

**NGO BRIEFING
TO THE UK GOVERNMENT:**

**KEY ISSUES FOR THE 62ND MEETING OF THE
INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION**

June 2010



NGO Briefing to the UK Government: Key Issues for the 62nd Meeting of the International Whaling Commission

This briefing is provided on behalf of the following organisations:

- Campaign Whale
- Environmental Investigation Agency
- Greenpeace
- International Fund for Animal Welfare
- The Mammal Society
- Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
- Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society
- World Society for the Protection of Animals

The points in this briefing follow the numbering of the IWC's Provisional Annotated Agenda, IWC/62/2.

Item 2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Japan has provided language for the Provisional Annotated Agenda that speaks of working in good faith to rebuild the IWC and of efforts to 'rescue' the IWC. Given that Japan has caused the current situation, by recruiting 30 developing countries to vote with it and using them to promote conflict, this is disingenuous and dishonest. Japan has also used the agenda to assert that whale killing methods, proposals for new sanctuaries, health issues, whale watching, small cetaceans and the conservation committee are not core responsibilities for the IWC and should be deleted from its agenda. It is hard to see how this is compatible with good faith dialogue.

Item 3. IWC FUTURE

Number of whales that may be 'saved' by the Chair/Vice Chair's Proposal

Firstly, we note that the numbers issue is misleading because:

- i. it focuses on total numbers rather than the vulnerability of the some of the populations that would be harvested;
- ii. it lures us into a debate about 'saving whales' which is unlikely to be the outcome of the endorsement of 'non-indigenous' whaling, especially if other nations then see this as a reason to start whaling (South Korea has confirmed its intention to start whaling);
- iii. No attention is paid through this method to removals caused by other human actions including but not limited to bycatch; and
- iv. it assumes that the only target of the whaling nations is meat for human consumption (the market for which is saturated in each country) whereas recent research by WDCS suggests that they aspire to create new commercial applications for whale oil in the long term which would have a much wider market.

There has been a lot of misinformation, mostly spread by those who favour the Chair's proposal (IWC62/7), as to how many whales would be saved if the proposal were accepted as written.

This comes in two main forms:

1. The Chair's proposal would save between 4,000 and 14,000 whales.
2. That catches of whales have been continually rising.

Both of these statements are wrong.

The new revised press release from the IWC suggests 3,200 whales saved over ten years when compared to the average catches 2005-9 (which are higher than the levels of catches in the earlier post-moratorium years)

We note that based on the actual catch in 2009 and the 2009/10 Antarctic season, which was 1511, the number saved would be substantially lower than 3,200. We also note that the 14,000 figure is obtained by comparing the Chair's proposal with quotas, not catch. Reductions should be calculated by comparison with actual catch, not quotas.

This is also based on the notion that other countries will not begin whaling (noting the proposal from Korea) and/or that countries will not start scientific whaling.

Catches of whales rose from 1991 until 2005 and then the rise stopped. Norway's average catch for the ten years from 2000 to 2009 was 567 per year and catches in the last three out of four years have been below that average. These hunts end well below quota because the wholesale buyers inform the whalers that no more whale meat is wanted. Japan has thousands of tonnes of whale meat in frozen storage and the Japanese media reported in 2008 that the Antarctic fleet would reduce its quota by 20% due to lack of demand. The Japanese catch in the North Pacific has been constant at between 300 and 375 whales since 2005. The only place where whaling has increased is in Iceland and that is largely because of an effort by one entrepreneur to reestablish an export oriented industry. The continuous uncontrolled growth of the whaling industry cited as a reason to support the Chair's proposal does not actually exist.

Some tables supporting the above are given in annex 1. We also draw the UK's attention to a graphic representation of all catches since 1946 by WDCS¹.

Aboriginal Subsistence

Having aboriginal subsistence quotas in the same table as commercial quotas confuses the two categories and hands the whalers an easy victory – especially given the ongoing confusion about the two forms of whaling anyway - they can and will claim that the IWC has recognised that all forms of whaling are the same. For example, we hear that the Danish Commissioner is already claiming that the proposed restriction on use to domestic only in paragraph 38 permits Greenland to distribute its whale meat across the whole territory, a commercial practice challenged by several contracting governments as not in conformity with the regulation of ASW. (See annex 1 for arguments refuting this). To avoid this confusion, the aboriginal/Indigenous Subsistence Whaling figures should be removed from Table 4.

US bowhead

We encourage the UK to ask the USA why the total number of bowheads that may be landed by the USA over ten years is 580 in Table 4, rather than 560 (double the current five year limit).

¹ http://www.wdcs.co.uk/whaling_graphs/main.swf

This increase has not been approved by the IWC. If, as we assume, the two extra whales a year that may be landed reflects greater efficiencies in the hunt (a lower struck and lost rate), this should be reflected by a reduction in the quota (strike limit).

Greenland and Russia's new quotas (see also Item 6)

It appears that Greenland and Russia are trying to secure an ASW quota increase 'through the back door', by including new quotas in Table 4 of IWC62/7. Greenland is seeking ten humpback whales a year for Greenland (and reduction of its minke whale quota from 200 to 178 annually) and Russia is seeking an increase in its gray whale quota by five whales a year. This attempt violates the rules of procedure and must be rejected as a bad precedent.

The UK should argue that these increases to ASW quotas cannot be considered at IWC62 because the proponents did not follow the process laid out in Rule of Procedure J.1 (as amended in 2009) for the Commission to consider a schedule amendment proposal:

Rule of Procedure J 1. No item of business which involves amendment of the Schedule to the Convention, or recommendations under Article VI of the Convention, or Resolutions of the Commission, shall be the subject of decisive action by the Commission unless the full draft text has been circulated to the Commissioners at least 60 days in advance of the meeting at which the matter is to be discussed.

The full draft text of the proposed changes was not set out in a proposal circulated to Commissioners by 22 April 2010. Document 62/7 only includes the new catch limits (in table 4); the proposed schedule amendment does not include the necessary changes to Schedule Paragraph 13.b.2 and 3.

If IWC62/11 fails to be adopted, Greenland is likely to argue that its proposal should be considered under agenda item 6 (ASW) instead. The UK should argue again that it has failed to provide full draft text in conformity with Rule of Procedure J.1. Greenland will argue that the Secretariat recently posted Greenland's 2009 ASW proposal to the website (as IWC61/11 rev), but this was not circulated before 22 April as required. Furthermore, this proposal no longer has any legal status. As the agenda notes, at IWC61 the Commission "agreed to leave open the decision on Greenland's request for a take of humpback whales (Document IWC/61/11rev) until an intersessional meeting". However, the Commission did not have the quorum necessary at the intersessional meeting in Florida to vote on Greenland's proposal or to decide to hold it over again to the annual meeting. It is therefore arguable that IWC61/11 expired at that point.

Southern Ocean Whale Sanctuary

The ICRW Schedule specifies that "[...] commercial whaling, whether by pelagic operations or from land stations, is prohibited in [...] the Southern Ocean Sanctuary"¹⁷. Japan is the only country to have an objection to this text of the schedule, and only as it applies to minke whales. Setting catch limits in the Southern Ocean Whale Sanctuary for both minke whales and fin whales, as suggested in the Chair's proposal, would be in direct contravention of existing text of the schedule, and would nullify a critical conservation decision of the IWC to protect whales in this critical feeding habitat. It would legalise an otherwise illegal fin whale hunt. Allowing minke whaling undercuts the entire concept of a sanctuary.

Trade

The proposal as written has the trade paragraph in square brackets, meaning that it is not agreed. This is unacceptable. There must be a ban on international trade in whale meat.

South Atlantic Whale Sanctuary

Creating a whale sanctuary where no one catches whales and no one has any intent to do so in the future is not much of a concession. But creating it for 10 years to protect animals with lifetimes of a century or more and low reproduction rates is absurd and not a concession at all. If it is to be created it must be of indefinite extent and not tied to the ten year lifetime of the Chair's proposal.

Other points

- The proposal does not require the RMP to be used by the SC to calculate catch limits;
- The proposal does not require bycatch and other human induced removals to be deducted from catch limits as the Commission agreed to do in 1998². Annual bycatch of North Pacific minke whales by Japan and South Korea is at least as high as 191 animals (according to their own reports). According to independent market sampling investigations, bycatch is actually much higher. As a result, total removals from this population, including the already critically endangered J stock, may be unsustainable under IWC62/7.
- The references made to the work of the Scientific Committee may be misleading as there is no mechanism proposed to take into account any conclusions coming from the Scientific Committee over the ten year period. The only way to change quotas remains a change to the schedule requiring a ¾ vote in favour. There is some smoke and mirrors being deployed here.
- Contracting Governments will still be able to take objections/reservations, and
- the burden will fall on non-whaling nations to pay the cost of regulating whaling and conducting the ongoing surveys necessary to get population estimates.
- Footnote 10 of Table 4 states: *Whaling will be in accordance with the framework set out in IWC/60/9 that describes Japan's Small Type Coastal Whaling proposal for the benefit of four communities in Japan.* This footnote creates the new category of whaling that Japan has demanded since the Moratorium. This demand has consistently been rejected by the IWC. Document IWC/60/9 was withdrawn by Japan and therefore never discussed by the Commission. It is unclear how this whaling operation would be regulated should the footnote be approved.
- The Proposal ignores the 20,000 other cetaceans killed in Japan's coastal waters every year.
- If the Management and Compliance Committee is established, we urge the UK to insist and ensure that the Working Group on Whale Killing Methods and Associated Welfare Issues is simultaneously included as one of its subsidiary bodies from the start.

Other matters in the proposal may also be in contravention to the schedule, including the use of factory ships for species other than minke.

² Resolution 1998-2 on Total Catches Over Time

Constructive recommendations on handling IWC62/7

1. We encourage the UK to give consideration to stating, if it seems appropriate to the following approach, its support for a package which would achieve a binding phase out of all current commercial and scientific whaling operations, as well as setting in place binding measures to permanently eliminate existing loopholes in the moratorium. No commercial catch limits should be adopted into the Schedule however, as this would render the Moratorium null and void.

2. We encourage the UK to advocate removing the whaling management proposal from IWC62/7 and instead, discussion be focussed on the remaining conservation and governance reform proposals. There is no need for the *lack of consensus* on the components of IWC62/7 relating to whaling management to stall progress on areas where there *is agreement*, as well as a pressing need for action.

Negotiations over if and when commercial whaling should be resumed, as well as how to permanently resolve the issue of whaling under permit, objection and reservation, could then continue at IWC63. The UK should also encourage Japan, Norway and Iceland, as a sign of good will to facilitate ongoing discussions, to agree to voluntarily caps on whaling catches at levels below the annual averages over the period 2000-2009 and implementation of a phase out plan to zero.

We note that changes to the Rules of Procedure and Financial regulations are also proposed under Administrative matters.

Item 4. WHALE STOCKS

This year the Scientific Committee will attempt to arrive at an estimate of the SH minke population. Two groups of scientists are currently analysing the data from CP2 and CP3, using different models, the OK model, named for its developers, Okamura and Kitakado and the SPLINTR [SPatial Line TRansect] model developed by Bravington and Hedley. The estimates provided by these models as of the 2009 meeting of the Scientific Committee are:

	CP II	CPIII
OK	1,287,000	688,000
SPLINTR	747,000	461,000

Both models have been extensively tested by the Committee and appear to be robust. If either the OK or the SPLINTR method had been used by itself, the Scientific Committee would have accepted its results as a valid estimate.

A number of possible reasons for the discrepancy have been identified and work has been going on since the last IWC meeting to test these.

Although both methods indicate a decrease from CPII to CPIII, the Scientific Committee has not yet agreed that any such decrease has actually occurred.

The UK should ask its scientists to pay very close attention to the question of decrease. Japan insists that there has been no decrease but if there has been it would indicate something is

going on the Antarctic that we do not understand and could be of great importance to the whale populations there.

Item 5. WHALE KILLING METHODS

The organisations that address humane issues regret that the Whale Killing Methods Working Group will not meet at IWC 62, apparently due to lack of time. The meeting schedule was discussed at the Florida meeting and the Secretary suggested that this Group might be able to meet in the evening due to pressure to ensure it was included. We urge the UK to express its extreme concern about the deletion of this vital Working Group, demand that it is reinstated in 2011. We also urge the UK to ensure that the Chair allows adequate time in the Plenary Meeting to ensure good discussion on welfare issues.

We also refer to the comment on Whale Killing Methods Working Group in the Future of the IWC item.

We further encourage the UK to propose an IWC welfare and ethics workshop to be held prior to IWC63.

Item 6 ABORIGINAL SUBSISTENCE WHALING

6.3 Catch limits

As noted above, Greenland and Russia's request for an increased ASW quota should not be considered under Item 3 or Item 6 because it fails to conform to the Rules of Procedure.

The organisations that work on ASW urge the UK to continue to take the lead in challenging Greenland's requests to increase its quota. The Secretariat has erroneously interpreted that the Commission decided at the Florida Intersessional that the Scientific Committee should not consider the report on Conversion Factors presented to that meeting. We urge the UK to challenge this interpretation as it sets a dangerous precedent of Commissioners purporting to take decisive action in the name of the Commission.

WDCS will provide a separate briefing for Commissioners on the Conversion Factors report and urges the UK to review the arguments against Greenland's proposal set out in a joint report with WSPA, 'Questionable Quotas'.

Greenland's bowhead hunt

Recent press reports of serious problems with Greenland's 2010 hunt of three bowheads indicate that the hunters are not equipped or able to hunt and process such large animals. Two animals were wasted and the third took over two hours to die. WDCS will provide a separate briefing.

We urge the UK to call for withdrawal of this catch limit from Greenland for the time being.

Item 7. REVISED MANAGEMENT SCHEME

7.1 RMP.

The UK should take advantage of this agenda item to point out that the published version of the RMP was not used to calculate the quotas in the Chair's proposal and to request that in the future:

- i. Only the published version of the RMP (including the agreed tuning level of 0.72) be used in calculating any quotas and;
- ii. Such calculations must be done and approved by the Scientific Committee, not a subgroup of it or individual scientists.

The UK should also remind the Commission that it agreed in 1998 in a resolution on total catches over time that bycatch and all human induced mortality was to be deducted from catch limits under the RMS. Ignoring this commitment in IWC62/7 may result in at least one hunt permitted in Table 4 being unsustainable. See discussion in Item 3.

It may also be useful for the UK to remind the Commission of the 10 years of discussions on the RMS and that numerous crucial elements of the RMS package are being ignored by the Chair's proposal.

Item 8. SANCTUARIES

Japan once again notes that in the past it has 'proposed amendments to paragraph 7(b) of the Schedule to the effect that it becomes consistent with Article V(2) of the Convention'. The UK should take this opportunity to say that paragraphs 7(a) and 7(b) are both consistent with Article V(2) of the Convention. Japan interprets Article V(2), which requires that decisions be made based on scientific findings, as meaning that all whale populations in an area must be depleted before a sanctuary can be established there. In fact a sanctuary can equally well be established to protect a healthy population of whales. The IWC maintained a sanctuary covering $\frac{1}{4}$ of the Antarctic from its inception to 1955; the stated purpose of this sanctuary was to provide an unexploited reserve population of blue whales.

8.2 SAWS

The UK should support establishing of this sanctuary for an indefinite period of time, not merely for 10 years as proposed by the Chair.

Item 9. SOCIOECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS AND SMALL TYPE WHALING

Japan has asked for this to be on the agenda as a placeholder to propose a schedule amendment for a quota in Agadir should IWC62/7 fail. However, this tactic is no longer possible since the Rules of Procedure were amended in 2009 to require a full draft text of any Schedule Amendment proposal to be circulated to Commissioners at least 60 days before the meeting. Under Rule of Procedure J.1, the Commission will not be able to 'take decisive action' on Japan's request at IWC62.

We also draw attention again to Footnote 10 of Table 4.

Item 10. SCIENTIFIC PERMITS.

The UK should take this opportunity to recall the many resolutions agreed in the past, which say that the IWC does not need the data these programs produce and ask for them to be ended and note that all of these remain in effect.

Item 11. SAFETY AT SEA

Under this item we have seen a series of one sided presentations by Japan with those accused of unsafe actions unrepresented. We note that media reports of investigations into one of the most recent of these, which resulted in the sinking of one of the vessels involved, appear to indicate that there was fault on both sides. We suggest that the UK work with the flag and port states involved (Australia, Netherlands, New Zealand) to ensure that such presentations are eliminated or balanced and that the IWC does not make any statement that favours one side over the other. The IWC is not a maritime court and has no jurisdiction in such matters.

Item 12. ENVIRONMENT AND HEALTH

We draw the UK's attention to a new briefing produced by a coalition of NGOs working on human health issues related to consumption of cetaceans to be circulated shortly³. The briefing gives an overview of some recent findings and developments in whale-consuming countries, including extremely high levels of mercury in the consumers of dolphin products in Taiji Japan. The report provides a series of recommendations for Contracting Governments to engage on this issue in a proactive way at IWC62, including reactivating and expanding the IWC's relationship with the World Health Organisation (WHO).

Item 13. CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT PLANS

We note that there will be discussion of these plans in both the Scientific Committee and the Conservation Committee and that a small specialist group will construct a list of candidate management plans and report progress to the plenary. We will give you detailed comments when their reports become available. We believe that work of this kind is the real future of the IWC and should be warmly welcomed.

Item 14. WHALE WATCHING

We encourage the UK to look carefully at the outputs from the Scientific Committee and the Conservation Committee on this theme and to be supportive of efforts to maintain this work under the auspices of the IWC.

Item 16. OTHER SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

16.1 Small Cetaceans

Small cetaceans

³ A joint briefing for IWC 62 by Animal Welfare Institute, BlueVoice, Campaign Whale, Elsa Nature Conservancy, Environmental Investigation Agency, Just Cause, OceanCare, Pro Wildlife, Society for the Conservation of Marine Mammals, and Whale & Dolphin Conservation Society.

The UK's historical leadership on small cetacean issues is greatly appreciated. We note that the current Chair's 'Proposed Consensus Decision to improve the Conservation of Whales' includes no provisions regarding directed takes of small cetaceans and the serious conservation; human health and welfare issues that these hunts raise.

We refer again to the paper *IWC/62/CC11: Small cetaceans and the IWC: A contribution to the discussions on the 'Future of the IWC'*, submitted by Belgium and co-sponsored by Switzerland.

We urge the UK to continue to both lead with and support initiatives to effectively promote and address all small cetacean issues. We request that the UK highlights the fact that many populations of small cetaceans are subject to huge and often clearly unsustainable hunts, and to draw attention to the fact that despite being identified as an a) category priority issue by the IWC's SWG, small cetaceans have not been directly included in the proposed consensus agreement identified in the Chair's proposal.

– Japan

Japan continues to kill 20,000 small cetaceans each year and this fact has been ignored in the discussions on the Future of the IWC. At IWC 60 in Santiago a record 15 countries expressed concern in the plenary discussions on small cetaceans and particularly the Japanese Dall's porpoise hunt.

We ask the UK to ensure that its scientists participate in discussions in the Scientific Committee's Small Cetaceans Sub-Committee to ensure that concern is expressed for the record about these Japanese coastal hunts including the single largest hunt of any cetaceans in the world of up to 15,000 Dall's porpoise per year.

UK Scientists should ask Japan for details of the purported new management system (PBR) adopted for Dall's porpoises to supposedly reduce catches to sustainable levels as quickly as possible.

We urge the UK to draw attention to these hunts in the Plenary, particularly the Dall's porpoise hunt. EIA and Campaign Whale will work with other delegations to ensure support on the floor of the plenary.

– Greenland

Greenland takes very high numbers of small cetaceans annually. The Home Rule government has repeatedly failed to bring narwhal and beluga catch limits down to levels recommended by NAMMCO and the Joint Canada/Greenland Committee on Conservation and Management of Beluga and Narwhal (JCNB) to prevent further declines in the West Greenland populations. Catch limits for belugas and narwhals continue to be well above the recommended levels.

It would be helpful for the UK to ask Greenland for a report on these hunts.

– Baiji

The UK should forcefully remind the Commission of the loss of the Baiji, despite repeated warnings from the Scientific Committee and urge the Commission give priority to ensuring that no other small cetacean populations are exterminated. The opportunity should be taken to

reiterate every encouragement to the Mexican Government for their efforts to save the Vaquita from extinction.

16.4 Future Work Plan

The Scientific Committee should focus its future work plan largely on conservation and abandon work that is aimed only at setting commercial quotas.

We encourage the UK to appoint scientists to its delegation who support the perspectives of the British public.

Item 17. CONSERVATION COMMITTEE

We note that Belgium and Switzerland have submitted a useful and timely contribution to discussion of how the IWC might address small cetaceans in the future. We urge the UK to co-sponsor CC 11, "Small cetaceans and the IWC: A contribution to the discussions on the 'Future of the IWC'".

Item 19. INFRACTIONS

This year the Infractions Sub-committee will not meet and reports of any infractions will be discussed in plenary. The UK should use this opportunity to raise concerns about a whale bycaught by Icelandic fishermen being processed on board (flensed, frozen, vacuum sealed and boxed) clearly for commercial sale. Although it does not, strictly speaking, constitute an infraction, this may also be an appropriate opportunity to raise concerns about bycatch in Norway not being reported to the IWC. WDCCS will provide details of both shortly.

Item 20. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Amendments to the Rules of Procedure, Financial Regulations and Rules of Debate

The proposed changes provide that the Finance and Administration Committee will be changed to the Finance Administration and Communications Committee. Among its tasks would be:

9 (d) Develop a communications plan for the Commission.

But the expanded Committee would remain closed to observers. So the Commission would be developing a communications plan, presumably to aid openness, behind closed doors. Since the new rules of procedure would create a new body, the Bureau, which would also be closed to observers, the Commission would actually be moving more areas of deliberation into private meetings, not less.

Item R 2. which currently reads:

"2. Any document submitted to the Commission for distribution to Commissioners, Contracting Governments or members of the Scientific Committee is considered to be in the public domains unless it is designated by the author or government submitting it to be restricted. Such restriction..."

Should be revised to read:

"2. Any document submitted to the Commission for distribution to Commissioners OR Contracting Governments is considered to be in the public domains unless it is designated by the author or government submitting it to be restricted. DOCUMENTS FOR DISTRIBUTION TO MEMBERS OF THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE MAY NOT BE DESIGNATED AS RESTRICTED. Such restriction..."

Item 24. DATE AND PLACE OF ANNUAL MEETING

We are currently on track for a 2011 meeting in the UK by default rather than by invitation of the UK Government.

Annex 1: SUPPORTING TABLES

The proposal from the IWC Chair gives proposed catches up to 2015 and then sets new levels after 2015.

Country	Species	Up to 2015	After 2015
JARPA	Minke	400	200
	Fin	10	5
N Pac	Minke	160	160
	Brydes	12	12
	Sei	50	50
Iceland	Minke	80	80
	Fin	80	80
Norway	Minke	600	600
Totals		1,392	1,187

World catch of whales in 2009 and 2009/10 Antarctic season:

Norway	484 minkes
Iceland	125 fin
	82 minkes
Japan - Antarctic	506 minkes
	1 fin
Japan - North Pacific	43 Minke pelagic
	119 Minke coastal
	100 Sei
	50 Brydes
	1 Sperm
Total	1511

The current level of catch (2008 and the 2008/9 Antarctic season) was 1,511 whales for Iceland, Japan and Norway combined, so the Chair's proposal would in theory only reduce overall catches of whales by about 120 a year in the first 5 years and 320 a year in the second five, giving a total reduction of about 2,200 whales saved over the 10 year lifetime of the agreement.

Some current catches:

Iceland's 2009 catch of fin whales was 125, of minke whales, 82. Catches of fin whales before 2009 were zero since 1990 except for a catch of 7 in 2006. Minke catches, mostly as 'scientific', average 47 a year over the 7 years from 2003 to 2009. The proposed catch limit for Iceland is therefore significantly greater than the average actual catch for 2005-2009.

Norway's quota and catch of minke whales for the last 10 years was:

	Quota	Catch
2000	655	487
2001	549	552
2002	671	634
2003	711	647
2004	670	543
2005	796	639
2006	1052	546
2007	1052	597
2008	1052	536
2009	885	484

The average catch by Norway for the ten years from 2000 to 2009 was 567 per year. The proposed catch limit for Norway is greater than its annual average catch from 2005-2009
Japan's Antarctic catch of minke whales for the ten years from 2000/01 to 2009/10 was:

00/01	440
01/02	440
02/03	440
03/04	440
04/05	440
05/06	853
06/07	505
07/08	551
08/09	680
09/10	506

Average catch for 00/01 to 09/10 inclusive is 530. The year the factory ship caught fire, 06/07, has been included because the factory ship has caught fire twice in the last 20 years. No allowance for protest has been made because this is now a normal part of the operating environment of the whaling fleet - there were protest vessels with the whaling fleet six seasons out of the ten listed above including each of the past five years.

Quotas for Japan's catch of other species in the North Pacific have been 380, broken down as follows

Minke: 120 (taken by small coastal whaling vessels)
Minke: 100 (taken by pelagic fleet)
Sei: 100 (taken by pelagic fleet)
Brydes: 50 (taken by pelagic fleet)
Sperm: 10 (taken by pelagic fleet)



Wildlife and Countryside Link
89 Albert Embankment, London, SE1 7TP
W: www.wcl.org.uk

Wildlife and Countryside Link is a registered
charity (No. 1107460) and a company limited
by guarantee in England and Wales (No.3889519)