

64th Annual Meeting of the International Whaling Commission

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

Panama City, Monday 25 June 2012

Contents

1. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS.....	2
1.1. Appointment of Chair.....	2
1.2 Appointment of rapporteur.....	2
1.3 Review of documents	2
2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA.....	2
3. DATA PROVIDED ON WHALES KILLED	2
3.1 New Zealand.....	2
3.2 USA	2
3.3. Denmark/Greenland.....	2
3.4 Russian Federation	2
3.5 Norway	2
3.6 General discussion	3
4. INFORMATION ON IMPROVING THE HUMANENESS OF WHALING OPERATIONS	3
4.1 USA	3
4.2 Norway	3
5. WELFARE ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH THE ENTANGLEMENT OF LARGE WHALES	4
5.1. Presentation of the report of the second IWC workshop on welfare issues associated with the entanglement of large whales.	4
5.2. Working group discussions and action arising	5
5.3 Report of Technical Expert's secondment to the Secretariat	5
5.4 Proposal to address human impacts on cetaceans in the wider Caribbean.....	6
6. WHALE WELFARE.....	7
6.1 Intersessional work by the United Kingdom on welfare and ethics.....	7
6.1.1 Report on intersessional work by the UK	7
6.1.2 Working group discussions and action arising including future workplan	8
7. NEW WEBSITE.....	8
8. Adoption of report	8

1. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The list of participants is given as Annex A.

1.1. Appointment of Chair

Given the other responsibilities of last year's Chair, Herman Oosthuizen (South Africa), Michael Stachowitsch (Austria) kindly took on the role as Chair.

1.2 Appointment of rapporteur

Greg Donovan (Secretariat) was appointed rapporteur.

1.3 Review of documents

The available documents are given in Annex C

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

The adopted agenda is given as Annex B.

3. DATA PROVIDED ON WHALES KILLED

This item 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 and/or time to death (TTD). 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.

3.1 New Zealand

IWC/64/WKM&AWI 4 summarises work undertaken in New Zealand with respect to the euthanasia of stranded animals that could not be rescued; these were 64 long-finned pilot whales, 14 pygmy sperm whales, 2 strap-toothed whales and 1 humpback whale. The methods used were various calibre rifles. In most cases the estimated TTD was instant but the estimated TTD for the humpback whale was 12 hours. New Zealand noted that determining how best to euthanise whales was an important issue for many governments and encouraged others to report their experiences and data (and see discussion under Items 5 and 6).

3.2 USA

IWC/64/WKM&AWI 10 summarises the information presented by the USA. In 2011, 38 bowhead whales were landed of which 20 were taken using black powder, 7 were taken using the new penthrate projectile and 12 were taken using black powder and the penthrate projectile. This is an increase from last year (2010), where 2 out of 45 whales were taken using penthrate. A total of 13 whales were struck and lost in 2011. Therefore, for 2011, the rate of efficiency of the hunt was 75% (the average over the last 10 years is 75%). This represents a considerable improvement over the 63% efficiency reported for 2010. The USA explained that weather and ice conditions play a significant role in determining the efficiency of the spring aboriginal bowhead whale hunts. Finally, the USA was pleased to report that use of the penthrate projectile is increasing and early 2012 reports show continued success in reducing time to death. This is discussed further under Item. 4.

3.3. Denmark/Greenland

IWC/64/WKM&AWI 7 summarises the information presented by Denmark/Greenland. There are two primary hunting types – the harpoon cannon hunting using penthrate grenades (with large calibre rifles as the secondary method for minke whales and penthrate grenades as secondary method for fin, bowhead and humpback whales) and the rifle hunt that uses large calibre rifles for minke whales. The median TTD for common minke whales for the former was 1 minute while the median TTD for the latter was 21 minutes. The median TTD for humpback whales was 3 minutes.

The Working Group thanked Denmark/Greenland for the presentation of this information.

3.4 Russian Federation

IWC/64/WKM&AWI 6 summarises the information presented by the Russian Federation. The hunt uses a harpoon with a float and then either a darting gun and/or a rifle. The mean TTD was 37 minutes.

The Working Group thanked the Russian Federation for the presentation of this information.

3.5 Norway

IWC/64/WKM&AWI 9 summarises the information presented by Norway.

In 2011, 533 whales were taken by 20 vessels. Five whales (0.9%) were reported lost and sank after they were dead. No whales were reported to have escaped wounded. At-sea monitoring was carried out by the Electronic Trip Recorder System (Blue Box). In addition, periodic checks of the hunting activities were carried out on eight boats by inspectors from the Directorate of Fisheries.

Harpoon guns of calibres 50 mm and 60 mm equipped with the Norwegian penthrite harpoon grenade developed in 1997-1999. Rifles with full metal jacket, round nosed bullets with a minimum calibre of 9.3 mm, are used as back-up weapons. Gunners must pass obligatory shooting tests, both with rifle and harpoon gun. At-sea monitoring is carried out on all boats by the Electronic Trip Recorder (Blue Box) developed in 2001-2005 (IWC/57/RMS/8). In addition, inspectors from the Norwegian Directorate of Fisheries conduct periodic and random checks of the hunt. In some years, observers under the NAMMCO International Observation Scheme are present on board during the hunting season.

The Working Group thanked Norway for the presentation of this information.

3.6 General discussion

The Working Group welcomed the continued provision of information and believed that this was a valuable component of IWC efforts to review and where possible assist with improvements in whale killing methods. It was noted that there was no information available for the hunt by St Vincent and The Grenadines and no representative present at the Working Group meeting. It hoped that the relevant information could be provided by St Vincent and The Grenadines either to the ASW sub-committee or the Plenary when a representative arrived.

Noting the extensive work undertaken by Norway in the period up to 2003 (see Item 4), Australia requested Norway to provide additional information on recent operations. Norway responded that for the reasons it has explained before about misuse of data, it believed that NAMMCO was a more suitable venue for it to report on whale killing methods in detail. This view was also expressed by Iceland and Japan.

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.

4.1 USA

Mr George Noongwook, Chairman of the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission (AEWC), said that the eleven whaling villages represented by the AEWC in 2011 struck 51 bowhead whales and landed 38, for an efficiency rate of 75%. He reviewed the conditions in the spring and fall hunts, noting that the ice conditions in the 2011 spring hunt were very poor.

Mr Noongwook then reviewed the weapons improvement program undertaken by the AEWC, and explained that the use of the new penthrite projectiles is continuing to expand, with only three of the eleven villages still needing to be trained in their use. The hunters are pleased with the new grenade and are especially grateful for Dr Egil Øen's collaboration and work on development and training of the new weapons. He also stated that in the spring hunt in 2012, the use of penthrite increased. In closing, Mr Noongwook noted that the penthrite projectiles are very expensive to buy and ship, and thanked the North Slope Borough and the US Government for their continued financial support of the weapons improvement programme.

Mr Eugene Brower, chairman of the AEWC Weapons Improvement Committee, then narrated a brief video that showed the successful use of a penthrite projectile to quickly kill a bowhead whale during the spring hunt.

The Working Group thanked the USA for this information and the presentation. Norway, Australia, UK and Mexico in particular commended the USA and the AEWC for the great progress made. Norway stressed the importance of human safety and of respecting local traditions and culture when assisting with the development of new weapons to improve the TTD for subsistence whaling. Local knowledge plays an extremely important role in both weapon improvements and training. He welcomed the news that two new villages were now using penthrite weapons, noting that full scale uptake of the penthrite weapon will bring even more improvements to TTD for the hunts and reduce struck-and-lost rates.

4.2 Norway

IWC/64/WKM&AWI 9 summarises the information presented by Norway. Norway summarised its long history of working to improve the humaneness of whale killing methods which has been recognised by several IWC workshops and has been contained in many documents and reports to the IWC and in scientific publications. For

the techniques now being used, at least 80% of animals are rendered instantly irreversibly unconscious or dead. The recorded average TTD was about 2 minutes using the criteria adopted by the IWC which will include periods when animals have been unconscious or already dead. Very few animals (< 0.5%) needed a second harpoon shot. In comparison, when cold harpoons were used (1981-83) the percentage of animals recorded dead quickly (instant or within 1 minute) was 17%. The average time to death (TTD) was more than 11 minutes with 17 per cent of re-shooting.

Norway has also played a major role in assisting other countries with training and improved technology. In accord with the IWC Action Plan, Dr. Egil Øen of Norway has worked co-operatively with hunters, scientists, authorities, and whale hunters' organisations in Norway, Canada (Nunavut and Nunavik), Greenland, Iceland, Japan, The Russian Federation (Chukotka) and the USA (Alaska). Norwegian scientists have also participated in and chaired expert group meetings in NAMMCO on whale killing data assessment and lectured in local workshops and training sessions for hunters.

5. WELFARE ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH THE ENTANGLEMENT OF LARGE WHALES

5.1. Presentation of the report of the second IWC workshop on welfare issues associated with the entanglement of large whales.

At IWC/63 in 2011 the WKM&AWI working group endorsed a series of recommendations presented through IWC/63/WKM&AWI 18. Amongst other things, these recommendations included a proposal to convene a second workshop on welfare issues and large whale entanglement response to be held in Provincetown, USA in October 2011.

The Chair of the Workshop, Arne Bjørge presented its report (IWC/64/WKM&AWI Rep 1). He recalled the background to the workshop, noting the three main priorities:

- (1) advance the progress made at the 2010 workshop;
- (2) develop 'Principles and Guidelines' for recommended practices for entanglement response;
- (3) develop a capacity building and training curricula.

He noted the thoroughness of the report and only a brief Chair's summary is presented here.

The Workshop first reviewed new information that had arisen since the 2010 workshop. This included information on new national disentanglement networks in New Zealand, British Columbia in Canada and in Argentina.

The Workshop also reviewed the findings of a US workshop held in 2011 to develop recommendations for stranded whale euthanasia methods. Three recommendations from that workshop were considered and endorsed:

- (1) further analyses of scavenger and environmental issues of euthanasia drugs should be undertaken (i.e. their effects on animals that may scavenge on the carcass before ultimate disposal and any effects on the environment).
- (2) cranial implosion techniques should be considered for adoption in regions where whales strand alive.
- (3) methods for at sea euthanasia should continue to be investigated.

The Workshop noted that explosive harpoon is a well-established tool for whale killing, but this tool is not available in most areas. Therefore no appropriate tool for at sea euthanasia is available in most areas. The workshop noted that in certain cases, severely moribund animals can be towed to shore and euthanised.

The Workshop then considered the value of improved documentation of entanglement response events. Improved documentation can assist in: increasing the safety and success of future efforts; understanding the scale and nature of specific entanglement; and facilitating the development of mitigation and prevention measures. The Workshop made a number of suggestions and recommendations in this regard.

An important and major outcome of the Workshop was the development of a set of Principles and Guidelines for Entanglement Response (Annex E of the report). The main goals of the entanglement response can be summarised in five points:

- (1) first comes human safety;
- (2) second animal welfare;
- (3) the entanglement response can contribute to the conservation of large whale populations as well as animal welfare issues;
- (4) data collection to assist with identifying key fisheries and whale populations to better describe the problem and assist with mitigation and prevention should be an integrated part of the entanglement response;

- (5) awareness at all levels to improve reporting and appropriate measures to address the mentioned issues.

The Workshop strongly commended these Principles and Guidelines to the Commission.

The Workshop was concerned at the danger to human life and the whales themselves from well-meaning but misguided attempts by non-experts to disentangle whales. It is therefore essential to consider an approach to capacity building and training. The Workshop agreed an outline of the capacity building and training programme in Annex F. Without going into details on the programme, the main focus of the programme is human safety and the achievement of the goals of the Principles and Guidelines.

The Workshop emphasised that the ultimate solution to large whale entanglement is prevention. However, as this was not a major topic for the workshop, it was only briefly reviewed. However, the Workshop did identify some research priorities and recommended the development of a full proposal for a future international workshop on prevention of large whale entanglements.

The final component of the Workshop was to examine ways to improve entanglement response efforts worldwide and to examine ways in which the IWC might assist in this. The Workshop stressed the great benefits to entanglement response effort of continued international collaboration and the establishment of a global network of recognised entanglement response operations. Given the global nature of IWC and its work on many fields related to conservation and management, there is a great potential value in these international efforts being undertaken under the auspices of the IWC. The Workshop therefore.... 'requested that the Commission endorses the global network of entanglement response operations (listed in Table 1 Annex G), the Guidelines and Principles for Disentanglement Response (given in Annex E) and the Recommended Approach to Capacity Building and Training (given in Annex F) and consider the following approach:'

- (1) establish a dynamic entanglement response section on the IWC Website;
- (2) consider establishing an international entanglement database;
- (3) facilitate data exchange;
- (4) promote establishment of national entanglement response networks;
- (5) provide advice to member governments;
- (6) develop a proposal for an international workshop on entanglement prevention;
- (7) continue to promote an IWC-managed fund for the entanglement response.

5.2. Working group discussions and action arising

The Working Group welcomed this extensive, thorough and clear report. It expressed its great appreciation to the Workshop organisers and participants. It **strongly endorses** the report and its conclusions and recommendations. It **commends** them to the Commission.

A number of specific comments were also raised. Norway supported the future work, noting that it had raised the issue of animal welfare in relation to entanglements before. It emphasised that in some cases it was not possible to release animals and in those cases it was important to kill the animal as quickly and painlessly as possible. It did not believe that public opinion or perceptions should be a governing factor as this may prolong the suffering of animals. Work to find suitable euthanasia techniques must continue and the experience of improved whaling weapons could prove a good basis for killing entangled animals that could not be rescued.

5.3 Report of Technical Expert's secondment to the Secretariat

IWC/64/F&A6 provides an overview of David Mattila's secondment to the Secretariat. IWC/64/WKM&AWI11 describes the first use of the IWC developed strategy and curriculum for entanglement response capacity building, as described above (in Appendix E and F of IWC/64/WKM&AWI Rep1 summarised above). During March, 2012, the Secretariat worked closely with the Commissioners from Argentina and Brazil in order to select appropriate candidates, work with relevant local authorities and conduct a series of seminars, classroom and practical trainings on all aspects of the topic. As a result, 43 key members of Brazil's National stranding network, including veterinarians and research biologists, were trained and assessed. In Argentina, an overview seminar was conducted for approximately thirty veterinarians and scientists in Buenos Aires. In the Chubut Province, World Heritage site for Southern right whale breeding grounds, over sixty veterinarians, scientists, governmental authorities, and professional ocean users were trained in the classroom, while ten individuals with some previous experience were given practical training on the water. Both formal and informal discussions held during the trainings and seminars stimulated the initiation of entanglement research and mitigation in the region. Upon completion, the Secretariat and Commissioners reviewed candidates for potential advanced apprenticeships.

The Working Group thanked Mattila for his valuable work, as well as the Governments of the USA, Argentina and Brazil. It stressed the importance of the extension of this work to other areas (and see the Item 5.4 below) where entanglements of large whales occur.

Argentina thanked the Secretariat and the USA for the training and encouraged others to take advantage of the programme. As a result of the workshops, the director of the Dirección de Fauna y Flora Silvestre (Division of wild flora and fauna), for the Ministerio de la Producción (Ministry of agriculture), for the Chubut Province, and the regional stranding director, authored a paper on entanglements of southern right whales in the region over the past decade (IWC/64/BC1). It described the entanglements and outcomes of 12 known cases of which 6 were released. More than half of the cases were in local boat moorings, a finding which stimulated local proposals for mitigation, and have encouraged Argentina (and Brazil) to more broadly work on prevention. Thanks were also expressed for the whale watching companies in Chubut, which provided vessel support for the training, and whose captains make up much of the response team.

The USA also thanked Mattila and the Governments of Argentina and Brazil. It stressed the value of this IWC structured approach, as it ensured that trainers work with the proper national and regional authorities, and that working together, the proper candidate trainees are selected (e.g. from authorised stranding networks) in accordance with the recommendations from the Provincetown Workshop. An essential component of the approach developed by the Workshop was the development of apprenticeships to give trainees practical experience in real entanglement responses. In this context, the USA announced the donation of \$12,000 USD in order to support apprentices from Argentina and Brazil to visit the USA for advanced training. The Working Group **expresses** great appreciation to the USA for facilitating the essential training component of apprenticeships.

5.4 Proposal to address human impacts on cetaceans in the wider Caribbean

The Working Group received IWC/64/WKM&AWI 12, a proposal sponsored by the Dominican Republic, France, Mexico, Panama and the USA to help address indirect human impacts on marine mammals of the wider Caribbean region including entanglements and ship strikes.

In accordance with the recommendations of the IWC and CEP's Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife's (SPA) Action Plan for the Conservation of Marine Mammals in the Wider Caribbean Region (Marine Mammal Action Plan, MMAP), the document proposes that the IWC and CEP Secretariats partner with interested member governments in order to convene workshops on these topics for the Wider Caribbean countries as follows:

- (1) an Interdisciplinary Ship Strike Workshop (2013); and
- (2) two Large Whale Entanglement Training Workshops (2012/2013).

IWC expertise can assist the countries of the Wider Caribbean region through this series of capacity building and mitigation workshops.

With regard to the ship strike issue in the region, there are two major components to address:

(i) gathering data on the risk associated with particular species and areas; and (ii) identifying potential mitigation actions. Currently identified partners include the IWC, UNEP-CEP, SPAW Regional Activity Center and the Parties of the Sister Sanctuary Agreement (Dominican Republic, France, the Netherlands, and the United States), but it is hoped to expand this to include other interested parties (e.g. IMO, stakeholders and other countries in the region). It is proposed that the terms of reference, agenda, venue and invited participants for this workshop be determined by an IWC-led steering committee in consultation with UNEP-CEP and Sister Sanctuary Parties. The Ship Strike Workshop could be held in 2013.

With regard to large whale entanglement, two practical workshops are proposed. These capacity building workshops will follow the approach recommended by the Provincetown Workshop (see above). The practical workshops will also include an extra day of training in the determination of human-caused mortalities, conducted by an internationally recognized expert on the topic. It is anticipated that these workshops will each take place in different venues and languages. One will be an English-French workshop in the French West Indies (e.g. Martinique, Guadeloupe), and the other will be an English-Spanish workshop, probably in Mexico.

It was proposed that the IWC Secretariat works with the UNEP CEP Secretariat and appropriate member governments, including the Parties of the Sister Sanctuary Agreement and other interested Parties on developing a list of invited participants, other logistics and necessary support.

The representative of UNEP-SPAW-RAC spoke in strong support of this proposal, stressing that it addresses many of the priorities in their marine mammal action plan.

The Working Group welcomed and supported this collaborative initiative and **commends** it to the Commission.

6. WHALE WELFARE

6.1 Intersessional work by the United Kingdom on welfare and ethics

At IWC/63 in 2011, the Commission considered the outputs of a workshop convened by the UK on issues relating to welfare and ethics in the context of the IWC. No consensus was reached at that meeting on a UK proposal to establish an *ad-hoc* IWC group to develop further recommendations. The UK therefore stated its intention to take the work forwards intersessionally in collaboration with those countries that had expressed support.

6.1.1 Report on intersessional work by the UK

The UK introduced IWC/64/WKM&AWI 3. Representatives from ten countries attended a UK organised workshop held in London in March 2012. It received presentations on the history of animal welfare issues in the IWC and developments in other international fora in dealing with animal welfare issues.

The group acknowledged that animal welfare is an issue which includes important ethical, economic and political dimensions and that animal welfare is relevant to many issues in addition to direct takes, including, whale watching, ship strikes, and bycatch. It discussed the importance of Governments continuing to share information with the IWC, as these data are required to advance scientific understanding for conservation and management.

It was noted that in recent years, some of the most important steps forward on welfare issues have been taken by aboriginal subsistence whaling countries. While agreeing general principles and actions are important, it was important to recognise that not all recommendations are practicable in subsistence whaling.

The group recognised that many IWC working groups are already giving significant consideration to the promotion of good animal welfare in the course of existing and ongoing projects. It was suggested that it may be practical for animal welfare to be taken into consideration and, where appropriate, addressed by all relevant IWC working groups and committees rather than for all welfare issues to be exclusively referred to the Working Group on Whale Killing Methods and Associated Welfare Issues.

There was also some discussion on the development of general guiding principles on animal welfare. It was suggested that co-operation with other inter-governmental bodies such as the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) could be a valuable exercise to ensure clarity and consistency of approach to the promotion of good animal welfare across the spectrum of the IWC's work.

It was recognised that the IWC has a significant history of working on welfare issues as well as a current Action Plan that is worth reviewing and building upon. It was noted that the IWC Scientific Committee has already recognised the need for external expertise when dealing with animal welfare issues, and previous expert workshops on whale killing methods and animal welfare-related issues have successfully allowed for that outside expertise to play a role in advancing these topics within the Commission.

The workshop recommendations (discussed further under Item 6.1.2 below) were developed to try find ways forward on such issues for amongst all IWC members.

After presenting the document, the UK commented that in its view the IWC has achieved some significant progress on welfare issues. However, in recent years, multilateral cooperation on such issues within the IWC has slowed. It noted that all Governments are in agreement that welfare is an important issue; the question is how best the issue can be addressed in a constructive manner. The UK was willing to assist in this regard, noting that this issue was not restricted to whaling operations but posed challenges to all governments.

The UK had recognised the concerns raised last year about the way in which certain data provided to the Commission had been interpreted and used. It is for this reason that it invites all countries to be involved intersessionally to develop this work to ensure that it proceeds in a manner that is acceptable to all. It also does not wish to duplicate work which is why it is important to identify areas to best focus IWC effort. The UK believes that this needs to be a dual process, making progress on technical areas needing resolution, underneath an overarching framework to ensure the IWC is keeping pace with developments in animal welfare science globally. As the work on entanglements has shown, wider debates regarding whales and whaling can be put in abeyance in order for progress to be made.

It believes that all countries will benefit by taking the opportunity to focus and identify regional or specific problems that need resolving with the assistance of the international community. The IWC could provide a forum to share experience and hopefully, progress towards practical answers to some of problems all face.

6.1.2 Working group discussions and action arising including future workplan

There was considerable discussion of this document and on how the IWC might take some of these issues forward. Several countries thanked the UK for its presentation and the collaborative approach suggested. They noted that the broader issues outside whaling were important from an animal welfare perspective and were relevant to problems faced by many members of the Commission.

Discussion then focussed on the proposed recommendations in IWC/64/WKM&AWI 3 and in conclusion, the Working Group **requests** to the Commission that the Working Group forms an *ad-hoc* intersessional working group to:

- (1) review its Terms of Reference and existing Action Plan to see if they need updating or revision and make recommendations accordingly; and
- (2) identify and agree upon important issues or themes to progress the promotion of good animal welfare and agree a timetable of regular future technical workshops on these issues, that would report back to the relevant working groups, recognising the success of previous IWC workshops on specific issues incorporating invited external experts.

In addition, it **recommends** the development of plans for an expert workshop on the euthanasia of large whales (both stranded animals and those entangled whales for which euthanasia appears to be the only option in accordance with the decision tree developed at the Maui workshop). As noted by Norway, this workshop could take advantage of the extensive previous discussions at IWC expert workshops relating to the criteria for determining unconsciousness and death in whales.

Finally, it **recommends** that the Secretariat be asked to (a) develop a database of external contacts with expertise in animal welfare science pertinent to work being undertaken by the Commission; and (b) recommend to the Commission opportunities for constructive co-operation with other relevant animal welfare bodies.

7. NEW WEBSITE

At IWC/63 in 2011, the Secretariat was requested to provide a beta version of the Commission's new website to IWC/64. In fulfilment of this request, the Secretary introduced a launch candidate version of the new site. Members of the WKM&AWI working group were requested to review the content of the new site as relevant to WKM&AWI affairs and pass any requests for changes to the Chair of the WKM&AWI before the end of IWC64. The 'dummy' website address is: <http://demo.iwcoffice.org/>.

8. ADOPTION OF REPORT

The report was adopted by email on 29 June 2012.

Annex A

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Argentina

Victor Marzari
Miguel Iniguez

Australia

Pam Eiser
Nick Gales
Stephanie Ienino
Victoria Wadley
Alexia Wellbelove

Austria

Andrea Nouak
Michael Stachowitch (Chair)

Chile

Barbara Galletti

Costa Rica

Eugenia Arguedas
Ricardo Meneses

Denmark

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

Ecuador

Gustavo Iturralde

Germany

Karl-Hermann Kock
Lutz Friedrichsen

Iceland

Asta Einarsdottir
Gisli Vikingsson

Italy

Plinio Conte
M. Francesca Granata

Japan

Shinji Hiruma
Kiyoshi Katsuyama
Toshihide Kitakado
Tomio Miyashita
Takaaki Sakamoto

Korea, Republic of

Du Hae An
Yong Rock An

Mexico

Lorenzo Rojas-Bracho
Yolanda Alaniz

New Zealand

Louise Chilvers
Karena Lyons

Norway

Ole-Savid Stenseth
Arne Bjørge
Egil Øen
Kathrine Ryeng
Truls Soløy
Lars Walløe
Hild Ynnesdal

Panama

Hector Guzman
Gabriel Despaigne

Russian Federation

Valentin Ilyashenko
Olga Etylin
Alexey Ottoy

St. Lucia

Jeannine Compton-Antoine

South Africa

Herman Oosthuizen
Ed Couzens

Spain

Santiago Lens

Sweden

Bo Fernholm

Switzerland

Bruno Mainini

UK

Nigel Gooding
Nicola Clarke
Jim Gray
Jenny Lonsdale
Beatriz Roel
Anju Sharda
Mark Simmonds
Jolyon Thompson

USA

Melissa Andersen
Greig Arnold
Charlotte Brower
Eugene Brower
Robert Brownell
Roger Eckert
Brian Gruber
Keith Johnson
Taryn Kiekow
Michael Lawrence
Ira New Breast
George Noongwook
Elizabeth Phelps
Ann Renker
Rollie Schmitten
DJ Schubert
Jonathan Scordino
Michael Tillman
Ryan Wulff

SC Chair

Debra Palka

IWC Secretariat

Simon Brockington
Greg Donovan
David Mattila

Annex B
AGENDA

1. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS
 - 1.1. Appointment of Chair
 - 1.2. Appointment of Rapporteur
 - 1.3. Review of Documents
2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA
3. DATA PROVIDED ON WHALES KILLED
4. INFORMATION ON IMPROVING THE HUMANENESS OF WHALING OPERATIONS
5. WELFARE ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH THE ENTANGLEMENT OF LARGE WHALES
 - 5.1. Presentation of the report of the second IWC workshop on welfare issues associated with the entanglement of large whales (Document IWC/64/WKM&AWI Rep 1)
 - 5.2. Working group discussions and action arising
6. WHALE WELFARE
 - 6.1. Intersessional work by the United Kingdom on welfare and ethics
 - 6.1.1. Report on intersessional work by the UK
 - 6.1.2. Working group discussions and action arising including future workplan
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 52nd 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.

Annex C

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

- | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| IWC/64/WKM&AWI | 1 | Draft Agenda |
| | 2 | List of Documents |
| | 3 | Report of the Intersessional Workshop on Welfare and Recommendations for Future Work (Submitted by the United Kingdom) |

- 4 Summary of Activities Related to the Action Plan on Whale Killing Methods (based on Resolution 1999-1) (submitted by New Zealand)
- 5 Ethical Review of Animal Experiments - a global perspective by DJ Fry (submitted by the United Kingdom)
- 6 Summary of Activities Related to the Action Plan on Whale Killing Methods (based on Resolution 1999-1) (submitted by the Russian Federation)
- 7 Summary of Activities Related to the Action Plan on Whale Killing Methods (based on Resolution 1999-1) (submitted by Greenland/Denmark)
- 8 US Report on Weapons, Techniques, and Observations in the Alaskan Bowhead Whale Subsistence Hunt (submitted by USA)
- 9 Norwegian Minke Whaling 2011 (submitted by Norway)
- 10 Summary of Activities Related to the Action Plan on Whale Killing Methods (based on Resolution 1999-1) (submitted by USA)
- 11 Summary of capacity building activities provided by the IWC to: Argentina and Brazil, March 2012
- 12 Proposal to address indirect human impacts on marine mammals of the wider Caribbean region (submitted by Dominican Republic, France, Mexico, Panama and the United States)

IWC/64/WKM&AWI

- REP 1 Report of the Second IWC Workshop on Welfare Issues Associated with the Entanglement of Large Whales with a Focus on Entanglement Response