

# Annex O

## Scientific Permits

**Members:** DeMaster (Convenor), An, Anselme, Baba, Bass, Berggren, Bjørge, Brandon, Brownell, Carlson, Charrassin, Childerhouse, Clapham, Cooke, Danielsdóttir, Deimer-Schuette, Donovan, Edwards, Fortuna, Fujise, Funahashi, Galletti, Gedamke, Givens, Goto, Gronvik, Hakamada, Hatanaka, Hyugaji, Iñiguez, Ivashchenko, Jackson, Kanda, Kasuya, Kato, Kawahara, Kell, Kim, Kitakado, Kock, Lawrence, Leaper (Rebecca), Lens, Lovell, Mate, Matsuoka, Miller, Miyashita, Mori, Morishita, Murase, Nakamura, Nishiwaki, Northridge, Ohsumi, Okamura, Ólafsdóttir, Palazzo, Parsons, Pastene, Polacheck, Punnett, Rambally, Reeves, Reijnders, Rogan, Rojas-Bracho, Rose, Senn, Shimada, Simmonds, J., Skaug, Tanaka, Tominaga, Van Waerebeek, Vasquez, Vikingsson, Wade, Walloe, Williams, Yamakage, Yasokawa, Yoshida, Young, Zerbini.

### 1. CONVENOR'S OPENING REMARKS

DeMaster opened the meeting and welcomed participants.

### 2. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR AND RAPORTEURS

DeMaster was elected Chair. DeMaster agreed to serve as rapporteur.

### 3. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

The agenda was adopted as shown in Appendix 1.

### 4. DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE

Documents to consider were SC/58/O7-10 and SC/58/O20.

### 5. PROPOSALS TO FACILITATE THE REVIEW PROCESS OF SCIENTIFIC PERMITS

The Chair noted that the present process for reviewing special permits is less than satisfactory. The reason for this is because there is considerable difficulty within the present approach of separating out the scientific from the political, as noted last year (IWC, 2006). While consensus was not reached within the Working Group regarding the cause of this problem, there was agreement as to there being a problem.

It was further noted there has been considerable variation in the types of proposals that have been submitted over the years, ranging from the catch of one animal for a museum specimen, to a one-year catch of a large number of animals, to long-term multi-year proposals for a large number of animals. This latter category has become more common in recent years. The Working Group's discussion therefore focused on this latter category of proposals.

It was noted that the objectives of any proposal must be clearly stated. However, it was recognized that proposals should include statements regarding their prospective contribution to (paraphrased from the existing guidelines from the Commission, as implemented by the Committee, see SC/56/SCP1): (1) improve the conservation and management of whale stocks; (2) improve the conservation and management of other living marine resources or the ecosystem of which the whale stocks are an integral part; or (3) test hypotheses not directly related to the management of living marine resources.

There was general agreement within the Working Group that an approved *pro forma* for proposals would be helpful. The following was adopted:

(1) *Objectives of the study* – these should be quantified where possible and explain briefly their value in the context of the three types of objectives listed under 2 above.

(2) *Methods<sup>1</sup> to address objectives:*

(a) Field methods, including

(i) species, number (and see (c) below), time-frame, area;

(ii) sampling protocol for lethal aspects of the proposal; and

(iii) an assessment of why non-lethal methods, methods associated with any ongoing commercial whaling, or analyses of past data have been considered to be insufficient;

(b) Laboratory methods;

(c) Analytical methods, including estimates of statistical power where appropriate;

(d) Time frame with intermediary targets.

(3) *Assessment of potential effects of catches on the stocks involved:*

(a) A summary of what is known concerning stock structure in the area concerned;

(b) The estimated abundance of the species or species, including methods used and an assessment of uncertainty, with a note as to whether the estimates have previously been considered by the Scientific Committee;

(c) Provision of the results of a simulation study on the effects of the permit takes on the stock that takes into account uncertainty and projects (1) for the expected life of the permit (i.e.  $n$  years); (2) for situations where the proposal is assumed to continue for (a) a further  $n$  years, (b) a further  $2n$  years; and (c) some longer period of years since the start of the proposal.

(4) *A note on the provisions for co-operative research*

(a) Field studies;

(b) Analytical studies.

---

<sup>1</sup> Where novel or non-standard methods are proposed, sufficient information must be given to allow these to be properly evaluated.

There was also general agreement within the Working Group that the objectives of the review of the specialist group of a special permit proposal should focus on, but not necessarily be limited to: (1) whether the proposed field and analytical methods are likely to achieve the stated quantified objectives within the proposed time-frame, where appropriate, commenting on sample size and time-frame considerations; (2) the provision of advice and suggestions on components of the programme that might be achieved using non-lethal methods, including, where appropriate power analyses and time-frames; (3) the provision of advice on the likely effects on the stock or stocks involved under various scenarios of length of the programme. It was noted that this may involve a different analysis to that provided in the original proposal and may include assumptions that permit proposals over a relatively short time period (e.g. 1-5 years) may be projected further into the future; and (4) a review of the proposed intermediate milestones/targets and a suggestion for when an intermediate review should take place, noting that when a major review is anticipated, a specialist workshop approach should be followed. While this statement was agreed by consensus within the SP Working Group, there was disagreement within the Working Group as to whether the focus of the review by the specialist group should also include the degree to which the proposal addresses information relevant to the management needs of the Commission. It was therefore agreed that this issue would be discussed in plenary. Some members felt that the degree to which the proposal addresses information needed by the Scientific Committee to provide management advice to the Commission should be an additional focus of the review

There was considerable discussion within the Working Group regarding the establishment of an independent specialist group to review special permit proposals and how any report(s) from this group would be incorporated into the advice provided by the Committee to the Commission. After some discussion, it was **agreed** by the Working Group that the initial review of the proposal would take place at a specialist workshop with a limited number of invited experts (who may or may not be present members of the Scientific Committee). The selection of the group would be the responsibility of the Convenors, based on the subject matter and methods given in the proposal. At least one of the Chair, vice-Chair or the Head of Science will be a member of the specialist group and will chair the workshop. In addition, a limited number of scientists or experts associated with the proposal would also be invited to participate in the workshop in an advisory role *inter alia* for the purpose of answering questions regarding the proposal.

The report of the specialist workshop should attempt to reach consensus on the individual issues referred to above, but where this is not possible the rationale behind the disagreement should be clearly stated. If the primary disagreement is between the invited experts and the proponents of the proposal, this should be clearly identified in the report of the specialist group to the Scientific Committee.

The report of the specialist group will be provided to the Contracting Government 80 days before the Annual Meeting of the Scientific Committee. The original special permit proposal, the report of the specialist workshop, and any revised special permit proposals from the Contracting Government will be submitted to the Scientific Committee no later than 40 days before the Annual Meeting. The report of the specialist workshop will then be discussed, but not amended by the Scientific Committee. It is anticipated that any such discussion of the report of the specialist group and the revised proposal will take place in Plenary.

The original proposal, the specialist workshop report, any revised proposal and the comments from the Scientific Committee will then be submitted to the Commission and becomes publicly available at the opening of the IWC Annual Meeting.

It was agreed by the SP Working Group that additional details regarding: (1) the timing of this process; (2) the criteria used by the Convenors to select workshop members; (3) the role of proponents at the specialist workshop; and (4) the process by which lack of consensus within the specialist working group, the Scientific Committee, or between the specialist working group and the Scientific Committee, will be discussed in plenary and reported in the Chair's Summary of the Annual Meeting of the Scientific Committee.

## **6. REVIEW RESULTS FROM EXISTING PERMITS**

The Working Group reviewed the results from two Japanese programmes (on Antarctic minke and fin whales and on North Pacific common minke, sei, Bryde's and sperm whales), and one Icelandic programme on North Atlantic common minke whales.

The entire review of results from the existing permits is found under Item 16.2 of the Scientific Committee plenary report.

## **7. REVIEW OF NEW OR CONTINUING PROPOSAL**

The Working Group did not have time to consider the continuing proposals of Japan (JARPA II and JARPN II) and Iceland. However, it was noted that there were no substantial changes in these proposals since the previous reviews by the Scientific Committee. The Working Group therefore referred to its comments made at earlier reviews.

The Working Group reviewed the progress report from the intersessional e-mail group tasked with preparations for the JARPA review. Their report is herein included as Appendix 2.

## **8. WORK PLAN AND BUDGET REQUEST**

A budget to cover the Invited Participants to the JARPA review in November 2006 in Japan is being prepared and will be discussed in plenary. In the event that some of the IPs identified in Appendix 2 decline the invitation or are funded by their governments to participate, several other appropriate scientists were also identified. Two, considered particularly valuable, were K. Reid (British Antarctic Survey) for feeding ecology and M. Bravington for abundance estimation. An intersessional e-mail group was established to finalize preparations for the JARPA review under Zeh.

## **9. ADOPTION OF REPORT**

The report was adopted on 3 June at 0020 with the understanding that several key issues regarding the responsibility of the Scientific Permits Working Group would be discussed in plenary.

## **REFERENCE**

International Whaling Commission. 2006. Report of the Scientific Committee. *J. Cetacean Res. Manage.* (Suppl.) 8: 1-65.

## Appendix 1

### AGENDA

1. Opening Remarks
2. Appointment of Chair and rapporteurs
3. Adoption of Agenda
4. Documents Available
5. Proposals to facilitate the review process of Scientific Permits
6. Review results from existing permits
  - 6.1 Japan – Antarctic minke whales
  - 6.2 Japan – North Pacific common minke, Bryde's and sperm whales
  - 6.3 Iceland – North Atlantic common minke whales
  - 6.4 Preparations for JARPA review
7. Review of new or continuing proposals
  - 7.1 JARPA II
  - 7.2 JARPN II
  - 7.3 Iceland
8. Work plan and budget request
9. Adoption of Report

## Appendix 2

### PROGRESS REPORT OF THE JARPA REVIEW PLANNING STEERING GROUP

**Members:** Zeh (Convenor), Brownell, Childerhouse, Fujise, Gales, Hatanaka, Pastene, Schweder

The JARPA Review Planning Steering Group continued to work intersessionally to prepare for the full review of the JARPA programme by the Scientific Committee (SC) in 2006. The Terms of Reference and draft Agenda were discussed during the 2005 SC meeting, and the remaining tasks to be completed in preparation for the review were outlined (IWC, 2006b, pp.265-7). Here we report progress on these tasks.

The tasks and progress on them are as follows.

(1) Compile and circulate:

- (a) a list of papers arising from JARPA research, including publications in scientific journals and unpublished reports (e.g. SC documents), with abstracts if available (see Appendix 3);
- (b) a list of papers to be updated and presented to the IWC JARPA review meeting.

These tasks have been completed. Under (a), lists of scientific papers and oral presentations at symposia and other scientific meetings have been compiled, along with abstracts.

(2) Compile and circulate an annotated list of datasets to be considered, bearing in mind data availability requirements under Procedure B (IWC, 2004).

This task has been completed. As noted above, datasets will be available to accredited scientist under SC Procedure B, for the specific purpose of the JARPA review. Requests for access to data will be submitted to the Steering Group via the Data Availability Group (DAG). Research proposals involving data requests will be evaluated in the context of additional analyses suggested under (3) below.

(3) Prepare and circulate suggestions, if any, for additional analyses to be carried out.

No suggestions were received intersessionally, but some may arise during discussion of this document by the SC.

(4) Decide time, venue, facilities, agenda, budget, and relevant participants, including Invited Participants.

The meeting will be held at Institute of Cetacean Research in Tokyo. It was initially proposed that it be a 5-day meeting, from 27 November - 1 December 2006. However, given scheduling issues related to other work of the Committee, these dates were changed to 4-8 December 2006. As noted above, a draft agenda has been agreed (IWC, 2006b, p. 267). The Steering Group suggested the following list of Invited Participants:

Invited Participant	Expertise
A. Aguilar	Environment
P. Best	Biological parameters
I. Boyd, Director, Sea Mammal Research Unit, UK	Feeding ecology
D. Butterworth	Abundance, biological parameters
T. Haug	Feeding ecology
R. Hoelzel	Stock structure
D. Palka	Abundance estimation

P. Palsboll	Stock structure
A. Punt or T. Polacheck	Statistical catch-at-age analyses
T. Schweder	Abundance, biological parameters

A budget to cover the Invited Participants is being prepared. In the event that some of the above IPs decline the invitation or are funded by their governments to participate, several other appropriate scientists were also identified. Two particularly considered valuable were K. Reid (British Antarctic Survey) for feeding ecology and M. Bravington for abundance estimation.

(5) Examine the resolutions in Appendix 3 of SC/57/O2 and the SC reports mentioned in those resolutions. Outline the topics to be considered under agenda item 9 and recommend whether these topics should be dealt with during the review meeting or only by the SC as a whole.

Before and during the 2005 SC meeting, the Steering Group made some progress on this task. The SC (IWC, 2006a, p.48) agreed that only scientific, not ethical, issues should be considered in the JARPA review. Childerhouse volunteered to carry out the task of re-examining the resolutions in light of this agreement and to circulate the results to members of the Steering Group. This task has not yet been completed. The Steering Group agreed to complete it within a month after the end of the 2006 SC meeting if it cannot be completed during the meeting.

## REFERENCES

- International Whaling Commission. 2004. Report of the Scientific Committee. Annex T. Report of the Data Availability Working Group. *J. Cetacean Res. Manage.* (Suppl.) 6: 406-8.
- International Whaling Commission. 2006a. Report of the Scientific Committee. *J. Cetacean Res. Manage.* (Suppl.) 8: 1-65.
- International Whaling Commission. 2006b. Report of the Scientific Committee. Annex O2. Progress report of the JARPA Review Planning Steering Group. *J. Cetacean Res. Manage.* (Suppl.) 8: 265-267.

## Appendix 3

### PRELIMINARY LIST OF DOCUMENTS FOR THE IWC JARPA REVIEW BY JAPANESE SCIENTIST

- Hatanaka, H., Fujise, Y., Pastene, L.A. and Ohsumi, S. Review of JARPA research objectives and update of the work related to JARPA tasks derived from the 1997 SC meetings.
- Nishiwaki, S., Ishikawa, H. and Fujise, Y. Review of general methodology and survey procedure under the JARPA.
- Hakamada, T., Goto, M. and Ishikawa, H. Examination of the effect of skip on abundance estimates for Antarctic minke whales.
- Pastene, L.A., Goto M. and Kanda, N. Genetic analysis on stock structure of the Antarctic minke whale based on mtDNA and microsatellite and samples from the JARPA.
- Bando, T., Zenitani, R. and Fujise, Y. A study on stock structure of Antarctic minke whale based on analysis of biological parameters and samples from the JARPA.
- Hakamada, T. A study on stock structure of the Antarctic minke whale based on morphometric analysis and samples from the JARPA.
- Pastene, L.A. A review of the information on stock structure of Antarctic minke whale.
- Matsuishi, T., Ikeda, H. and Nishiwaki, S. Estimation of  $g(0)$  based on the sighting survey data of JARPA incorporating additional information.
- Hakamada, T., Matsuoka, K. and Nishiwaki, S. An update of Antarctic minke whales abundance estimate based on JARPA data, including a comparison to IDCR/SOWER estimates.
- Bando, T., Zenitani, R., Fujise, Y. and Kato, H. Biological parameters of Antarctic minke whale based on materials collected by the JARPA survey in 1987/88 to 2004/05.
- Tanaka, E., Zenitani, R. and Fujise, Y. A point estimate of Natural Mortality Coefficient using JARPA data.
- Mori, M., Kitakado, T. and Butterworth, D.S. Progress on application of ADAPT-VPA to minke whales in Areas IV and V given updated information from IDCR/SOWER and JARPA surveys.
- Zenitani, R. and Kato, H. Long- term trend of age at sexual maturity of Antarctic minke whales by counting transition phase in earplugs.
- Tamura, T. and Konishi, K. Feeding habits and prey consumption of Antarctic minke whales, *Balaenoptera bonaerensis* in JARPA research area.
- Konishi, K. and Tamura, T. Yearly trend of blubber thickness in the Antarctic minke whale *Balaenoptera bonaerensis* in Areas IV and V.
- Matsuoka, K., Hakamada, T. and Nishiwaki, S. Distribution and abundance of humpback, fin and blue whales in the Antarctic Areas IIIE, IV, V and VIW (35°E-145°W).
- Murase, H., Nishiwaki, S., Ishikawa, H., Kiwada, H., Yoshida, T. and Ito, S. Results of the cetacean prey survey using echo sounder in JARPA from 1998/99 to 2002/03.
- Murase, H., Tamura, T., Matsuoka, K., Hakamada, T. and Konishi, K. Preliminary estimation of feeding impact on krill standing stock by three baleen whale species (Antarctic minke, humpback and fin whales) in Areas IV and V using JARPA data.
- Yasunaga, G., Fujise, Y., Zenitani, R., Honda, K. and Kato, H. Yearly trend of trace element accumulation in liver of Antarctic minke whales, *Balaenoptera bonaerensis*.
- Yasunaga, G., Fujise, Y., Zenitani, R., Tanabe, S. and Kato, H. Spatial and temporal variation in organochlorine contaminants in the Antarctic minke whales, *Balaenoptera bonaerensis*.
- Watanabe, T., Yabuki, T., Suga, T., Hanawa, K., Matsuoka, K. and Kiwada, H. Results of oceanographic analyses conducted under JARPA and possible evidence of environmental changes.
- Pastene, L.A., Goto, M., Yoshida, H., Nishiwaki, S. and Kanda, N. Genetic analyses on stock identification in the Antarctic humpback whales based on samples collected under the JARPA.
- Fujise, Y., Hatanaka, H. and Ohsumi, S. Changes occurred on Antarctic minke whale stocks in the Antarctic and their ecological implications.