the excellent work in this area. Argentina, Australia and the USA highlighted the need for further entanglement response work to continue. The UK stated its belief that the disentanglement response and training programme is an extremely successful model that the IWC should be minded to replicate to enable a co-ordinated and informed response to other welfare problems, such as mass strandings.

Norway considered that future entanglement workshops should discuss in more detail euthanasia methods to kill moribund, entangled animals as quickly and painlessly as possible in cases where rescue is not possible. Australia said that work on prevention and early intervention should be the highest priorities. The UK highlighted the importance of the establishment of a global database on entanglement which will be discussed during the next meeting of the entanglement response network. In the meantime it encouraged member countries to submit information to the Secretariat (e.g. through the existing National Progress Report system).

The UK and Belgium, considered that the general approach developed for this work could also be applied to other areas such as dealing with mass strandings.

The Working Group **recommended** continuation of the work in light of the recommendations of the previous Workshops, including consideration of prevention measures.

#### 5.2.2 Other matters

Argentina presented IWC/65/WKM&AWI12 which notes the case of a southern right whale interacting with a huge plastic burlap bag in Puerto Madryn that could have been dangerous for the animal and was eventually removed. The case was extensively covered by the national media and helped raise awareness of marine plastic pollution.

Argentina also presented IWC/65/WKM&AWI13 which details four entanglement cases that have taken place 2012-

14. In total, 13 entangled southern right whales were sighted in Gulf Nuevo since a stranding network was created in 2009.

The UK and France thanked Argentina for both reports and noted the importance of awareness raising and in particular the positive role that whalewatching operators can play.

## 6. WHALE WELFARE

### 6.1 Report of the Workshop on Euthanasia Protocols *Intersessional Working Group on Welfare*

The UK and Norway presented IWC/65/WKM&AW1Rep01 (Report of the IWC Workshop on Euthanasia Protocols to Optimise Welfare Concerns for Stranded Cetaceans)<sup>1</sup>. The Workshop, organised jointly by the UK and Norway, brought together international experts to develop guidelines on the best welfare outcomes for stranded cetaceans and to address euthanasia methods, safety of personnel, and decision-making on when to intervene in a stranding. The Workshop compared various euthanasia methods used worldwide and ways of improving efficiency, safety of personnel and when and if to intervene. Objectives included: improving the evidence base on when and how to euthanise stranded cetaceans; improving data on stranding events, and lessons learned from them; improving practical considerations and protocols/guidelines; developing protocols for each euthanasia method; and how to manage events in the context of the media and general public.

The Workshop stressed that human safety was of paramount importance and that euthanasia should only be attempted by trained personnel.

A series of specific and practical recommendations on euthanasia protocols agreed by the Workshop included:

- (a) human safety must come first and euthanasia should only be attempted by trained personnel;
- (b) humaneness considerations should also be of major importance;
- (c) studies are needed on toxicity and persistence of euthanasia chemicals and disposal of contaminated carcasses;
- (d) a darting gun to deliver penthrite grenades should be developed for large whale strandings;
- (e) the data provided in National Progress Reports should be refined to allow for better evaluation of different euthanasia techniques;
- (f) IWC should build on the success of the entanglement response network and provide a similar forum for euthanasia issues;
- (g) workshops should be held on euthanasia at sea and for mass strandings; and
- (h) member nations should refine or improve new incident response protocols based on principles and guidelines in the Workshop report.

The Workshop recommendations were subsequently endorsed by the Scientific Committee at SC/65b.

### 6.2 Discussions and action arising

The Chair welcomed the report and thanked the Workshop participants for their thorough and comprehensive review and carefully developed recommendations. Norway thanked the UK for the way it organised the Workshop and hoped that the report would be a constructive tool for those who have to carry out an assignment of animal welfare, which sometimes is risky and dangerous for the operators in addition to often being controversial in the public opinion.

<sup>1</sup>Published in this volume.

### 6.3 Progress update from the *ad-hoc* intersessional Working Group on Welfare

The UK presented IWC/65/WKM&AWI05 (Discussion paper addressing welfare within the IWC – Intersessional Working Group on Welfare Summary Recommendations). It thanked the members of the intersessional group (Argentina, Luxembourg, New Zealand and the US) for their help in drafting the discussion paper. The group noted that the welfare of cetaceans has become an increasingly important issue globally over the last decade and such considerations are entwined with many of the issues already considered by the IWC, such as whalewatching, ship strikes and entanglement. These discussions currently take place in an *ad-hoc* manner within the IWC so there is a need to bring all aspects of welfare together in one place.

To address this the intersessional Working Group recommended:

- continuing to work on welfare issues intersessionally (see also Appendix 4);
- amending the name and revising the current Terms of Reference of the Whale Killing Methods and Associated Welfare Issues (WKM&AWI) Working Group to reflect a more comprehensive consideration of welfare within the IWC;
- a ‘common understanding’ of welfare to help promote coordination and understanding within and beyond the IWC;
- a revised Action Plan to better reflect the current scope of the IWC considerations of welfare;
- considering effective ways to deliver this action plan including using seconded experts; and
- a proposal to increase welfare expertise within the IWC.

The UK stressed that the recommendations are not intended to change the group’s existing work relating to hunting and welfare, noting the progress made in delivering its 2003 action plan. The purpose of the document is to formally recognise and embed the wider range of welfare considerations already being considered within the IWC into a single place.

### 6.4 Discussions and action arising

Several delegations thanked the intersessional Working Group for its work. The USA noted that many anthropogenic activities may result in welfare concerns for whales and supported expansion of the group’s work to include such welfare concerns. This view was supported by New Zealand, Argentina (who noted that this view was shared by the Buenos Aires group) and Belgium.

Norway gave a brief history of the work of the WKM&AWI Working Group, which began in 1983. It stated that it had implemented many of the proposals in the report and that much of this work is now done through NAMMCO. It acknowledged that it is difficult to develop a universal system to address welfare issues that encompasses the different considerations and ways of life represented at the IWC. The current proposal has good intentions but the scope of them could lead to lengthy discussions. Work on other welfare issues would be better dealt with by separate expert workshops, as in the case of the entanglement issue. Norway would contribute to any such workshops. It recommends that the Working Group continues with its current remit on welfare issues. Iceland associated itself with the statement from Norway.

Denmark acknowledged the importance of welfare work which is especially relevant in Greenland and the Faroe Islands. It shares Norway’s concerns about differing values.

The Russian Federation expressed some concerns with the proposed mandate of the revised action plan. In particular, it believed that the issue of hunter welfare should

be included. It believes that the current proposal would extend the competence of the Working Group to what it considered to be philosophical issues. With regards to hunter welfare, it described a hunt in Chukotka which uses old hunting methods (mainly spears). This method means a quick death for the whale using low-level technology, but one which is very dangerous for the hunters. The mandate should include discussion of this type of hunt and countries involved in all types of hunting.

Mexico supported the recommendations in the document. The work on entanglement and strandings should be combined under a welfare umbrella. It supported continued use of expert workshops on specific topics. It also noted the co-ordinating role of the Commission, e.g. with respect to various databases and the Global Whale Entanglement Response Network.

Australia supported the recommendations, noting the great progress that has been made despite political differences. Australia noted that just because something might be difficult we should not avoid attempting it and recommended starting implementation of the action plan, since experience within the WKM&AWI Working Group shows that progress is possible.

In responding to these discussions, the UK noted the generally strong support for the recommendations. It emphasised that the objective of the paper was to bring together the wider welfare issues already under discussion within the IWC. The UK noted the intervention made by Norway that the 2003 action plan on welfare was largely complete. The UK recognised that this success was due to a substantial contribution by whaling countries on welfare and invited these countries to provide updates to the proposed Action Plan to reflect this. It acknowledged that the Action Plan was ambitious but believed that there was a need to start work. It also re-emphasised that the issue was not simply philosophical but that there is a recognised scientific discipline regarding animal welfare. It also noted that the new Action Plan does not interfere with previous work on hunter welfare.

South Africa acknowledged Norway’s contribution to this issue, and it believed that there was much common ground in the text of the proposed new Action Plan, as well as differences of opinion on some aspects. South Africa suggested that those parties with concerns meet outside of the Working Group to draft changes to the text in order that the proposal could be agreed.

The UK clarified that it was ready to discuss moving forward with any party, with a view to bringing a final revised draft to Plenary for consideration. It stressed that the draft Action Plan contained many recommendations that have already been agreed through earlier Workshops, and it was important that the Commission did not lose momentum on these by deferring the decision on the whole Action Plan to 2016.

Norway said that it did not believe further discussions on changes to text would be productive, as this was an issue of the principles of the IWC and how it works. It reiterated its willingness to continue work in the other areas mentioned by the UK.

The Chair of WKM&AWI requested the UK to consult further with others and to bring the issue forward before Plenary<sup>2</sup>.

## 7. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

The Chair closed the meeting at 12 noon. The report was adopted by correspondence on 15 September 2014.

<sup>2</sup>Editor’s Note: Text as adopted by consensus in Plenary can be found at Appendix 4.

**Appendix 1****LIST OF PARTICIPANTS****ARGENTINA**

Miguel Iñíguez  
Juan Pablo Paniego

**AUSTRALIA**

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

**AUSTRIA**

Andrea Nouak  
Michael Stachowitsch

**BELGIUM**

Fabian Ritter

**CHILE**

Barbara Galletti Vernazzani

**DENMARK**

Gitte Hundahl  
Amalie Jessen  
Leif Fontaine  
Nette Levermann  
Martin Mennecke  
Ole Samsing

**FRANCE**

Marie-Anne Mortelette  
Martine Bigan

**GHANA**

Mike Akyeampong

**ICELAND**

Johann Gudmundsson  
Kristjan Loftsson  
Gisli Víkingsson

**ITALY**

Caterina Fortuna  
Maria Francesca Granata

**JAPAN**

Joji Morishita  
Dan Goodman  
Naohito Okazoe  
Hideki Moronuki  
Takaaki Sakamoto

**KOREA, REPUBLIC OF**

Duhae An  
Yong Rock An

**LUXEMBOURG**

Pierre Gallego

**NEW ZEALAND**

Rohan Currey  
Jillian Dempster  
David Lundquist  
Erin Morriss  
Anita Perkins  
Alexandra Smithyman

**NORWAY**

Ole-David Stenseth  
Guri Breigutu  
Egil Øen  
Kathrine Ryeng  
Truls Soløy  
Lars Walloe  
Hild Ynnesdal

**PANAMA**

Gabriel Despaigne

**RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

Valentin Ilyashenko  
Nikolay Etytegin  
Maria Vorontsova  
Olga Etylina

**ST. LUCIA**

Jeannine Compton-Antoine

**SLOVENIA**

Andrej Bibic  
Tilen Genov

**SOUTH AFRICA**

Herman Oosthuizen  
Ed Couzens

**SWEDEN**

Jacob Hagberg

**SWITZERLAND**

Bruno Mainini  
Martin Krebs

**TANZANIA**

Zahor El Kharousy  
Hosea Gonza Mbilinyi

**UK**

Nigel Gooding  
Claire Bass  
Nicola Clarke  
Donna Mackay  
Jamie Rendell  
Emma Rundall  
Mark Simmonds

**USA**

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

**URUGUAY**

Rodrigo Garcia

**NAMMCO**

Charlotte Winsnes

**CHAIR OF SCIENTIFIC  
COMMITTEE**

Toshihide Kitakado

**IWC SECRETARIAT**

Simon Brockington  
Greg Donovan  
Andrea Cooke  
David Mattila  
Harriet Gillett  
Tim Inskipp  
Pablo Sinovas  
Kate Wilson

## Appendix 2

### AGENDA

1. Introductory items
  - 1.1 Appointment of Chair
  - 1.2 Appointment of rapporteurs
  - 1.3 Review of documents
2. Adoption of Agenda
3. Data provided on whales killed
  - 3.1 Contracting Government reports
  - 3.2 Working Group discussion and recommendations
4. Information on improving the humaneness of whaling operations
  - 4.1 Reports from Contracting Governments
  - 4.2 Report from NAMMCO
  - 4.3 Working Group discussion and action arising
5. Welfare issues associated with the entanglement of large whales
  - 5.1 Secretariat report on progress
  - 5.2 Discussions and action arising
6. Whale welfare
  - 6.1 Report of the Workshop of Euthanasia Protocols (Intersessional Working Group on Welfare)
  - 6.2 Discussions and action arising
  - 6.3 Progress update from the *ad-hoc* intersessional Working Group on Welfare
  - 6.4 Discussions and action arising
7. Adoption of the Report

### TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Working Group is established to review information and documentation available with a view to advising the Commission on whale killing methods and associated welfare issues (*Chairman's Report of the 52<sup>nd</sup> Annual Meeting held in 2000*).

### ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS

#### *Rule of Procedure C.2*

Observers accredited in accordance with Rule [of procedure] C.1.(a) and (b) are admitted to all meetings of the Commission and Technical Committee, and to any meetings of subsidiary groups of the Commission and Technical Committee, except the Commissioners-only meetings and the meetings of the Finance and Administration Committee.

---

## Appendix 3

### LIST OF DOCUMENTS

IWC/65/WKM&AWI	Agenda Item
01 Draft Agenda	
02 List of documents	
03rev Summary of Activities Related to the Action Plan on Whale Killing Methods (based on Resolution 1999-1) [2014] (submitted by New Zealand)	3
04 Summary of Activities Related to the Action Plan on Whale Killing Methods (based on Resolution 1999-1) (submitted by Russian Federation)	3
05 Addressing welfare within the IWC - Intersessional Working Group on Welfare Summary Recommendations	6.3
06 Summary of Activities Related to the Action Plan on Whale Killing Methods (based on Resolution 1999-1) [2012] (submitted by Greenland (Denmark))	3
07 Summary of Activities Related to the Action Plan on Whale Killing Methods (based on Resolution 1999-1) [2013] (submitted by Denmark)	3
08 Report on weapons, techniques, and observations in the Alaskan bowhead whale subsistence harvest (submitted by USA)	4
09 Summary of Activities Related to the Action Plan on Whale Killing Methods (based on Resolution 1999-1) (submitted by USA)	3
10 Summary of Activities Related to the Action Plan on Whale Killing Methods (based on Resolution 1999-1) (submitted by St Vincent and The Grenadines)	3
11 Norwegian Minke Whaling 2012 and 2013 (submitted by Norway)	3 and 4
12 Dangerous situation of a southern right whale playing with a huge plastic burlap bag in Gulf Nuevo in waters off Puerto Madryn	6
13 Update of the report 'Entanglement of Southern Right whales ( <i>Eubalaena australis</i> ) in Golfo Nuevo, Chubut, Argentina'	5
14 Overview of the work of the technical adviser assigned to the Secretariat to assist with reducing conflicts between cetaceans and marine resource users: July 2012 to Sept. 2014	5
15 Summary of Activities Related to the Action Plan on Whale Killing Methods (based on Resolution 1999-1) [2013] (submitted by New Zealand)	3
<b>IWC/65/WKM&amp;AWI Rep</b>	
01 Report of the IWC Workshop on Euthanasia Protocols to Optimize Welfare Concerns for Stranded Cetaceans	

---

## Appendix 4

### REVISED NAME, TERMS OF REFERENCE AND ACTION PLAN FOR ADDRESSING WELFARE WITHIN THE IWC - INTERSESSIONAL WORKING GROUP ON WELFARE SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

The revisions in Table 1 are not intended to further burden subsistence hunters with new welfare-related definitions. Rather, they are specifically intended to expand the remit of the IWC's welfare work to include non-hunting contexts that the IWC is already working on.

#### **Name of the Working Group**

Working Group on Whale Killing Methods and Welfare Issues (WG-WI).

#### **Terms of reference**

The Working Group is tasked with reviewing information and providing advice to the Commission on issues relating to whale killing methods and all aspects associated with ensuring good welfare of cetaceans that are hunted or otherwise impacted by human activities<sup>3</sup>.

#### **Revised Action Plan**

The revised Action Plan is intended as a living document. It should help organise and articulate priorities, making them clear within the WG-WKM&AWI and across the wider IWC family.

In delivering some aspects of this proposed Action Plan, additional experts may be required or there may be a need to establish specific expert groups. In some cases such expert groups already exist and should be drawn upon, for example, welfare issues related to the direct take of whales have been previously discussed by an expert group that last met in 2006 in St. Kitts<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>3</sup>The IWC does not have an agreed definition of welfare. It agreed to work intersessionally to try to develop agreed definitions and guiding principles on animal welfare in order to help promote coordination and understanding within and beyond the IWC. To aid intersessional work on this issue it was noted that a number of expert bodies and intergovernmental organisations have agreed definitions of animal welfare. They commonly consider welfare to be the health of an animal, encompassing both its physical and psychological state. An animal in a good state of welfare (as indicated by scientific evidence) would be free from pain, fear, and distress and be healthy, well nourished, and able to express innate behaviour.

<sup>4</sup>See *Ann. Rep. Int. Whal. Comm.* 2006: 12 (Item 6.1) [2007].

Table 1

Revised Action Plan. \*Indicates text based on the 2003 Action Plan.

<b>Workstream 1 - Embedding welfare considerations within the IWC</b>			
<i>Aim:</i> To equip the Commission and its working bodies with the necessary information to ensure cetacean welfare aspects are proactively and consistently considered across all relevant areas of work.			
Actions	Outcome	Timelines	Responsible parties
1.1	Examine the potential for a shared understanding of animal welfare in relation to non-hunting human induced threats.	Clarity on the broader goals of the IWC with respect to the promotion of sound animal welfare practices relating to non-hunting aspects of human activities. If possible, identification of shared welfare principles to help provide a collective understanding.	Ongoing WKM&AWI Working Group
1.2	Establish working links with all relevant Working Groups and Sub-Committees on welfare related aspects.	Formalised information flow from and to those IWC groups already considering welfare aspects and the establishment of new linkages where necessary.	Ongoing WKM&AWI Working Group; Sub-Committees; Working Groups on whalewatching, ship strikes, entanglement, small cetaceans, etc.
<b>Workstream 2 - Research, management advice and actions to address welfare issues from non-hunting anthropogenic threats</b>			
<i>Aim:</i> To improve understanding of the nature and scale of non-hunting welfare threats to cetaceans, and provide both management advice and practical support to mitigate these threats.			
Actions	Outcome	Timelines	Responsible parties
<b>2.1 Data gathering and advice</b>			
<i>Objective:</i> To ensure fit for purpose data are collected and made available to the Commission to help improve our understanding of the implications of key threats on the welfare of cetaceans and to support the proposal of appropriate welfare related recommendations.			
2.1.1	Identify and agree upon priority areas of work, where welfare issues are considered most relevant. Agree a detailed Action Plan and update over time as appropriate.	A focussed programme of work and detailed Action Plan which will support delivery and provide a clear steer on priorities to the Commission and the Scientific Committee.	Ongoing WKM&AWI Working Group
2.1.2	Identify and quantify (where possible) the nature and extent of threats to cetacean welfare, gaps in our understanding, and specific data needs. Where appropriate, propose possible mitigation measures for consideration by the Commission.	A series of topic-specific welfare orientated workshops generating recommendations for the Commission to consider. Covering, for example, extent and severity of threats, research needs, and potential mitigation measures.	Ongoing WKM&AWI Working Group
2.1.3	Seek to develop criteria to support standardised welfare data collection and encourage the regular sub-mission of relevant data from the sub-groups to the WKM&AWI Working Group.	Fit for purpose, standardised data which are more easily compared and analysed across the range of welfare issues being addressed by the WKM&AWI Working Group.	- WKM&AWI Working Group; Sub-Committees; Working Groups on whale watching, ship strikes, entanglement, small cetaceans, etc.
<b>2.2 Euthanasia</b>			
<i>Objective:</i> To produce specific recommendations to the Commission in relation to the euthanasia of cetaceans.			
2.2.1	Review the information, and progress the recommendations, arising from the 2013 Workshop on Euthanasia Protocols to Optimize Welfare Concerns for Stranded Cetaceans.	Agreed suite of humane practices and protocols (including health and safety) applicable to stranded cetaceans and associated recommendations to be considered and adopted by IWC parties.	2016 WKM&AWI Working Group (IWC/66)
2.2.2	*Organise additional topic-specific workshops to address gaps in understanding and progress key aspects relating to euthanasia ( <i>Action 5, 6, and 10 - 2003 Action Plan</i> ).	The bringing together of experts to: agree recommendations on euthanasia protocols for mass stranding events; the development of criteria for determining permanent insensibility, unconsciousness and death; and work towards developing reliable indices of stress (last two relevant to both whaling and non-whaling welfare considerations).	Ongoing WKM&AWI Working Group
<b>2.3 Disentanglement</b>			
<i>Objective:</i> To produce specific recommendations to the Commission in relation to the welfare implications of entanglement, in particular relating to marine debris and active fishing gear.			
2.3.1	Support the continued growth and development of the disentanglement network and ensure that the IWC becomes the central point for capturing and disseminating relevant information and raising standards.	A sustained increase in the number of people trained to safely disentangle cetaceans. A global, publically accessible database on cetacean entanglements, disentanglement efforts and outcomes. Training workshops held in entanglement hotspots.	Ongoing Disentanglement network (led by David Mattila)
2.3.2	Take steps to apply the successful model of the disentanglement network to other areas, in particular in improving and standardising responses to euthanasia and strandings events (linked with sub-workstreams (i) and (iii)).	Improved and standardised responses to issues such as strandings and euthanasia. Establishment of a global strandings/euthanasia expert network, training package and stranding database. Management advice adopted by the IWC and translated into practical content.	2016 WKM&AWI Working Group (IWC/66)
<b>2.4 Cetacean strandings</b>			
<i>Objective:</i> To work through existing strandings networks to produce specific recommendations to the Commission in relation to the welfare implications of responding to cetacean stranding events.			
2.4.1	Organise a mass strandings workshop to progress the development of shared best practice and guidance in responding to such events (linked with Action 7).	The bringing together of experts and existing strandings networks to share experiences, agree guidance, and help raise welfare standards when dealing with mass stranding events. The IWC established as a central repository for shared guidance and best practice.	2016 WKM&AWI Working Group (IWC/66)



**Workstream 3 – Management advice and actions to address welfare issues in relation to hunting****Aim:** To deliver practical improvements in welfare aspects associated with cetacean hunts, including Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling (ASW).

Actions	Outcomes	Timelines	Responsible parties
3.1 *Encourage increased collection and submission of fit for purpose, standardised time to death data from member states in relation to primary and secondary killing methods in commercial and ASW hunts. ( <i>Action 7 - 2003 Action Plan</i> ).	Fit for purpose and consistent data from across different hunts will allow for an evidenced comparison of the effectiveness of different killing methods. Data presented with appropriate statistical analysis will allow for comprehensive independent appraisal.	Ongoing	IWC Contracting Parties
3.2 *Encourage the collection and presentation of fit for purpose, standardised struck and lost rates in all commercial and ASW hunts, including information on weaponry and techniques used. ( <i>Action 8 and 9 - 2003 Action Plan</i> ).	Data will allow for evidenced considerations of the effectiveness of different weaponry and techniques.	Ongoing	IWC Contracting Parties
3.3 Encourage continued co-operation amongst Contracting Governments to review and improve weaponry and methods used for hunting whales. This may include but is not limited to:	The implementation of practical improvements to existing practices which will improve the welfare aspects associated with the hunting of whales, including time to death and struck and lost rates.	Ongoing	IWC Contracting Parties
(a) *refining the design of penthrite grenades to take into consideration necessary species-specific modifications of charge and depth or timing after impact at which detonation is triggered ( <i>Action 1 and 9 - 2003 Action Plan</i> );			
(b) encouragement and support for the replacement of cold harpoons and other weaponry of lower efficiency with penthrite grenades in ASW hunts;			
(c) *refining the design of sighting equipment suitable for rapid action under conditions at sea, in order to improve accuracy of delivery of penthrite grenades ( <i>Action 2 and 9 - 2003 Action Plan</i> );			
(d) *supporting and encouraging the development and implementation of training programmes on safe handling and effective use of weaponry including the penthrite grenade and other aspects of hunts ( <i>Action 2 and 9 - 2003 Action Plan</i> );			
(e) *seeking updated information and review of constraints on shooting distance and relative orientation of vessel and whale in order to promote measures to reduce times to death ( <i>Action 3 - 2003 Action Plan</i> );			
(f) *reviewing the use and effectiveness of secondary killing methods on different species including analysis of all currently used methods and promotion of most effective methods for reducing time to death of whales ( <i>Action 4 - 2003 Action Plan</i> ); and			
(g) collection of information on age and wear of the weaponry currently being used, and the impact of such on welfare aspects of hunts. Encouragement of the development of mechanisms to address concerns such as regular inspections of whaling gear.			

**Workstream 4 - Communications and outreach****Aim:** To engage external experts in, and promote more widely, the IWC's welfare agenda.

Actions	Outcome	Timelines	Responsible parties
4.1 Establish and maintain appropriate and constructive links with organisations considering animal welfare, including the hunting of terrestrial animals.	Secures input of additional and valuable expertise into IWC discussions. Ensures cross-fertilisation between organisations dealing with cross-cutting issues such as the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA), the North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission (NAMMCO) and the World Organisation for Animal Health and Welfare (OIE).	Ongoing	WKM&AWI Working Group; Secretariat
4.2 Request that Contracting Governments provide information on animal welfare science experts for inclusion in the IWC external contacts database.	A fully populated database of external national contacts which can be drawn upon to help progress relevant work being undertaken by the Commission.	2016 (IWC/66)	WKM&AWI Working Group; Secretariat; IWC Contracting Parties