

Chair's Report of the Intersessional Meeting of the Commission

St. Pete Beach, Florida 4 March 2010

1. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The meeting was held in St. Pete Beach, Florida, USA on 4 March 2010. It was attended by 35 of the Commission's 88 Contracting Governments. A list of participants is given as Annex A. The meeting was to have been chaired by Cristian Maquieira, Chair of the Commission. Unfortunately, Ambassador Maquieira was unable to attend the meeting because of important duties he had following the earthquake that hit Chile on 27 February. He sent his apologies to the meeting and asked Anthony Liverpool, Vice-Chair of the Commission to chair the meeting in his place.

The meeting extended its sympathies and condolences to Ambassador Maquieira and the people of Chile at this difficult time.

1.1 Introductory remarks

The Chair welcomed participants and observers to the meeting and on behalf of the Commission thanked the USA for its generous help in holding the meeting.

The Chair recalled that at the 2009 Annual Meeting in Madeira, the Commission agreed to leave open the decision on Greenland's request for a take of humpback whales (IWC/61/11rev) until an intersessional meeting, by which time the report from a small scientific group established to investigate the issue of conversion factors would be available to facilitate discussions; the extensive 52pp. report is available as IWC/M10/2 'Report of the small working group on conversion factors (from whales to edible products) for the Greenlandic large whale hunt'.

The Chair explained that the purpose of the intersessional meeting was to take a decision on Greenland's request. However, he reported with regret that as there was not a quorum of the membership present (i.e. a majority), it would not be possible to take a decision. Nevertheless he intended to proceed with the presentation of and discussion on the report on conversion factors and to invite Denmark/Greenland to presents its proposed Schedule amendment if it so wished.

1.2 Reporting

The Chair noted that he would prepare a Chair's Report to be circulated after the meeting.

1.3 List of documents

The list of documents available to the meeting is given as Annex B.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

The agenda adopted is given as Annex C. The Chair noted that because there was no quorum, there would be no action arising under item 4.2.

3. REPORT OF THE SMALL WORKING GROUP ON CONVERSION FACTORS FOR THE GREENLANDIC LARGE WHALE HUNT

3.1 Presentation of the Report

Greg Donovan, the Secretariat's Head of Science and convenor of the small working group presented, in some depth, the report of the small working group on conversion factors for the Greenlandic large whale hunt. A summary is provided below.

At the request of the Commission, a small scientific group (Table 1) was established to examine the issue of the quantities of edible products that might be expected from catches of common minke, fin, bowhead and humpback whales in the Greenlandic fisheries. It is important to note that the group was not asked to examine the 'need statement' itself.

Table 1: The members of the small working group.

Greg Donovan	Head of Science IWC, Chair of Standing Working Group on the Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Management Procedure (AWMP) and field experience in Greenland
Debi Palka	Chair of the Scientific Committee
Craig George	Member of Scientific Committee with experience in fieldwork on Bering-Chukchi-Beaufort Seas stock of bowhead whales
Philip Hammond	Ex-chair Scientific Committee, University of St Andrews, fieldwork in Greenland
Lars Witting	Scientist from Greenland Institute of Natural Resources and member of the Scientific Committee
Nette Levermann	Representative of the Government of Greenland

An extremely important component of the group's work was a field visit to Greenland to obtain as much information possible on those factors that might affect yield. The group visited the three largest settlements in Greenland (Sisimiut, Ilulissat and Nuuk), interviewed hunters and wildlife officers, and visited a variety of flensing site types. In addition the group was granted access to the raw data on edible products provided by hunters.

During the field trip, considerable general information on the nature of the hunt was collected. There are two types of hunting of large whales off Greenland: the harpoon hunt (all species) and the rifle hunt (common minke whales only); about three-quarters of the common minke whales are taken by harpoon and one-quarter by rifle. In both types of hunting, whaling is only a seasonal part of the activities of the hunters, along with, for example, fishing and the hunting of land animals. While the expenses of the harpoon hunt are greater than those of the rifle hunt (for example, a single explosive grenade can cost US\$1,000), the number of hunters requiring a share is considerably less - up to 7 versus up to 40). Only persons with a full-time occupational hunting license are allowed to hunt large whales. There are a number of important conditions and limitations imposed on the hunt, including those related to catch limits, methods of hunting, training and reporting.

In terms of edible products, as is the case elsewhere in the world, differences were found in what products are considered edible by region. In all places, blubber, muscle, throat, peduncle and flukes are consumed but the importance attached to internal organs and intestines varied.

In Greenland there are a wide variety of flensing sites and a number of techniques used to manoeuvre the whale into a position on land to allow flensing to occur. The time it takes to flense an animal depends on a number of factors including size of the flensing team, weather conditions, nature of the site (e.g. if an animal could not be completely flensed in one tide cycle) and the size of the animal. Flensing times vary with conditions but range from about 1-4 hours for common minke whales to 12-48 hours for fin and bowhead whales. There were no financial or other incentives for hunters not to obtain as much edible products from each whale as possible given the conditions. The group's visit to the remains of one flensing operation of a common minke whale suggested an efficient process for this species. This was confirmed by the fact that the edible product yield for common minke whales obtained from the Greenlandic data is similar to that obtained under 'ideal' conditions elsewhere in the world. Larger whales (including large minke whales) are more difficult to fully flense (as well as capture) than smaller whales given *inter alia* the time required (more than one tidal cycle) and difficulties in manoeuvring the animal during flensing.

To examine the most appropriate dataset for developing conversion factors, the group undertook a thorough review of all relevant published and unpublished data. The details and conclusions of that review are provided in the report (Item 3). Particular focus was placed on strengths and weaknesses of the hunter-provided data on lengths and amounts of edible products for Greenland that has been submitted to the Ministry of Fisheries, Hunting and Agriculture since 1987. During the interviews with the hunters, an important discovery was made that is critical to understanding and interpreting the Greenlandic data i.e. the length measurements are taken over the body rather than parallel to the body – this results in an overestimate of length data compared to the 'standard' measurements used in traditional length-weight relationship studies reported. The extent to which this is an overestimate is unknown and the group recommended that a formal study to examine this be carried out.

After an extensive review of the available data from Greenland and elsewhere, the group agreed that for common minke and fin whales, the most appropriate data to use for the present study (i.e. obtaining realistic conversion factors for the circumstances of the Greenlandic hunts) are the Greenlandic data themselves, appropriately truncated on the basis of the scientific data available from other studies to allow for known and suspected issues with hunter-derived data. These issues include: (a) that the data were not collected as part of a scientific experiment; (b) some hunters do not fill in forms completely and may not include products taken directly by

captain and/or crew; and (c) there are differences in yield related to local circumstances including what is considered edible, flensing site conditions, reporting rigour and what is considered necessary to report. There were little or no useful local data for humpback and bowhead whales and so external data were used for these.

After reviewing possible approaches for estimating the average yield of products per whale and correcting this for struck-and-lost animals to obtain the average yield per strike (i.e. the amount that one could expect to contribute to meeting need, taking into account that strike limits are not always met), the group adopted a method for each species as described in item 4.2.3 of the report. The results of this, including a consideration of uncertainty, are given in detail under Item 5 of the report and summarised in Table 2 below. Information is also provided for conversion factors that do not take into account the fact that strike limits are always met. Conversion factors for the fin, bowhead and humpback whale are considered to be interim factors pending the collection of additional data recommended below.

Table 2

The recommended conversion factors per strike (RCFPS). In addition the equivalent conversion factors per animal (RCFPA), as well as the original conversion factors (per animal and calculated per strike on the basis of the struck-and-lost rates given in the report – OCFPA and OCFPS) are provided. NG = not previously given.

Note: If the allowance for not reaching the strike limits is not incorporated into the correction factor per strike then the factors would be 1.84 for common minke whales, 9.2 for fin whales and 10.4 for humpbacks

	OCFPA	RCFPA	OCFPS	RCFPS
Common minke whale	2	1.88	1.96	1.82
Fin whale (interim)	10	10.91	6.6	6.8
Bowhead whale (interim)	NG	11.00	NG	11
Humpback whale (interim)	NG	11.59	NG	9.5

The group stressed that the conversion factors recommended are average values based wherever possible on the available Greenlandic data, truncated to remove implausibly low or high values for products based on the best scientific evidence. This reduces the likelihood of either over- or underestimating the product yield when assessing whether particular combinations of catch limits do or do not meet need. The use of average values is important in that it takes into account the variation in yield that is to be expected in a hunt in which animals of varying lengths are taken throughout a season in which animals are feeding, not to mention natural variation among individuals. While in theory, a weighted conversion factor (or factors) could be obtained that tried to take into account the many factors that may affect yield per animal (Item 4 of the report) the group did not believe that the data that exist now, or that might be expected to be obtained in the future would justify this level of analysis. The implications for determining *Strike Limit Algorithms* and for setting catch limits under such a regime would also be extremely complex.

Where data permit, the recommended conversion factors are provided to more accurate values rather than an integer since the ultimate use for these factors is to provide information on whether and how the Greenlandic multispecies hunt can obtain an agreed level of need expressed in terms of edible products. This is particularly important for common minke whales where the annual strike limit recommended by the Scientific Committee is 178 animals and thus rounding to an integer can have a major effect on estimated products obtained.

Table 3 provides information on estimated edible products using these conversion factors for (A) the present strike limits and (B) for those limits that were in accord with Scientific Committee advice in its report based upon the request by Denmark. It only includes catches for West Greenland (Denmark requested its 670 tonnes of products for West Greenland – its need statement for East Greenland is expressed in terms of numbers of animals - 12).

Given a number of uncertainties described in its report and the different levels of available information by species, the group made a number of recommendations for further work. These are summarised below.

Given the large sample size and consistency with scientific studies for common minke whales, the group agreed that while data on the yield of edible products should and will continue to be collected under the existing Greenland regulations, and the importance of that emphasised, the focussed effort should concentrate on the other species, where the sample sizes are small. The group therefore recommended that a focussed attempt to collect new data on edible products taken from species other than common minke whales be undertaken, at least until the end of the next block quota when the interim conversion factors should be reviewed (i.e. 2012). These data should be collected as a collaborative effort between scientists, wildlife officers and hunters. The small working group expressed its willingness to assist in terms of design and analyses.

The group also recommended that data on both ‘curved’ and ‘standard’ measurements are obtained during the coming season for all species taken. These data should be collected as a collaborative effort between scientists, wildlife officers and hunters. Again, the group expressed its willingness to assist in terms of design and analyses.

Finally, the group recommended that the conversion factors are re-evaluated at the end of each five-year block to take into account the new information on struck-and-lost animals, quota fulfilment and yield.

Table 3

Information on tonnes (t) of products to be expected on average for certain catch limits (see text) using the conversion factors per strike (RCFPS) recommended in this report and for (A) the present strike limits and (B) for those limits that were in accord with Scientific Committee advice in its report based upon the request by Denmark.

Note: If the allowance for not reaching the strike limits is not incorporated into the correction factor per strike then the total values for (A) and (B) would be 565t and 628t

	RCFPS	(A) present limits	(B) Limits within SC advice on sustainability	Products for (A)	Products for (B)
Common minke whale	1.82	200	178	364	324
Fin whale	6.8	19	19	129	129
Bowhead whale	11	2	2	22	22
Humpback whale	9.5	0	10	0	95
Total				515	570

3.2 Discussion

All those countries that spoke congratulated the small working group for its work and thorough report. The co-operation shown by the Greenland Home Rule Government and the hunters was also acknowledged.

Denmark considered that the findings of the report responds to a number of questions posed in the past. It believed that the results showed that Greenland had not been using conversion factors that have been inflating its quota requests, but rather the opposite, i.e. if the new conversion factors were applied, then the quotas would have to be increased to reach the 670 tonnes estimated need of whale meat.

The USA, who had experts on the small working group, accepted the report which it believed resolved previous concerns regarding the conversion factors used. It also considered that the processing efficiency of the Greenland hunt is reasonable and could accept the conversion factor proposed for humpback whales. The USA supported the working group’s recommendations for further data collection. With respect to processing efficiency, while recognising the difficult flensing conditions in Greenland, Mexico asked whether there is any way this could be improved, particularly for large whales. Argentina made a similar remark and expressed concern regarding the potential waste if humpbacks were to be included in the hunt.

The UK supported the working group’s request for more data and hoped that this would be forthcoming. It requested clarification with respect to how the group’s recommendation that conversion factors be re-evaluated at the end of each five-year block related to the draft Consensus Decision to Improve the Conservation of Whales discussed during the Small Working Group meeting on 2-4 March (Document IWC/M10/SWG 4) which it understood to have no five-year quota blocks. The UK also questioned why the small working group had chosen to correct the average yield of products per whale for struck-and-lost animals to obtain the average yield per strike. In view of these questions and recognising that a decision on Greenland’s request could not be taken in Florida, the UK suggested that the small working group’s report be forwarded to the Scientific Committee for review if an appropriate procedural mechanism could be agreed. Germany also expressed some unease regarding the correction of data to take account of struck-and-lost animals.

A number of countries supported the UK’s suggestion that the working group’s report be submitted to the Scientific Committee, including the USA, Australia, Argentina, Mexico, Portugal and Costa Rica. Australia considered that the reasons the report should go to the Committee related to the sparseness of the data that was available, over-confidence in some of the results and the use of correction factors. Portugal believed that there was also a need to review the subsistence needs of Greenland.

Noting the calls by some for further work on conversion factors, St. Lucia suggested that additional unnecessary demands were being made of Greenland. It urged Commissioners to consider carefully their requests for further work, including the review of the working group’s report by the Scientific Committee, since in its view the report addresses adequately the issues raised at IWC/61. Cambodia associated itself with these remarks. Norway, Iceland, Sweden and Denmark also did not believe that it was necessary for the Scientific Committee to review the working group’s report. Norway suggested that the Scientific Committee: (1) would not be able to

perform a complete review without an enormous amount of work if it decided that it would need access to the primary data; and (2) already has many high priority tasks for IWC/62 in Agadir. Iceland agreed and believed that the Commission was spending a disproportionate amount of time on a modest request from Greenland that is scientifically based and obviously sustainable. Furthermore, Iceland considered this issue to be an integral part of the discussions on the future of the IWC and that a solution should appear as part of the 'collage' of measures under discussion. Sweden questioned what exactly was being requested of the Scientific Committee if it received the working group's report. While Denmark did not see the necessity for the Scientific Committee to review the report, it would not object to such a review if the Committee had the time. However, it noted that the work initiated last year was to assess whether the conversion factors that Greenland had been using were wrong – a question it believed had been answered satisfactorily.

Responding to a number of comments made, the Head of Science noted that the issue of how the re-calculation of conversion factors at the end of each quota block for aboriginal subsistence whaling and are dealt with in any Consensus Decision would be a matter for the Commission, not the Scientific Committee. Regarding correcting for struck-and-lost animals, he noted that the group had presented what it considered to be the most appropriate method to determine the amount of edible products reaching Greenlanders (if the hunters are not able to reach the strike limit, they cannot achieve the desired yield); however, it had also presented results with and without the use of the correction factor. He also stressed that whether or not to correct for struck-and-lost animals is also a matter for the Commission, as is any decision about the acceptable level of 'waste', the need to improve flensing efficiency and a review of subsistence need; all of these are outside the terms of reference of the small group. Regarding the question of the sparseness of data and overconfidence in the results, he noted that a major part of the small group's report had focussed on the undertaking of a thorough review of the available data. It had identified the strengths and weaknesses in the datasets and indicated that for three of the four species considered, the conversion factors should be considered interim until further data can be collected. Finally, with respect to workload, the Head of Science confirmed the heavy workload of the SWG on the Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Management Procedure (which in addition to its usual work was scheduled to carry out an *Implementation Review* of eastern gray whales) and the sub-committee on the Revised Management Procedure (that was undertaking a *pre-Implementation Assessment* of western North Pacific common minke whales). However, he noted that the Committee would of course review the report if asked.

In conclusion, the meeting agreed that it was not necessary for the report to be reviewed by the full Scientific Committee in Agadir. However, the Head of Science indicated that the authors would be pleased to receive comments on their report directly and, if necessary, produce a revised version for consideration by the Commission in Agadir. The meeting therefore agreed that should any Scientific Committee members (or others) have comments on the report, these should be sent directly to the authors via the Secretariat's Head of Science.

4. PROPOSED SCHEDULE AMENDMENT

4.1 Presentation of the proposed Schedule amendment

Statement by Ane Hansen, Minister of Fisheries, Hunting and Agriculture, Greenland

Before the introduction of the proposed Schedule amendment itself, Ane Hansen, Minister of Fisheries, Hunting and Agriculture for Greenland addressed the meeting. She underlined Greenland's commitment to working within relevant international and regional organisations on the management of living natural resources, including whales, but also stressed the importance of mutual understanding and respect for cultural differences in such fora.

In implementing self-governance, the Minister referred to the need for Greenland to make full use of its own natural resources (on a sustainable basis and based on sound science) so as to limit the importation of western food, which in turn will contribute to a reduction in CO₂ emissions and modern life-style diseases. She stressed the importance of taking an ecosystem-based approach to the management of living resources and noted that the increasing number of whales and seals around Greenland are the biggest competitors to its fishermen and hunters.

With respect to Greenlandic whaling, the Minister noted that for many years it has been fulfilling requirements for its quotas to be based on sound science and for its hunts to be properly regulated and conducted in an effective manner in relation to killing methods. Despite this, Greenland felt that some IWC members were trying to find new excuses as to why its request for a take of humpback whales should be denied, including for example through questioning the commerciality of its hunt. In this respect she noted that in the present day, all activities involve money, that there are expenses associated with the hunt (see section 3.1 above) and that any surplus income generated is used to maintain hunting gear.

The Minister referred to the 2007 UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and in particular to those Articles concerning the rights of such peoples to determine their own identity and membership as well as their self determination and their own means of subsistence and economic and social development. She believed that the UN Declaration would be violated if a satisfactory solution to Greenland's request could not be found. She also believed that the domestic policies of some IWC member countries were obstructing the ability of the organisation to fulfil its objectives and purpose as set out in the 1946 International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling and strongly believed that the IWC should be able to support reasonable subsistence quota requests provided that they are sustainable within the scope of subsistence needs for local use and that the whaling operations are properly regulated.

The Minister warned that if the IWC could not differentiate between domestic politics and the objectives and purpose of the Convention, Greenland would question the relevancy of its continued membership of the organisation. Furthermore she noted her concern for the other subsistence hunters whose quotas are set by the IWC.

Statement by Leif Fontaine, Chairman of the Organisation of Fishermen and Hunters in Greenland

The Minister's statement was followed by one from Leif Fontaine, Chairman of the Organisation of Fishermen and Hunters in Greenland who spoke about Greenland's traditional hunting culture, which has a history of over 1,000 years, and the importance of subsistence whaling that supplies meat for many Greenlanders all through the year. He noted that renewable resources, including whales, form the basis of Greenlanders' existence. Thus it is necessary for them to protect their environment and use the resources sustainably. He noted the improvements over the years in hunting methods that have lead to improvements in times to death of hunted whales. Also referring to the UN Declaration the Rights of Indigenous Peoples the Indigenous peoples, he stressed that whaling and the right to use humpback whales has been an important part of Greenland's marine traditional food source from time immemorial and is part of its cultural heritage. Like the Minister, his organisation also considered that it would be a breach of the UN Declaration if a quota for humpback whales was not awarded to Greenland.

Presentation of the proposed Schedule amendment

The proposed Schedule amendment was for an annual quota of 10 humpback whales for the period 2010-2012 inclusive and a reduction in the proposed take for minke whales in West Greenland from an annual quota of 200 to 178 animals.

Although it was not possible for the meeting to make a decision on Greenland's proposed Schedule amendment on humpback and minke whales, Amalie Jessen from Greenland's Home Rule Government presented the proposal in some depth and in a similar manner as at IWC/61.

She noted the opportunistic nature of hunting in Greenland, with resources being shared throughout the country and stressed that whale products are not exported. She gave a brief overview of the regulation and monitoring of the whale hunt and described the efforts made to keep up with technology and to train hunters to ensure that large whales are killed as humanely as possible while taking into consideration the safety of the crew. Before introducing Greenland's request, she addressed a number of issues raised at the IWC regarding the nature of Greenland's aboriginal hunt, i.e. the distribution of whale meat, claims regarding commercialisation of the hunt, flensing conditions, conversion factors and need.

As noted in section 3.1 above, the Greenland whale hunt relevant to the IWC consists of two forms – the rifle hunt conducted from small boats and the harpoon hunt conducted from fishing vessels mounted with harpoon cannon. The rifle hunt is aimed only at minke whales and can take place from the smallest of the communities stretching along the coast. The hunt is a local affair as transport opportunities away from the area are normally not available. The proceeds are distributed to the hunters involved who are also allowed to barter or sell parts of the proceeds in the local open air markets of nearby communities, thereby securing that the wider local community has a supply of meat. The harpoon hunt is directed at minke, fin and now also bowhead whales. The proceeds from this hunt are partly distributed to the crew of the vessel and partly sold at the open air market of the community in question to cover the costs of the hunt (grenades – which cost around 1,400 US dollars - with some hunts requiring 2 grenades, vessel costs and crew remuneration). A smaller part of the hunt is processed in one locality in Greenland, to meet the needs of those local communities not having access to their own whaling or those communities having a meat deficit.

Greenland has some 18 towns and 60 settlements spread along a coastline measuring 44,000 kilometres, many of which are accessible only by boat or air, and many accessible for only part of the year. Fourteen out of 18 whale hunting villages are able to take a combination of minke, fin, and until 1985, humpback whales, and from the 2009 season, also bowhead whales in the Disko Bay area. In these villages, a substantial portion of the whale

meat is consumed locally through direct sharing. In addition, some of the whale is shared more broadly through local markets, and some is transported to other towns and settlements. One supermarket chain is a co-operative and two distribution companies are partially owned by the Greenland Home Rule Government, with operations subsidised by the government in one of them.

Greenland believed that the distinction, by some, between subsistence and commercial harvests is artificial. It recalled that in previous discussions, some have maintained that a hunt cannot be considered to be for subsistence if any money enters the distribution system. It did not agree and stressed that its strategy for marine mammal hunting is not that of a commercial enterprise aimed at profit maximisation. In commercial hunting proper, investments not only call for more efficient hunting methods, they also necessitate new investments and create a need for still more income. This is not the case in aboriginal subsistence hunting, even if distribution of the prey secured requires money. There is no profit maximising mechanism, thus ensuring no growth in the pressure on the resource in question. When the hunters share their catch through the local markets or the larger distribution network, they receive cash for the meat they provide. With this cash, they are able to buy meat and other products from the other towns, and they are able to replenish their hunting equipment so that they can continue to take and provide whale meat and product. This has been the way in Greenland for many generations.

With regard to concerns expressed in relation to the conversion factors it has used to derive tonnage of meat and other products that will be obtained from individual whales of different species and the efficiency of its flensing operations, Greenland explained that the opportunistic nature of the hunt in combination with the practical difficulties of flensing operations in subsistence hunts explains why the yield is not and could never be as efficient as from commercial hunts. However, Greenland reported that it is already working to improve efficiency where possible and in collaboration with the IWC's Scientific Committee and the Greenland Institute of Natural Resources and will implement the recommendations from the small working group on conversion factors. It expressed its appreciation to the working group for its report.

With respect to need, Greenland noted that in 1991 the Commission accepted and endorsed that the annual need of meat from large whales in West Greenland is 670 tonnes. The need was estimated on the basis of the average annual catches of 232 minke whales, 9 fin whales and 14 humpbacks through the years from 1965 to 1985. Greenland noted that the need has never been met by the quotas allocated by the IWC.

Greenland reported that in 2009 the Scientific Committee was for the first time able to give interim advice (valid for two 5-year quota blocks) on all four whale species relevant to Greenland. Greenland noted that with respect to minke whales off West Greenland, the advice was that an annual strike limit of 178 minke whales will not harm the stock and that it wished to follow this advice. The strike limit would therefore be reduced to 178 from the current 200. With respect to humpback whales off West Greenland, the Scientific Committee's advice was that an annual strike limit of 10 whales will not harm the stock. Noting this advice, Greenland indicated that by seeking a quota for humpback whales, it seeks to return to the multi-species harvest and balance of resources available prior to 1987, when concerns over the status of humpback whale stock led to the need to abandon that hunt. Greenland further noted that by returning humpback whales to its mix of resources, it would be able to reduce the overall number of whales taken by its hunters because of the greater yield provided by the humpback whales.

Finally, referring to the recommendations in the Scientific Committee report from IWC/61, Greenland recognised that it needed to provide verifiable measurement equipment to its hunters and standardised protocols for measurement together with the already reported data on sex, length, date and position of capture. It reported that it planned to develop a programme for updating and standardising the measurement techniques used by its hunters and would report back to the Commission, probably in 2010 on the structure of that programme and on progress in working toward the goal of improved measurement.

4.2 Discussion

Given that it was not possible for a decision on Greenland's request to be made at the meeting, there was little discussion of the request. Iceland and the USA thanked Greenland for the extensive information it provided. The USA noted its strong support of subsistence whaling. Portugal recognised the rights of the indigenous people of Greenland but believed that requests for additional quotas should be properly scrutinised. The Chair expressed the hope that this matter could be completed at IWC/62.

5. OTHER MATTERS

The meeting noted that this was the last meeting for Richard Cowan, the UK Commissioner to IWC who was to retire shortly and recognised his contribution to the work of the IWC over the years.

Annex A

Delegates and observers attending the intersessional meeting of the Commission St. Pete, Florida, USA, 4 March 2010

List of Participants

Antigua & Barbuda

Anthony Liverpool (C)

Argentina

Mario Oyarzabel (AC)

Miguel Iniguez (AC)

Australia

Donna Petrachenko (C)

Paula Watt (AC)

Sandy Hollway

Pam Eiser

Austria

Gerda Hansen (AC)

Belgium

Alexandre De Lichtervelde (C)

Brazil

Fabio Pitaluga (C)

Fabia Luna

Cambodia

Nao Thuok (C)

Cameroon

Baba Malloum Ousman (C)

Costa Rica

Eugenia Arguedas (AC)

Ricardo Meneses-Orellana

Denmark

Ole Samsing (C)

Ane Hansen

Amalie Jessen

Helga S. Jakobsen

Nette Levermann

Leif Fontaine

Klara Hawes (I)

Finland

Esko Jaakkola (C)

France

Stephane Louhaur (C)

Martine Bigan (AC)

Germany

Thomas Schmidt (AC)

Monika Roemerscheidt (AC)

Iceland

Tomas H. Heidar (C)

Kristjan Loftsson

India

Anmol Kumar

Ireland

John Fitzgerald (C)

Israel

Esther Efrat-Smilg (C)

Italy

Plinio Conte (C)

Caterina Fortuna (AC)

Marco Abbate

Angelo Ciasca

Japan

Jun Yamashita (AC)

Joji Morishita (AC)

Toshinori Uoya

Hideaki Okada

Daisuke Kiryu

Dan Goodman

Yasuo Iino

Yoko Yamakage (I)

Kiyomi Ito (I)

Korea, Republic of

Choi-Woo Lee (C)

Dae-Yeon Moon (AC)

Zang-Keun Kim (AC)

Luxembourg

Pierre Gallego (AC)

Mexico

Lorenzo Rojas-Bracho (C)

The Netherlands

Marie Josée Jenniskens (C)

Peter Bos (AC)

New Zealand

Geoffrey Palmer (C)

Jan Henderson (AC)

Gerard van Bohemen (AC)

Michael Donoghue

Karena Lyons

Norway

Ole-David Stenseth (AC)

Lars Walløe

Hild Ynnesdal

Petter Meier

Republic of Palau

Vic Uherbelau (C)

Peru

Doris Sotomayor (C)

Poland

Monika Lesz (C)

Iwona Pawliczka Vel Pawlik

Portugal

Jorge Palmeirim (C)

Saint Kitts and Nevis

Timothy Harris (C)

Daven Joseph (AC)

Saint Lucia

Jeannine Compton (C)

Spain

Carmen Asencio (AC)

Ana Tejedor

Vanessa Dowd

Sweden

Bo Fernholm (C)

Stellan Hamrin (AC)

UK

Richard Cowan (C)

James Gray (AC)

Sarah Archer (AC)

USA

Monica Medina (C)
Douglas Demaster (AC)
Ryan Wulff
Roger Eckert
Lisa Phelps
Mike Tillman
Rollie Schmitten
Earl Comstock
DJ Schubert
Allison Reed
Doug Tedrick
Mike Smith
Jessica Lefevre
Mike Gosliner
Robert Brownell
Kitty Block

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL
ORGANISATION
OBSERVERS**

European Union
Irene Plank

**NON-GOVERNMENTAL
OBSERVERS**

American Cetacean Society
Cheryl McCormick

Animal Welfare Institute
Susan Millward

**Antarctic and Southern
Ocean Coalition**
Sidney Holt

BlueVoice Org
Hardy Jones
Deborah Cutting

Campaign Whale
Andy Ottaway

**Centro de Conservacion
Cetacea**
Elsa Cabrera
Jose Palazzo Jr.

**Cetacean Society
International**
Jessica Dickens

**Comité Ballena Azul
Nicaragua**
Yanina Luna

Cousteau Society
Clark Lee Merriam

Dolphin Connection
Deborah Adams

**Eastern Caribbean Coalition
for Environmental
Awareness (ECCEA)**
Gerardo Palacios

**Environmental Investigation
Agency**
Jennifer Lonsdale
Sam LaBudde
Alan Thornton

ExxonMobil
Bruce Tackett

Greenpeace
Phil Kline
John Frizell

**Guatemalan Association of
Marine Biology (ABIMA)**
Lucia Gutiérrez

**Humane Society
International**
Paricia Forkan

**Instituto de Conservacion de
Ballenas**

Roxana Aida Schteinbarg
**International Fund for
Animal Welfare**
Patrick Ramage
Vassili Papastavrou

**IWMC World Conservation
Trust**
Eugene Lapointe
Gavin Carter

Ocean Sentry
Sidney Holt

**Society for the Conservation
of Marine Mammals (GSM)**
Birgith Sloth

Pew Environmental Group
Susan Lieberman
Duncan Currie

Werkgroep Zeehond
Geert Drieman

**Whale & Dolphin
Conservation Society**
Sue Fisher
Niki Entrup
Kate O'Connell

Windstar Foundation
Nancy Azzam

**World Society for the
Protection of Animals**
Claire Bass
Joanna Toole
Marcela Vargas

WWF International
Leigh Henry

SECRETARIAT
Nicky Grandy
Greg Donovan

Annex B

List of Documents

- IWC/M10/
- 1 Draft agenda and list of documents
 - 2 Report of the small working group on conversion factors (from whales to edible products) for the Greenlandic large whale hunt
 - 3 List of participants

Documents from IWC/61

- IWC/61/ 11rev Proposed Schedule Amendment (Greenland catch limits) submitted by Denmark

Annex C

Agenda

1. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS
 - 1.1 Introductory remarks
 - 1.2 Reporting
 - 1.3 Review of documents
2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA
3. REPORT OF THE SMALL WORKING GROUP ON CONVERSION FACTORS FOR THE GREENLANDIC LARGE WHALE HUNT
 - 3.1 Presentation of the Report
 - 3.2 Discussion
4. PROPOSED SCHEDULE AMENDMENT
 - 4.1 Presentation of the proposed Schedule amendment
 - 4.2 Discussion and action arising
5. OTHER MATTERS