

A very hypothetical set of examples as to how a 2-year cycle might work

THE SECRETARIAT

ASSUMPTIONS

Document IWC/58/F&A 5 includes some thoughts on the implications of moving to a two-year Commission meeting cycle. On p.3 of that document, it states that ‘the Secretariat hopes to provide an illustration’ of how a review of catch limits might occur given a two-year cycle of Commission meetings. It must be stressed that to produce such an illustration one needs to make a number of assumptions about the Commission and its priorities. The choice of assumptions given in this document, should, under *no* circumstances be taken as a suggestion or proposal from the Secretariat as to how the Commission may develop in the next few years; it is *merely* for illustrative purposes and should not be construed as a proposal.

(1) Given the current sensitivities over whether or not an RMS is feasible, impractical, desirable or not acceptable, for simplicity the illustrations focus only on the setting of catch limits for aboriginal subsistence whaling – an illustration assuming both an AWS and an RMS could be developed if it were so wished.

(2) On an assumption that the Commission’s priorities do not change with respect to the Scientific Committee’s work on the RMP, the Scientific Committee’s work on that topic is included in the timeline.

(3) Moving to a 2-year cycle carries the implication that catch limits should be set for even numbers of years, rather than the present ‘tradition’ of setting five-year block quotas for many aboriginal subsistence whaling operations. This document makes no suggestion as to what that should be and provides examples for 4- and 6-year block quotas.

(4) At present, the Commission sets all aboriginal subsistence whaling catch limits in the same year. In early discussions on an AWS, some believed this was desirable and others believed it was better to separate them to the extent possible, possibly based on the dates of *Implementation Reviews*. Illustrations of both are given.

(5) With respect to the option of not setting all aboriginal subsistence whaling catch limits in the same year, the assumption has been made that the block limits for some fisheries will be for a shorter initial time than others, to achieve separation – in this example this has been based on: (a) the fact that an *Implementation Review* for gray whales is set for 2009; (b) an assumption that *SLAs* for the Greenlandic fisheries will be available by 2011. Other assumptions can be made and illustrations developed if so desired.

(6) The timing of AWMP and RMP *Implementation Reviews* remains on the agreed 5-year cycle. Although not illustrated here, the Commission can alter catch limits in the middle of a block if an *Implementation Review* suggests that is necessary.

(7) Given the complexities for the first *Implementation*, the assumption has been made to allow more time for the North Pacific common minke whale *Implementation Review* – other assumptions could be made and illustrations developed if so desired.

(8) It assumes no requests for additional species/stock *Implementations* under the AWMP or RMP.

(9) It assumes that the Scientific Committee continues to meet in some form each year.

	Scientific Committee		Commission (1)	Commission (2)	Commission (3)
Year	AWMP	RMP	AS	AS	AS
2007	Bowhead IR	Finish Bryde's I; begin NA fin I	Bowhead [4]; Gray [2]; WG fin [4]; WG minke; St Vincent [2]	Bowhead [6]; Gray [2]; WG fin [4]; WG minke [4]; St Vincent [6]	Bowhead [4]; Gray [4]; WG fin [4]; WG minke; St Vincent [4]
2008		Finish NA minke whale IR; Continue NA fin I; Plan NP minke IR	Annual Review of Catch Limits		
2009	Gray IR	Finish NA Fin I; Continue NP minke IR	Gray [4]; St Vincent [4]	Gray [6]	
2010	WG fin SLA	Finish NP minke IR			
2011	WG minke SLA	Plan NP Bryde's IR	Bowhead [4]; WG fin [6]; WG minke [6]	WG fin; minke [6]	Bowhead [4]; Gray 4); WG fin [4]; WG minke; St Vincent [4]
2012	Bowhead IR	Finish NP Bryde's IR; Plan NA minke whale IR			
2013		Finish NA minke whale IR; Plan NA fin IR	Gray [4]; St Vincent [4]	Bowhead [6]; St Vincent [6]	
2014	Gray IR	Finish NA Fin IR Plan NP minke IR			
2015	WG fin IR; WG minke IR	Finish NP minke IR	Bowhead [4]; WG fin [4]; WG minke [4]	Gray [6]	Bowhead [4]; Gray [4]; WG fin [4]; WG minke; St Vincent [4]
2016		Plan NP Bryde's IR and NA minke IR			
2017	Bowhead IR	NP Bryde's IR; Plan NA minke whale IR	Gray [4]; St Vincent [4]	WG fin; minke [6]	
2018		Finish NA minke IR			
2019			Bowhead [4]; WG fin [4]; WG minke [4]	Bowhead [6]; St Vincent [6]	Bowhead [4]; Gray [4]; WG fin [4]; WG minke; St Vincent [4]

(1) This assumes that once the system is established, 4 year block quotas are the norm, and the desire is not to renew all quotas in the same year

(2) This assumes that once the system is established, 6 year block quotas are the norm, and the desire is not to renew all quotas in the same year

(3) This assumes that once the system is established, 4 year block quotas are the norm, and the desire is to renew all quotas in the same year.

The number in square brackets after the fishery is the number of years the block quota will last.

Key: I = *Implementation*; IR = *Implementation Review*; SLA = *Strike Limit Algorithm* finalised; NA= North Atlantic; NP = North Pacific; WG = West Greenland; Bowhead = Alaskan and Chukotkan fisheries for bowhead whales; Gray = Chukotkan and Makah fisheries for gray whales; minke = common minke; St Vincent = St Vincent and The Grenadines fishery for humpback whales