

Report of the Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Sub-Committee

WEDNESDAY 6 JULY 2011, ST HELIER, JERSEY

Contents

1. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS.....	2
2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA.....	2
3. ABORIGINAL SUBSISTENCE WHALING MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE.....	2
3.1 Progress with the Greenlandic Research Programme.....	2
3.2 <i>Implementation Review</i> for gray whales.....	3
4. ABORIGINAL WHALING SCHEME (AWS).....	4
5. ABORIGINAL SUBSISTENCE WHALING (ASW) CATCH LIMITS.....	4
5.1 Bering-Chukchi-Beaufort Seas stock of bowhead whales (annual review).....	4
5.2 North Pacific Eastern stock of gray whales (annual review).....	4
5.3 Common minke whale stocks off Greenland (annual review).....	5
5.4 West Greenland stock of fin whales.....	5
5.5 West Greenland stock of bowhead whales.....	6
5.6 Humpback whales off West Greenland.....	6
5.7 North Atlantic humpback whales off St. Vincent and the Grenadines.....	6
6. PREPARATION FOR 2012 REVIEW OF CATCH LIMITS.....	7
6.1 Replacement of the term 'aboriginal'.....	7
6.2 Facilitating technical exchange on ASW hunts.....	7
6.3 Guidelines for the preparation of need statements.....	8
6.4 Consideration of long-term issues.....	8
7. OTHER MATTERS.....	9
8. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT.....	9

1. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

A list of participants is given in Appendix 1.

1.1 Appointment of Chair

Joji Morishita (Japan) was appointed as Chair.

1.2 Appointment of Rapporteur

Greg Donovan (Secretariat) was appointed as rapporteur with assistance from Allison Reed (USA).

1.3 Review of Documents

The list of documents is given as Appendix 2.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

The adopted agenda is given as Appendix 3.

3. ABORIGINAL SUBSISTENCE WHALING MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE

3.1 Progress with the Greenlandic Research Programme

3.1.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

The Chair of the Scientific Committee's SWG on the Development of an Aboriginal Whaling Management Procedure, Greg Donovan (hereafter 'Chair of the SWG'), reported on the Scientific Committee's work in this regard. He explained that three items of the Committee's agenda were relevant to this item; those relating to the development of the sex ratio method in the assessment of common minke whales (IWC/63/Rep1, Item 8.1), work on the development of *SLAs*¹ (IWC/63/Rep1, Item 8.3) and consideration of conversion factors for edible products (IWC/63/Rep1, Item 8.5)

The Chair of the SWG noted that for a number of years, the Committee had focussed on developing assessment methods for common minke whales off West Greenland that rely on the observed sex ratio in the catches. The original motivation for this work had been an inability to provide management advice for this hunt. Several developers from Greenland, South Africa and Norway have devoted considerable research effort to this scientifically challenging task. However, despite this enormous effort and a number of scientific advances, a fully tested method proved elusive and last year it was agreed that unless a comprehensive final analysis was presented this year, we would no longer prioritise work on this approach. No such analysis was presented and thus the Committee has agreed that further developmental work will be of low priority for the future.

In this context, the Chair of the SWG highlighted the fact that the situation has also changed recently with respect to the Committee being able to provide advice. The Committee now has an agreed abundance estimate for common minke whales off West Greenland that, in conjunction with the agreed approach to provide safe interim advice for up to two five-year blocks developed in 2008, means that the Committee is able to provide reliable management advice for the West Greenland hunt (see Item 5.3 below).

He then turned to the issue of the development of long-term *SLAs* for the Greenland hunt. In Greenland, a multispecies hunt occurs and the expressed need is for 670 tonnes of edible products from large whales for West Greenland; this involves catches of common minke, fin, humpback and bowhead whales. Development of *SLAs* for Greenland hunts (especially for common minke and fin whales where *inter alia* stock structure questions are more difficult) will be more complex than any previous *Implementation*.

At this year's meeting, the Committee considered the available information on each species and developed a workplan with an initial focus on common minke and fin whales. Development of *SLAs* and the testing framework will need to take into account RMP *Implementations* for these two species. Development of *SLAs* for the bowhead and humpback whale hunts should be considerably easier.

Given the agreed safe method to provide advice on catch limits for up to two 5-year blocks for the Greenland hunts, the Committee's target is for agreed and validated *SLAs*, at least by species, prior to the 2017 Annual Meeting (assuming that the Commission sets 5-year block quotas in 2012 as scheduled and depending on the outcome of discussions on biennial meetings). The Committee proposes that this work is allocated high priority and it notes that intersessional workshops will be needed to expedite progress.

With respect to conversion factors, the Chair of the SWG recalled that last year, the Scientific Committee had requested Greenland to provide information on its sampling scheme and data validation protocols based on the recommendations in the report of the Commission's Small Working Group on Conversion Factors for use in

¹ *Strike Limit Algorithms*. Methods of determining catch limits that have been fully tested and whose performance meets Commission set objectives for conservation and management.

Greenland Hunts (IWC/62/9). The focus was on fin, humpback and bowhead whales for which provisional conversion factors had been proposed; a robust conversion factor for the common minke whale had been developed.

This year, recognising the logistical difficulty of collecting these kinds of data in remote areas, the Scientific Committee welcomed the provision of a response by Greenland to its request. However, it noted that more detail is needed for it to evaluate the proposed programme and the Committee suggested that Greenland take up the offer of the authors of IWC/62/9 to assist in the development of the programme. The Committee requested that a detailed report be presented for consideration at the next meeting that includes: (1) a description of the field protocols and sampling strategy, including effort and likely sample sizes; (2) a description of analysis methods and models; and (3) a presentation of results thus far, including preliminary analyses with the available data.

3.1.2 Discussion and Recommendations

The Sub-Committee **endorses** 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 noted that the Committee's discussions on this issue can be found under Item 8.2 of SC/63/Rep1. He recalled that the 2010 *Implementation Review* had shown that the eastern North Pacific population as a whole was in a healthy state (the population size in 2006/7 was around 20,000 animals), but that a new immediate *Implementation Review* was needed to evaluate the performance of *SLAs* for proposed hunting by the Makah tribe in the Pacific Northwest, with a primary focus on the small (around 200 animals) PCFG (the Pacific Coast Feeding Group).

He reported that considerable progress was made during the year on this issue, including at an intersessional workshop. It is a complex exercise given the geographical and temporal components of both whale behaviour and the hunt. Work is continuing on developing the necessary trials to incorporate uncertainty in knowledge of stock structure and movements, and to ensure that the somewhat complex management approach and *SLA* proposed by the Makah tribe is safe. The Committee has developed a workplan (including an intersessional workshop) to ensure that the review is completed at the 2012 annual Meeting.

The Chair of the SWG noted that this year, new information (from telemetry, photo-identification and genetic studies) was received that gray whales from the western population can cross to the eastern Pacific (including the PCFG area as well as off California and in the Mexican lagoons). The present situation can be summarised as: (1) there is now more uncertainty regarding Pacific gray whale stock structure than previously thought although there is no need to revise stock structure assumptions for Pacific gray whales at present; and (2) range-wide studies need to be undertaken to better understand the situation.

He noted that the existing trials are designed to evaluate the *SLAs* for the northern and PCFG areas in the context of *eastern* gray whales. However, they do *not* incorporate conservation implications for western gray whales. Therefore, the Committee stressed the following items.

- (1) The new information emphasises the need to estimate the probability of a western gray whale being taken in aboriginal hunts for Pacific gray whales, initially based upon the existing information.
- (2) It is very important that work commences on the research programme given under Item 10.4 of SC/63/Rep1 that focuses on photo-identification, genetics and telemetry.
- (3) The Committee will continue to examine this situation and is willing to respond to any guidance or requests for further information from the Commission.

3.2.2 Discussion and Recommendations

In discussion, it was noted that in this case, the Scientific Committee was testing a single *SLA* provided by the Makah rather than one or more developed within the Scientific Committee. The Chair of the SWG explained that in this case the only proposal for testing was that provided by the Makah. The conditions for testing and ultimately accepting or rejecting an approach remain unchanged whether there are one or more candidate *SLAs*. Any agreed *SLA* must show acceptable conservation and need satisfaction performance in line with the objectives already provided by the Commission. If the *SLA* proposed by the Makah does not meet such standards then alternatives would need to be developed and explored by the Committee.

The Sub-Committee **endorses** 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 noted its discussions of this item can be found under Item 8.4 of IWC/63/Rep1. In 2002, the Committee strongly recommended that the Commission adopt the Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Scheme (IWC, 2003b, pp.22-3). This 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* and it reaffirmed this view. The Committee noted that discussions within the Commission of some aspects such as the 'grace period' are not yet complete.

4.2 Discussion and Recommendations

The Sub-Committee **notes** the report of the Scientific Committee.

5. ABORIGINAL SUBSISTENCE WHALING (ASW) CATCH LIMITS

5.1 Bering-Chukchi-Beaufort Seas stock of bowhead whales (annual review)

5.1.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

The Chair of the SWG noted that this item had been discussed under Item 9.3 of IWC/63/Rep1. The Committee had received two papers on genetic studies for this stock. The new analyses provided no reason to change the present single stock hypothesis (that had been extensively tested during the previous *Review*) for the forthcoming *Implementation Review*.

The Committee was also pleased to receive two papers dealing with abundance estimation. Two successful field efforts took place in 2011: (1) an on-ice census with visual and acoustic monitoring; and (2) an aerial survey to obtain individual identification photographs to estimate population size. The Committee thanked the field crews who endured considerable hardship and personal risk to complete the surveys successfully.

Following the Committee's Data Availability Agreement requirements, these data will be made available as soon as possible, but it is very unlikely that compilation and validation can be completed in time for their provision for the scheduled 2012 *Implementation Review*. The most recent agreed estimate for this stock was from 2004; under the draft Aboriginal Whaling Scheme (IWC, 2003a, pp.74-5), a new estimate is not therefore needed until 2014.

The Chair of the SWG noted that the detailed discussion of the 2012 *Implementation Review* is found under Item 8.6 of SC/63/Rep1. The purpose of an *Implementation Review* is to examine whether any new information has become available which would indicate that the set of trials used to test the *Bowhead SLA* did not adequately address uncertainty. No new information was presented at the present meeting to suggest that this was the case. The Committee agreed that an *Implementation Review* should occur in 2012 and information on data availability guideline deadlines is given in the Committee's report. A new abundance estimate is not a requirement for such a review. Once an agreed estimate is determined it can be incorporated routinely into the *SLA* for the provision of management advice.

The Chair of the SWG then referred to the management advice given under Item 9.3.2 of IWC/63/Rep1.

For the 2010 Alaskan hunt, 71 bowhead whales were struck resulting in 45 animals landed (20 were males, 23 were females and 2 of unknown sex). Two males were taken in Chukotkan waters in 2010.

The Committee reaffirmed its advice from last year that the *Bowhead SLA* remains the most appropriate tool for providing management advice for this harvest. The results from the *SLA* show that the present strike and catch limits are acceptable.

5.1.2 Discussion and Recommendations

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

5.2 North Pacific Eastern stock of gray whales (annual review)

5.2.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

The Chair of the SWG noted that its discussions of this item can be found under Item 9.2 of IWC/63/Rep1. With respect to abundance estimates, the Committee is looking forward to receiving a detailed overview paper for the counts of southbound whales migrating past Granite Canyon, California next year. It also received interesting new information from the breeding grounds in Mexico and northbound counts off the west coast of the USA (including links between calf production and ice cover). It commended these valuable long-term monitoring programmes and recommended continuation of this work. It encouraged a quantitative integrated analysis of the long time series of data now available from both in Mexico and the USA. It suggested that correlations between calf production in western and eastern gray whales could also be examined.

The Russian Federation reported that a total of 118 gray whales (57 males, 61 females) was landed in Chukotka, Russia, in 2010; no whales were struck and lost. One whale was considered unfit for consumption (i.e. was a 'stinky' whale).

The Chair of the SWG then turned to the Committee's management advice. The Committee agreed that the *Gray Whale SLA* remained the appropriate tool to provide management advice for eastern North Pacific gray whales, apart from the PCFG animals that are part of the ongoing work of the SWG on the AWMP for an *Implementation Review*. It agreed that the *Implementation Review* undertaken last year had identified no reason to change the Committee's advice for the Chukotkan hunt, at least until the *Implementation Review* with an emphasis on the PCFG is completed.

5.2.2 Discussion and Recommendations

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

5.3 Common minke whale stocks off Greenland (annual review)

5.3.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

The Chair of the SWG reminded the Committee that there are two hunts to consider under this Agenda Item, that off West Greenland and that off East Greenland. The Committee's advice on this item can be found under Items 9.4 and 9.5 of IWC/63/Rep1.

WEST GREENLAND

In the 2010 season, 179 minke whales were landed in West Greenland and 7 were struck and lost. Of the landed whales, there were 122 females, 53 males, and four whales of unreported sex.

In 2007, the Commission had agreed that the number of common minke whales struck from this stock should not exceed 200 in each of the years 2008-12, except that up to 15 strikes could be carried forward. In 2009, the Committee was for the first time able provide management advice for this stock based on a negatively biased estimate of abundance of 17,307 (95% CI 7,628-39,270) and the agreed method for providing interim management advice. Such advice can be used for up to two five-year blocks whilst *SLAs* are being developed. Last year, the Commission agreed to replace the number 200 to 178 as recommended by the Committee. Based on the application of the agreed approach, and the lower 5th percentile for the 2007 estimate of abundance, the Committee repeats its advice of last year that an annual strike limit of 178 will not harm the stock.

EAST GREENLAND

Nine common minke whales were struck (and landed) off East Greenland in 2010 (no animals were struck and lost). Of the landed whales, there were two females, four males, and three whales of unreported sex. Catches of minke whales off East Greenland come from the large Central Stock of minke whales.

In 2007, the Commission agreed to an annual quota of 12 minke whales from the stock off East Greenland for 2008-2012, which the Committee stated was acceptable in 2007. The present strike limit represents a very small proportion of the Central Stock. The Committee agreed that the present strike limit will not harm the stock.

5.3.2 Discussion and Recommendations

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

5.4 West Greenland stock of fin whales

5.4.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

A total of four fin whales (all females) were landed, and one additional animal was struck and lost, in West Greenland during 2010. An acoustic study on fin whales in Davis Strait between Greenland and Canada found that call frequencies peaked in November–December, and continued until the area was covered by ice in January.

In 2007, the Commission agreed to a catch limit (for the years 2008-2012) of 19 fin whales struck off West Greenland. At last year's Commission meeting, it was agreed that this should be reduced to 16 animals with a note that this will be voluntarily limited to 10 by Greenland. The Committee agreed on an approach for providing interim management advice in 2008 and this was confirmed by the Commission. It had agreed that such advice could be used for up to two five-year blocks whilst *SLAs* were being developed. The most recent agreed abundance estimate is 4,359 (95% CI 1,897-10,114). Based on the application of the agreed approach, the Committee agreed that an annual strike limit of 16 (and therefore also 10) whales will not harm the stock.

5.4.2 Discussion and Recommendations

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

5.5 West Greenland stock of bowhead whales

5.5.1 Information from the Government of Canada

In response to a request made by the Sub-Committee last year, the Secretariat wrote to Canada requesting information about catches and catch limits for the Canadian hunt. The response was circulated to the Commission and in summary, Canada briefly described its approach to management and indicated that in 2010 two whales were landed and two were struck and lost. The quota for 2011 is for four whales. This information was incorporated into the Scientific Committee discussions.

5.5.2 Report of the Scientific Committee

The Chair of the SWG noted that the Committee's discussions under this item can be found under Item 9.1 of IWC/63/Rep1. The current working hypothesis of the Committee is for a single stock of bowhead whales in this region. However, in the past additional genetic work has been recommended to finalise its conclusions. The Committee again recommended genetic analyses to be presented to the 2012 meeting but recognises the complications arising out of the fact that much of the existing data are held by a non-member nation, Canada.

In 2010, three bowhead whales were harvested in Disko Bay, West Greenland, and biological samples were obtained from all three animals.

In 2007, the Commission agreed to a quota for 2008 to 2012 of two bowhead whales struck annually (plus a carryover provision of two unused strikes from the previous year) off West Greenland, but the quota for each year shall only become operative when the Commission has received advice from the Scientific Committee that the strikes are unlikely to endanger the stock. Following the agreed approach for determining interim management advice, the Committee again agreed that the current catch limit for Greenland will not harm the stock. It was also aware that catches from the same stock have been taken by a non-member nation, Canada. It noted that should Canadian catches continue at a similar level as in recent years, this will not change the Committee's advice with respect to the strike limits agreed for West Greenland. Given the importance of this issue, the Committee recommended that the Secretariat should continue to contact Canada requesting information about catches and catch limits for bowhead whales.

5.5.3 Discussion and Recommendations

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

5.6 Humpback whales off West Greenland.

5.6.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

The Chair of the SWG noted that the Committee's discussions under this item can be found under Item 9.7 of IWC/63/Rep1. A total of nine (three males; five females; one unreported sex) humpback whales was landed (none were struck and lost) in West Greenland during 2010. Genetic samples were obtained from five of these whales.

Last year, the Commission established an annual strike limit of 9 whales for the years 2010-2012 with an annual review by the Scientific Committee. The most recent agreed abundance estimate is 3,039 (CV=0.45; annual rate of increase 0.0917 SE 0.0124). Using the agreed approach for providing interim management advice, the Committee agreed that an annual strike limit of 9 whales will not harm the stock.

5.6.2 Discussion and Recommendations

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

5.7 North Atlantic humpback whales off St. Vincent and the Grenadines

5.7.1 Report of the Scientific Committee

The Chair of the SWG noted that the Committee's discussions under this item can be found under Item 9.8 of IWC/63/Rep1. No information was provided on 2010-2011 catches by St Vincent and The Grenadines. The Committee strongly recommended that catch data, including the length of harvested animals, be provided to the Scientific Committee. It also strongly recommended that genetic samples be obtained for any harvested animals as well as fluke photographs, and that this information be submitted to appropriate catalogues and collections.

In recent years, the Committee has agreed that the animals found off St. Vincent and the Grenadines are part of the large West Indies breeding population. The Commission adopted a total block catch limit of 20 for the period 2008-12. The Committee agreed that this block catch limit will not harm the stock.

5.7.2 Discussion and Recommendations

In discussion, the Chair of the SWG noted that the Committee, while recognising the difficulties in collecting data in remote areas, had also made a general recommendation encouraging data collection for all subsistence hunts. The Sub-Committee **endorses** the report of the Scientific Committee and its recommendations.

6. PREPARATION FOR 2012 REVIEW OF CATCH LIMITS

The Sub-Committee agreed that discussion under this agenda item would not be limited to only preparation for the 2012 review of catch limits, as some of the four available documents (IWC/63/ASW3-6 submitted by the USA) related to broader and longer-term issues.

Before presenting the documents in detail, the USA provided a brief introduction to the overall process being suggested. In discussions with other countries (both with and without ASW hunts), the USA noted they had heard a desire to address several unresolved issues including the need to: obtain adequate information for consideration of quota requests; develop an agreed need statement template; improve accuracy of data; ensure local consumption vs. commercialism; define key terms; improve operational efficiency; improve the welfare of the hunt; consider longer term quotas; and remove ASW quotas from political discussions.

The USA noted that despite a general willingness for the IWC to address these, it is not feasible to fully consider all at a single meeting. It therefore recommended a two-step process. The first phase would be to address short-term issues that may be agreed upon at this meeting or by 2012 (e.g. changing the word 'aboriginal' to 'indigenous', defining a process to advance the exchange of technical hunting information between ASW parties, and the development of a standardised approach for preparing needs statements). However, it noted that from preliminary conversations with other affected countries, the last issue should probably be moved to the longer term list.

For the remaining longer-term issues (*inter alia*: standardised needs statements; welfare issues, ensuring local consumption and long-term quotas), the USA suggested the creation of a small *ad hoc* working group. Its membership, terms of reference and method of operation could be worked out by the Sub-Committee and its tasks could include: reviewing (with assistance from the Secretariat) all previous relevant IWC actions; determining where further work is necessary; and suggesting solutions to the issues and drafting potential recommendations.

6.1 Replacement of the term 'aboriginal'

The USA introduced IWC/63/ASW5 that proposed the replacement of the term 'aboriginal' with the term 'indigenous'. Although historically the term 'aboriginal' has been used in the management of whaling, in recent years (e.g. during IWC59 and during discussions of the Future of the IWC) some Commissioners have suggested that the term can be offensive and/or a misnomer and thus should be changed; it noted that there were no objections made at the time. The USA therefore proposed to:

- (1) discontinue using the term 'aboriginal' and replace it with the term 'indigenous';
- (2) continue, in principle, managing indigenous subsistence whaling under the terms of all currently existing management measures that apply to ASW including relevant Commission agreements; and
- (3) request the Secretariat to modify existing language used in applicable management measures and relevant agreements as necessary, including, as appropriate, preparing a Schedule amendment for the Commission's consideration.

In discussion of the proposal, a number of issues arose:

- (1) the importance of the issue;
- (2) the need for time to consider the proposed solution more fully, including complications with terms such as 'aborigine' and consideration of also removing the term 'native';
- (3) the absence of a definition of 'indigenous people(s)' within the UN system;
- (4) clarification that the use of the words 'in principle' in (2) above related to the timing of presenting a Schedule amendment and the fact that the Commission would have to use the old term and comply with existing management measures until such time as a Schedule amendment could be adopted.

Conclusion

The Sub-Committee noted the generally positive sentiments regarding the USA's proposal. However, noting the absence of some ASW countries and the expressed need for more time to consider the proposal, it **recommends** that the USA continues bilateral and multilateral discussions to try to develop a proposal that could be adopted by consensus at Plenary.

6.2 Facilitating technical exchange on ASW hunts

In introducing IWC/63/ASW6 on this matter, the USA noted that during previous meetings of this Sub-Committee, the Infractions Sub-Committee and the Whale Killing Methods and Associated Welfare Issues Working Group, a number of countries had commented that there appeared to be relatively little exchange of information between ASW nations on *inter alia* hunting techniques, equipment, hunter safety, time to death and

animal welfare aspects of the hunts. The USA noted that delegations and hunters of the four ASW countries regularly discuss these matters bilaterally, as well as within the informal 'ASW caucus' that has met on the margins of annual meetings since 2006. It believes that a broader exchange of technical information could lead to more efficient, safe, and improved hunts. To further facilitate this, the US suggested that the Sub-Committee considers forwarding a recommendation to the Commission that:

- (1) requests member governments with ASW hunts cooperate to the fullest extent possible in the exchange of technical information; and
- (2) acknowledges and welcomes the activities of the informal ASW caucus in facilitating the exchange of technical information and requests it to add an item on exchange of technical information to the agenda of its future meetings.

In discussion, Denmark welcomed the initiative. It noted that exchange of technical information was already taking place, for example with Alaskan hunters with respect to its bowhead hunt. It also referred Greenland's active participation in NAMMCO workshops and meetings related to technical aspects of the hunt. It viewed the USA's initiative as attempting to obtain Commission endorsement of the co-operative efforts to improve hunting techniques.

Conclusion

As under Item 6.1, the Sub-Committee noted the generally positive sentiments regarding the US proposal. However, noting the absence of some ASW countries and the need for more time to consider the proposal, it **recommends** that the USA continues bilateral and multilateral discussions with the two ASW countries not present prior to Plenary.

6.3 Guidelines for the preparation of need statements

The USA introduced IWC/63/ASW4 which dealt with conformance in preparing ASW needs statements. Under the ASW process, governments submit a 'needs statement' to request an ASW catch limit. The USA noted that, while the definition of ASW adopted by the Commission in 1982 defines the building blocks to follow in preparing such a statement, the Commission has not provided any guidance on a format for the statement. IWC/63/ASW4 includes suggested guidelines for needs statements and suggested that the Sub-Committee consider recommending its adoption by the Commission. In concluding its presentation, the USA reiterated that after consultation since drafting the document, it now believed that this issue should be considered a longer-term issue. The USA also commented that it knew of an existing background document on related issues that had been authored by Greg Donovan of the Secretariat. It believed that this could be of value to the Commission and suggested that the Sub-Committee request that this paper be made available as a Commission document.

Conclusion

As under the previous items, the Sub-Committee noted the generally positive sentiments regarding the US proposal. However, noting the absence of some ASW countries and the need for more time to consider the proposal, it **recommends** that the USA continues bilateral and multilateral discussions to try to develop a proposal that could be adopted by consensus at Plenary. The Sub-Committee also **recommends** that the background document developed by Donovan be submitted to Plenary for information.

6.4 Consideration of long-term issues

The USA introduced IWC/63/ASW3 that outlined a process to address long-term ASW issues including elaboration of the idea of an *ad hoc* working group noted above. It proposed that the Sub-Committee establish a small *ad hoc* working group comprising the four ASW countries and a small number of other interested parties and registered observers. The USA also highlighted the importance of the assistance of the Scientific Committee and of the Secretariat. It believed that a working group is needed because of the time required to conduct an in-depth examination of these issues. It stressed the importance of considering the issue of catch limits of various time lengths due to both the desire by ASW countries for longer periods and the issues surrounding the use of 5-year quota blocks if the Commission moves to biannual meetings. In presenting IWC/63/ASW3, the USA noted that the proposed list of issues was to assist discussion in the Sub-Committee and could of course be modified. It also suggested terms of reference for the working group. The USA suggested that the working group should report on their progress to the Sub-Committee in 2012 and provide a final report at IWC65 or beyond.

In discussion, it was noted that there would be minimal budgetary implications associated with the proposal, except perhaps any associated with staff time. It was also noted that the Scientific Committee already consider longer periods than 5 years when testing the performance of proposed *Strike Limit Algorithms* in the light of IWC management and conservation objectives.

Denmark thanked the USA for this initiative, which it broadly supported. It suggested that the four ASW countries could meet together develop proposals for the remaining partners in the group. It believed that there

has been different treatment of ASW countries recently in the IWC and it hoped that this initiative would result in better understanding and more equitable treatment. It expected that the Russian Federation and St. Vincent and the Grenadines would probably also support this initiative. However, it noted there was some further work needed with the proposed language and it believed that it would be wise to work on this initiative over a 2-year period.

Conclusion

As under the previous items, the Sub-Committee noted the generally positive sentiments regarding the US proposal. However, noting the absence of some ASW countries and the need for more time to consider the proposal, it **recommends** that the USA continues bilateral and multilateral discussions to try to develop a proposal that could be adopted by consensus at Plenary. It recognised that requests for additional work by the Scientific Committee would need to come from the Commission.

In concluding the overall discussion of Item 6, the Chair of the Sub-Committee encouraged members to submit comments to the USA on the four documents submitted and to work with the USA and others before the Plenary to try and reach consensus on proposals.

7. OTHER MATTERS

No matters were raised under this item.

8. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

The Chair thanked the participants for the constructive discussions held and the participants thanked the Chair for his efficient and fair handling of the meeting.

The report was adopted 'by post' at 1100hrs on Saturday 9 July.

Appendix 1

List of Participants

ARGENTINA

Miguel Iniguez

AUSTRALIA

Donna Petrachenko

Stephanie Ierino

Nick Gales

Pam Eiser

AUSTRIA

Andrea Nouak

Michel Stachowitsch

BELGIUM

Alexandre de Lichtervelde

Fabian Ritter

Els Vermeulen

BRAZIL

Marcus Paranagua

CHILE

Barbara Galletti

DENMARK

Amalie Jessen

Nette Levermann

Ole Samsing

FINLAND

Penina Blankett

GERMANY

Walter Duebner

Karl-Hermann Kock

ICELAND

Gisli Vikingsson

Asta Einarisdottir

Kristjan Loftsson

ITALY

Caterina Fortuna

JAPAN

Joji Morishita

Toshinori Uoya

Shinji Hiruma

Dan Goodman

KOREA

Dae Yeon Moon

LUXEMBOURG

Pierre Gallego

MEXICO

Lorenzo Rojas-Bracho

NETHERLANDS

Peter Bos

NEW ZEALAND

Andrew Bignell

Louise Chilvers

Caroline McDonald

NORWAY

Ole-David Stenseth

Einar Tallaksen

Lars Walløe

Egil Øen

Hild Ynnesdal

SOUTH AFRICA

Herman Oosthuizen

Ed Couzens

SPAIN

Santiago Lens

SWEDEN

Bo Fernholm

SWITZERLAND

Martin Krebs

UK

Richard Pullen

James Gray

Beatriz Roel

Vassili Papastravrou

Trevor Perfect

Anju Sharda

Mark Simmonds

USA

Rollie Schmitten

Doug DeMaster

Michael Tillman

Robert Brownell

Roger Eckert

Michael Gosliner

Lisa Phelps

Allison Reed

Ryan Wulff

Greig Arnold

Harry Brower

Eugene Brower

Brian Gruber

Ryland Bovechop

Greig Arnold

SC CHAIR

Debbie Palka

SECRETARIAT

Simon Brockington

Greg Donovan

Appendix 2

List of Documents

IWC/63/ASW

- 1 Draft Agenda
- 2 List of documents
- 3 Draft Proposal for Dealing with Long-term ASW Issues (USA)
- 4 Conformance in preparing Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Needs Statements (USA)
- 5 Replacement of the term 'Aboriginal' (USA)
- 6 Facilitating the exchange of technical information on ASW hunts (USA)

Commission documents

IWC/63/Rep1 Report of the Scientific Committee

Appendix 3

Agenda

1. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS
 - 1.1 Appointment of Chair
 - 1.2 Appointment of Rapporteur
 - 1.3 Review of Documents
 2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA
 3. ABORIGINAL SUBSISTENCE WHALING MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE
 - 3.1 Progress with the Greenlandic Research Programme
 - 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. ABORIGINAL SUBSISTENCE WHALING CATCH LIMITS
 - 5.1 Bering-Chukchi-Beaufort Seas stock of bowhead whales (annual review)
 - 5.1.1 Report of the Scientific Committee
 - 5.1.2 Discussion and Recommendations
 - 5.2 North Pacific Eastern stock of gray whales (annual review)
 - 5.2.1 Report of the Scientific Committee
 - 5.2.2 Discussion and Recommendations
 - 5.3 Common minke whale stocks off Greenland (annual review)
 - 5.3.1 Report of the Scientific Committee
 - 5.3.2 Discussion and Recommendations
 - 5.4 West Greenland stock of fin whales
 - 5.4.1 Report of the Scientific Committee
 - 5.4.2 Discussion and Recommendations
 - 5.5 West Greenland stock of bowhead whales
 - 5.5.1 Information from the Government of Canada
 - 5.5.2 Report of the Scientific Committee
 - 5.5.3 Discussion and Recommendations
 - 5.6 Humpback whales off West Greenland.
 - 5.6.1 Report of the Scientific Committee
 - 5.6.2 Discussion and Recommendations
 - 5.7 North Atlantic humpback whales off St. Vincent and the Grenadines
 - 5.7.1 Report of the Scientific Committee
 - 5.7.2 Discussion and Recommendations
 6. PREPARATION FOR 2012 REVIEW OF CATCH LIMITS
 7. OTHER MATTERS
 8. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT
- TERMS OF REFERENCE**
- The terms of reference of the Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Subcommittee are to consider relevant information and documentation from the Scientific Committee, and to consider nutritional, subsistence and cultural needs relating to aboriginal subsistence whaling and the use of whales taken for such purposes, and to provide advice on the dependence of aboriginal communities on specific whale stocks to the Commission for its consideration and determination of appropriate management measures (*Rep. int. Whal. Comm* 48: 31)
- 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.