

**WILDLIFE AND COUNTRYSIDE LINK BRIEFING
TO THE UK GOVERNMENT:**

**KEY ISSUES FOR THE 61ST MEETING OF THE
INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION**

May 2009



Wildlife and Countryside Link briefing to the UK Government: Key Issues for the 61st Meeting of the International Whaling Commission

This briefing is provided on behalf of the following members of Wildlife and Countryside Link:

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

The Wildlife and Countryside Link (Link) Whales Working Group is composed of Non-Governmental Organisations with a range of concerns. These include organisations whose mandate relates purely to conservation issues, organisations whose mandate relates purely to welfare issues and organisations that are concerned about both conservation and welfare. Where joint documents include statements on issues relating to whale welfare these do not necessarily represent the views of all groups.

We urge that the UK resist attempts to link items and that every item be considered on its own merits.

The points in this briefing follow the numbering of the Annotated Provisional Agenda as well as comments on the EU Common Position and co-ordination

EU Common Position and Coordination

With the introduction of the EU Common Position and the subsequent requirement for an EU Common Position, it has become clear that the UK must take a leadership role in this Group to ensure that the EU Common Position is compatible with the policies of the UK Government on cetacean conservation and welfare.

With respect to the EU Common Position it is essential for the UK to ensure that:

- interpretation of the EU Common Position is beneficial for cetaceans
- ensures that the moratorium on commercial whaling remains intact
- positive progress is made within the IWC on cetacean conservation and welfare.

UK NGOs are very concerned about the lack of transparency and involvement of civil society in the development of the EU Common Position and its implementation at IWC meetings. We call on the UK to ensure that there is active engagement of NGOs in this process including some involvement in EU IWC Members Coordination Meetings.

3. Whale stocks

Antarctic minke whales

After considerable difficulty and nine years of work, the Scientific Committee (SC) is expected to agree a new abundance estimate for Antarctic minke whales. It is expected to be considerably lower than the most recently agreed estimate. The apparent 60% decline in southern hemisphere minke whale numbers in fewer than 15 years highlights the potential for large errors in counting whales and should lead to reduced confidence in the sustainability of catch limits. We urge the UK to highlight in the SC and plenary the inaccuracies associated with assessing the status of this population and cetacean populations generally.

We expect Japan to agree to a lower Antarctic minke estimate but to deny that this represents a real decrease in the minke population. We urge the UK's scientists to challenge any such statement by Japan and to draw attention to this real decrease and the fact that its cause is unknown..

Western North Pacific minke whale

The SC will report on current assessments of the Western North Pacific minke whale populations, which are not adequate to set quotas under the RMP. This population is subject to substantial takes by net entanglement, which particularly impacts the J stock, as well as by Special Permit whaling. Despite the clear threats and lack of information, there are likely to be proposals under items 8 or 18 to set ad hoc quotas on this population, instead of using the RMP. The UK should use this opportunity to point out this contradiction.

Western Grey Whale

We urge the UK to table a resolution on the Western Grey Whale noting that at least four Western Grey Whales are known to have been bycaught in the past three years, a rate of catch which will drive the population to extinction. The resolution should call for specific actions to end this bycatch. Link will supply further details when more information is made available, in advance of the plenary session.

4. Whale Killing Methods and Associated Welfare Issues

The Whale Killing Methods and Associated Welfare Issues Working Group will meet again this year. We offer the following comments and recommendations with respect to its core agenda:

Data on whales killed (Contracting Governments are invited to provide the information listed in Resolutions 1999-1 and 2001-2)

Resolution 1999-1 requests the submission of full welfare datasets for each animal killed. We note that Russia is the only country to supply this data as requested and that all other whaling nations supply either summary or worse still, no data. Japan has never supplied comprehensive welfare data sets for all whales killed under its lethal research programmes. Furthermore, no welfare data at all – not even in summary statistics – have ever been provided on for the two largest species killed in these programmes - sperm whales and fin whales.

We urge the UK to strongly reiterate the importance of the provision of full welfare datasets and that such data collection should be an essential component of any proposals to sanction commercial whaling.

In 2003 Norway ceased collecting welfare datasets for each animal killed, replacing inspectors with the 'blue box', capable only of recording minimal data such as time of harpoon fire and time of hauling the animal aboard the vessel.

We request that the UK raises the point that this lack of oversight and reporting is inconsistent with Norway's provisions for welfare oversight in its other marine mammal hunts (i.e. sealing) and also in its other commercial meat production (in abattoirs).

Improving the humaneness of whaling operations (Contracting Governments will be invited to provide the information specified in 1997-1 and supported by Resolution 2001-2);

The welfare of animals used by humans is an issue now recognised by numerous intergovernmental bodies, including the 174 member strong World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE). The OIE's animal welfare guidelines and principles represent a valuable, culturally neutral opinion on the humane treatment of animals and their application could help to improve the humaneness of whaling operations.

We recommend the UK advocates the general welfare principles within the OIE's Terrestrial animal health code¹ as a useful international welfare opinion for consideration by the IWC, with a view to possible development of a formal relationship between the two organisations in future.

We further urge the UK to actively support an initiative by Australia seeking to promote the inclusion of the '3Rs' of animal experimentation in codes of conduct for both lethal and non-lethal uses of whales in the name of science.

Progress with planning the workshop on welfare issues associated with the entanglement of large whales.

The UK should enquire about progress with respect to this workshop and demonstrate support for it.

5. Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling

The IWC has yet to complete and implement an Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling scheme. This scheme is an essential prerequisite to any consideration of new Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling quotas. Until the scheme is adopted no consideration should be given to new quotas. Additionally, subsistence whaling must be clearly defined as meeting the nutritional needs of local communities of indigenous peoples with a long-standing dependence on whale products exclusively for local consumption, and with no element of commercial sale or resale.

¹ Terrestrial animal health code 2008. Chapter, volume 1, section 7.1 Introduction 'Introductions to the recommendations for animal welfare; and Chapter 7.5 Guidelines for the slaughter of animals. Available online at: www.oie.int/eng/normes/mcode/en_chapitre_1.7.1.htm

Greenland's humpback request

Denmark is expected to submit another proposal to amend the schedule to permit Greenland to hunt 10 humpback whales a year for ASW. Based on its own 'conversion factors' for meat yields from large whales, Greenland's ASW quotas have yielded 540 tonnes of meat annually since 2003. Greenland claimed in 2007 that these quotas are inadequate and that it needs at least 730 tonnes annually. At the 2007 meeting, Greenland was awarded 25 more West Greenland minke whales and two bowhead whales a year (from 2008), but its request for 10 humpbacks was declined in 2007 and 2008.

Although Greenland continues to claim that it needs over a hundred more tonnes of whale meat to meet its needs, it does not realize the full potential of its existing quotas. This undermines its claim that it urgently needs 10 humpback whales (which would provide 80 tonnes of whale meat) to meet its nutritional needs.

Greenland's 'conversion factors' for calculating meat yields of minke, humpback and fin whales (two, eight and ten tonnes respectively) are unique amongst ASW applicants and have never been assessed by the Scientific Committee. We note that a request was made at IWC60 for the Scientific Committee for clarification of factors used by Greenland to convert whales to tonnes in expressing their Need, including whether the factors take account of blubber as well as meat yielded. We urge the UK to argue that blubber from large whales as well as meat from small cetaceans is making a significant contribution to meeting Greenland's nutritional subsistence needs.

According to Greenland's own data, annual hunts of over 4,000 small cetaceans in Greenland provide an average of 338 tonnes of meat each year. This represents 43% of all cetacean meat consumed in Greenland and more than makes up the shortfall in whale meat that Greenland claims. Some Commissioners will deny that the IWC can take into account the meat yielded by small cetacean hunts when assessing whether Greenland has made a compelling case to the IWC that it needs higher ASW quotas. WCL disagrees with this position because the IWC has previously taken alternative sources of nutrition into account when evaluating need, including small cetaceans and other marine mammals:

In 1979, the Technical Committee convened a panel of experts to examine the cultural, biological, and nutritional aspects of aboriginal subsistence whaling, focusing mostly, but not entirely, on the Alaskan native communities. Having determined that the bowhead stock was severely threatened, the Biological Panel considered alternative resources on which the native Alaskan whaling communities could subsist. The panel considered both the status and availability of gray and white whales; walrus; bearded, ringed, largha and ribbon seals; polar bear; caribou; fox; eider, cliff nesters; white and other fish. Citing short notice, the panel was unable to adequately estimate the status of each species under consideration, but noted that if any or all of the species under consideration were to replace the bowhead hunt, the hunting intensity of such species would increase. The biological panel determined that additional studies should be conducted to determine the effect of an increased hunt on any or all of the considered species².

² Wildlife Panel, Report of the Panel Meeting of Experts on Aboriginal/Subsistence Whaling, Report of the Wildlife Panel, in ABORIGINAL/SUBSISTENCE WHALING 11, 15 (G.P. Donovan, ed., 1982)

Commercialisation of products from ASW hunts

Greenland commercialises a significant proportion of the meat yielded by its ASW hunts. Whether, and what kind of, commercialization of whale meat (and other products) taken in ASW hunts is permitted by the IWC remains a matter of legal interpretation that is not likely to be resolved until the Commission undertakes its long-overdue reform of the regulation of Aboriginal Whaling. However, it is arguable that the kind of commercialization practiced by Greenland (whereby whole whales are sold to commercial suppliers for processing and distribution via supermarkets) was never intended.

The IWC's anthropological research in the late 1970s affirmed the importance of indigenous peoples' use of whale meat to *strengthen familial, community, social, and cultural ties*. For this reason, the IWC does not expressly prohibit trade in whale products. However, the Schedule requires that indigenous people use whale meat and products *locally* and *for subsistence purposes*. Although neither term is adequately defined, it is reasonable to presume that the intent of this language was to ensure that any sales of whale meat and products directly benefit indigenous people. The Commission could provide such assurance by requiring that whale products may only be sold via direct trade by those indigenous communities or individuals. i.e. by prohibiting the processing facilities or commercial institutions from buying and distributing the products onwards, because such distribution would no longer directly benefit indigenous people.

6. Revised Management Scheme (RMS)

Progress on the RMS has stalled because the whalers do not want to accept the 'user pays' principle or strict rules such as full observer coverage, real time monitoring and a DNA register held by the Commission. Despite this, the whaling nations blame the lack of progress on the pro-conservation members. The UK should make it clear by means of interventions that it is the whaling nations who were responsible for the lack of progress on the RMS.

The UK should also question why effort is being applied to implementation trials, the only purpose of which is to set catch limits for commercial whaling, under rules the whalers refuse to accept and propose that this effort should be diverted elsewhere.

Norway may present proposed changes to the RMP. These will be designed to increase quotas in the short term and should be vigorously opposed.

7. Sanctuaries

The UK should take this opportunity to state for the record that both of Commission's existing sanctuaries are consistent with Article V(2) of the Convention. It should note that the Commission is not limited to creating sanctuaries just to protect endangered populations – indeed the first sanctuary ever accepted by the Commission was set up specifically to protect a population untouched by whaling.

The Latin American bloc may make a presentation about the SAWS without calling for a vote. The UK should support this proposal on its own merits, and as with Agenda Item 8, reject attempts to link its adoption to the creation of any new category of whaling under the Future of the IWC negotiations

8. Socio-economic implications and Small-type whaling

If Japan's longstanding proposal for a STCW quota, or a package that permits whaling in coastal waters were adopted, it could violate the moratorium and would establish a new category of whaling which would blur the distinctions between commercial whaling and aboriginal whaling.

Permitting any new category of whaling that circumvents both the moratorium and the RMP, relying instead upon *ad hoc* scientific advice, would create a dangerous precedent and must be strongly opposed.

Japan has reserved the right to propose a Schedule amendment saying:

"(f) Notwithstanding the other provisions of paragraph 10, the taking of up to x minke whales from the Okhotsk Sea - West Pacific stock of the North Pacific in subarea 7 (excluding Okhotsk Sea) shall be permitted for each of the years 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 and the meat and products are to be used exclusively for local consumption."

with the number, x, to be provided before the vote is taken.

Japan states that this would only allow community based whaling in order to 'reinstate traditional and local practices associated with the catching, processing, distribution and consumption of whale meat, and revitalise traditional festivals and rituals of the region'. But 'local consumption' will be taken to mean consumption anywhere within Japan and Link does not believe that the operation could be classified as non-commercial.

This whole item is likely to feed into the 'Future of the IWC' discussions, as with the next item.

9. Scientific Permits

Report of the Scientific Committee - The Scientific Committee will report on its review of results from existing permits and on work to improve procedures for reviewing scientific permit proposals. The review of JARPN II, which was conducted under the new procedures agreed last year, recommended improvements in the JARPN II program which might be interpreted by its proponents as support for the program to continue. We urge the UK to ensure that the SC does not support these calls.

We also urge the UK produce a paper and initiate a discussion within the SC aimed at building support for an end to secrecy of scientific permit proposals, as was proposed in 2007, so that any future proposals can be circulated to all scientists working in the field, not just the IWC's Scientific Committee. This would enable the Committee to have the widest possible input when considering any future proposals.

We note that Australia has produced a set of key principles for how all IWC science should be undertaken. We trust you will support tabling of these principles and a call for a consensus agreement to abide by them.

10. Safety at Sea

Japan will make a presentation and has said it is important for the IWC to share information about attacks on its research vessels in order to take coordinated international actions against the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society. It is not clear what information is proposed to be shared with whom. Investigation of incidents at sea is outside the competence of the IWC - effective mechanisms exist elsewhere and should be applied. The only information presented by Japan has been edited video produced by a party to the conflict.

An edited video may not tell the whole story and interested parties do not always make accurate judgments, for example in SC/60/04, [2007/08 JARPA II cruise report] the ICR says:

'An Australian patrol ship, Oceanic Viking (OV) stalked NM and three SSVs from 22 January to 12 February. ... it often approached our vessels at abnormally close distance and our crew members were exposed to potential threats of ship collisions all the time.'

We do not believe that the crew of the Oceanic Viking would agree with those statements, which incorporate judgments by the ICR.

It is the port and flag states concerned which have competence and authority to act to ensure that vessels and crews comply with the rules concerning the safety of navigation and life at sea. The appropriate international forum for discussion of these matters is the International Maritime Organisation (IMO).

At the March Intersessional the Commission was told by the flag state of the Sea Shepherd vessel that it was investigating complaints by Sea Shepherd over the conduct of Japanese flag vessels as well as vice versa; the port state is also conducting investigations. The IWC is not a maritime court and should not conduct its own investigations.

Agenda 21, a group unknown to the conservation NGO community at the IWC, has claimed responsibility for sabotaging the Norwegian whaling vessel Skarbakk while it was docked for repairs in April 2009. Agenda 21 earlier claimed to have caused the sinking of the Willassen Senior. There may be discussion of this at the meeting.

11. Environment and Health Issues

The UK should support the maintenance of these agenda items at the Commission and, in particular, seek to assist discussion of human health concerns and continue to strongly support the work of the SC on environmental issues, welcoming and endorsing as appropriate.

There should be support of recommendations coming from the Climate Change workshop for further action including non-invasive research. We urge the UK to support these recommendations which may take the form of a resolution.

We encourage the UK to state its continued support for Pollution 2000+ and SOCER and to support any proposal for a workshop or special session of the SWGEC on Marine Renewable Energy Developments.

Link asks the UK to urge that the human health issues associated with the consumption of highly contaminated whale products and the environmental threats to whale stocks are given higher priority, including budgetary priority, in the Scientific Committee. Particularly this priority should be greater than that given to implementation trials for whale stocks intended solely to facilitate any resumption of commercial whaling as this is far from agreement.

12. Whalewatching

The UK should welcome the report and continue to ensure that this item provides a platform for the positive contributions that whale watching is able to make in terms of awareness, education and research. The UK should also highlight the economic benefits to local communities from the non-consumptive use of cetacean resources, and compliment the Conservation Committee for its work on this issue.

13. Cooperation with other organisations

We note with concern that international commercial trade in whale products under Reservations to the CITES Appendix I listing is at its highest level for years. We draw attention to the statement of concern submitted by 38 NGOs to Commissioners at the Intersessional Rome meeting (annex 2) and urge the UK to encourage the EU to make strong statements to the Madeira meeting opposing trade in whale products under reservation and demanding that contracting governments lift their CITES reservations on whales.

14. Other Scientific Committee Activities, its future work plan and adoption of the Scientific Committee report

14.1 Small cetaceans

The UK's leadership on small cetacean issues since 1990 is greatly appreciated. We urge the UK to note the importance of effectively addressing all small cetacean issues in Future of the IWC discussions

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.

Link asks the UK to raise concerns about these and other small cetacean hunts in Greenland and note that small cetaceans hunted in Greenland yield on average 338 tonnes of meat annually. Although small cetaceans contribute to meeting Greenland's needs for whale meat, they are not taken into account in Greenland's Needs Statement to the IWC in support of its ASW requests. Please see annex 1 for more details.

Greenlandic small cetacean catches are further addressed in an Annex to this briefing.

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. Last year a record 15 countries expressed concern in the plenary discussions on small cetaceans and the Japanese Dalls hunt.

Link asks the UK to ensure that its scientists participate in discussions in the Scientific Committee's Small Cetaceans Sub-Committee to give warranted attention to the single largest hunt of any cetaceans in the world, averaging of over 17,000 animals being killed every year.

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

Link urges the UK to draw attention to these hunts in the Plenary, particularly the Dall's porpoise hunt including sponsoring a resolution on Japan's Dall's Porpoise hunt. EIA and Campaign Whale will provide a further briefing specifically on this issue and NGOs will work with other delegations to ensure support for the resolution on the floor of the plenary.

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.

Solomon Islands dolphin captures and exports

Link urges the UK to support a statement in the Scientific Committee and Plenary expressing concern about unsustainable captures and exports of live dolphins from the Solomon Islands. A separate briefing will be provided.

Botos

Recent research by the Sea Mammal Research Unit indicated that half the population of *botos* in a study area had disappeared over the last six years. The UK should take the opportunity to raise this issue with Brazil (the range state) either bilaterally or in plenary on this issue.

14.2. Regional non-lethal research partnerships

Australia will present the outcomes of a Workshop held in April, 2009. We trust the UK will give this its strong support. We request that those responsible for whaling issues contact the British Antarctic Survey to develop specific ideas for incorporating a whale research component into existing BAS work for further discussion with Australia.

The UK should also actively encourage other members of the IWC including Japan and Norway to participate in this work.

14.4 *Scientific Committee Future Work Plan*

The Scientific Committee will put forward proposals for the priority work it believes it should carry out in the next year. UK should support work that aids the conservation of whales and oppose work that is aimed toward setting commercial catch limits.

15. Conservation Committee

We urge the UK to welcome the report and repeat its call for full participation in the Committee highlighting the urgent need to address the environmental threats to all cetaceans and the urgent need to prioritise recovery plans for critically endangered whale populations and species such as the Western grey and north Atlantic right whales.

Japan and the 25 members who attend the IWC meetings in support of Japan continue their boycott of the Conservation Committee meetings, the UK should note that this behaviour falls well short of the efforts to reduce conflicts and to try to build the trust and consensus that Japan has called for. There should be full participation in good faith in this Committee and its important work.

The Ship Strikes Working Group will present an update on its plans for a workshop in 2010. We urge the UK, in the Conservation Committee and in the Plenary to commend the SSWG for its work on this very important issue, highlighting the fact that this is an example of the excellent work that the IWC accomplished to effectively mitigate the anthropogenic threats to cetaceans.

18. The IWC in the Future

We believe that a complete halt to Special Permit whaling, international trade in whale products and the recruitment of new countries by the whaling countries without conditions is a necessary prerequisite for the IWC to move into a modern era.

We urge the UK to refer to the considerable difficulty it has in seeing commitment to this process from the whaling nations, given their track record over the last year (Annex 3), and to stress that ongoing whaling under special permit and objection undermines faith in these negotiations.

If Japan continues to block progress toward moving the IWC into the modern era, we urge the UK, and the like minded, to make a symbolic move in this direction by deleting a line item in the IWC's budget for work involved in the exploitation of whales and reassigning it to work on the conservation of whales. Precedent for doing this by majority vote exists – for example at the 2004 IWC meeting 23 Contracting Parties, led by Japan, proposed that funding for a workshop on the use of market sampling, proposed by the Scientific Committee, be deleted and reassigned to other named projects. This proposal was voted on in the IWC plenary where it failed

We request that instead of continuing to develop rules and models for commercial whaling the Commission should move away from its primary focus of exploitation of great whales. We urge the UK to initiate a discussion with NGOS and other contracting governments on how we want the IWC to evolve in respect of all cetaceans. Specifically we urge consideration of how direct and indirect threats to cetaceans (including climate change, noise pollution, ship strikes, toxic pollution, habitat destruction and entanglement) can best be addressed on an international level, including by the IWC, and how the recovery of endangered species and populations can be accomplished.

We may provide a full briefing on the report of the Small Working Group after it becomes available on May 18.

We note that an Intersessional Correspondence Group (ICG) is focused on ways to improve the role of science in the IWC, including by reviewing composition and function of the Scientific Committee. The terms of reference of the ICG included consideration of the applicability of other models for scientific bodies. WDCS has commissioned a comparative analysis of the role and function of the IWC Scientific Committee and other relevant scientific advisory bodies which will be provided shortly. We urge the UK to take a leadership role in seeking reforms of the Scientific Committee that would enhance its transparency, accountability and scientific integrity.

A copy of the Link paper of November 2007 entitled 'Modernisation To Avoid Extinction' has been attached to this briefing and should be used by the UK to remind delegates of what the future of the IWC negotiations should seek to achieve above all else.

24. Date and place of Annual and Intersessional meetings

The IWC should move to biannual meetings with SC meetings held every year and decoupled in time from the plenary meeting.

We hope the UK will take a leadership role in securing a pro-conservation future for the IWC under a new Chair.

Annex 1: Small cetaceans and Greenland’s need

Greenland claims that its current ASW quota does not provide enough whale meat to meet its claimed need for 730 tonnes annually. However, Greenland also hunts over 4,000 small cetaceans a year – killer whales, belugas, narwhals, pilot whales and harbour porpoises. These small cetaceans contribute to meeting Greenland’s need for whale meat. A data set recently³ published by Greenland for cetacean hunts shows that:

- 1) Small cetaceans hunted in Greenland yield on average 338 tonnes of meat annually. Although they contribute to meeting Greenland’s needs, meat from small cetaceans is not taken into account in Greenland’s Needs Statement to the IWC.
- 2) Small cetaceans provide 43 % of meat from cetaceans hunted in Greenland.
- 3) When small cetacean meat is taken into account, cetaceans provide more than 730 tonnes of cetacean meat annually to Greenlanders.

Furthermore, Blubber and mattak (skin) from whales are also consumed in Greenland, but are not taken into account in its Needs Statement. A conservative estimate indicates that blubber (excluding mattak) represents at least 10% of body weight in cetaceans. If blubber and mattak were included in the yield of edible products from each cetacean, the total yields would be far higher.

Greenland does not take all the fin whales available under its quota. Since 1991, Greenland has taken an average of 13.6 fin whales a year out of the available quota of 19. If the full quota were taken, an extra 50 tonnes of whale meat would be available each year.

Meat yields claimed by Greenland⁴

species	Meat yield (kg)
Fin whale	10,000
Humpback	8000
Minke	2000
Orca	500
Pilot whale	400
Narwhal	225
Beluga	200
Harbour porpoise	20-40 (30)

³ “Greenland in Figures 2007”, Statistics Greenland, Greenland Home Rule Government.. Available at www.nanoq.gl.

The five years reported are those for which data sets are published. The small cetacean catch figures for 2004 and 2006 are incomplete, so should be viewed as minimums

⁴ Directorate of Hunting and Fishing Greenland Home Rule Authority. www.nanoq.gl

Meat yield by year from all cetaceans hunted in Greenland

species	1998	Meat yielded (kg)	2000	Meat yielded (kg)	2002	Meat yielded (kg)	2004 *	Meat yielded (kg)	2006 *	Meat yielded (kg)	
Fin	9	90000	6	60000	13	130000	13	130000	10	100000	
Minke	176	352000	155	310000	149	298000	190	380000	182	364000	
Sub-total		442000		370000		428000		510000		464000	2214000
Orca	1	500	1	500	21	10500	14	7000	-		
Pilot whale	365	146000	5	2000	38	15200	265	106000	27	10800	
Narwhal	814	183150	600	135000	672	151200	509	114525	307	69075	
Beluga	718	143600	609	121800	424	84800	186	37200	80	16000	
Harbour porpoise	2131	63930	1605	48150	2132	63960	2963	88890	2373	71190	
Sub-total		537180		307450		325660		353615		167065	1690970
TOTAL		979180		677,450		753,660		863615		631,065	3904970

Annex 2: NGO Statement of Concern

“TRADE IN WHALE PRODUCTS AND THE FUTURE OF THE IWC”

Non governmental organizations, which collectively regard several issues as serious impediments to agreement on the proposal before the forthcoming Intersessional meeting of the IWC, are deeply concerned about increasing international trade in whale products by Norway, Iceland and Japan under their Reservations to the Appendix I listing of whales by CITES, the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.

The IWC's current discussions on the Future of the Commission focus only on Japan, and how to bring one of its special permit whaling operations under international control. The proposal ignores Norway and Iceland's expanding whaling operations, and Japan's recent decisions to resume imports of whale products from both nations.

Exports of whale products by Norway and Iceland have increased significantly since the negotiation process began:

2008: Iceland exported nearly 82 tons of fin whale meat to Japan, 900 kg of minke whale meat to the Faroe Islands, and 90 kg of whale oil to Norway; Norway exported five tons of minke whale meat to Japan.

2009: The Norwegian Food Safety Authority (Mattilsynet) confiscated (on health grounds) 4,320 kg of whale meat, some of which was destined for the Faroe Islands.

The IWC cannot make a rational decision about how to shape its future without considering the current global economic crisis and the acute impact it has already had on at least two of the three whaling nations. We believe that Iceland's recent decision to resume commercial whaling was motivated by the potential of revenue from international trade in whale products. We fear that unregulated international trade in whale products will stimulate further increases in unregulated whaling, and further destabilize the IWC.

We urge Contracting Governments to the IWC to denounce the whaling nations' ongoing and increasing international commercial trade in whale products in defiance of both the IWC and CITES. We believe that no further negotiations of the Future of the IWC should take place until Norway, Iceland and Japan stop all international trade and revoke their Reservations to the CITES Appendix I listing of whales.

We, the undersigned, strongly urge Contracting Governments to call upon Japan, Norway, and Iceland to immediately cease all international trade in whale products and revoke their CITES reservations as a pre-requisite to any further discussion on the Future of the IWC.

Signed

Animal Alliance of Canada
Animal Welfare Institute

ASOC
Born Free Foundation
Born Free USA
Campaign Whale
Canadian Marine Environment Protection Society
Conservacion De Mamiferos Marinos De Mexico (Comarino)
Cousteau Society
Cetacean Society International
Defenders of Wildlife
Earth Island Institute
ECCEA
Eurogroup for Animals
Finns for the Whales
Fundacion Cethus
Global Ocean
Greenpeace
GSM - Society for the Conservation of Marine Mammals.
HSI/HSUS
Humane Society of Canada
Instituto de Conservacion de Ballenas Argentina
International Marine Mammal Project of Earth Island Institute
IFAW
ILPC
Iruka and Kujira Action Network (IKAN)
Marine connection
NRDC
OceanCare
Pacific Orca Society/Orcalab
Project Sea Wolf Coastal Protection
Pro Wildlife
Salamandra
Society for the Conservation of Marine Mammals, Denmark
WDCS
WSPA
WWF
Zoocheck Canada

Annex 3: Diary of whaling nation ‘commitment’ to compromise throughout negotiations on the future of the IWC

1/4/2008	Norwegian whaling season starts with a quota of 1,052 minke whales
18/5/2008	Small type coastal whalers in Sanriku complete their JARPNII coastal hunt, killing a total of 60 minke whales
20/5/2008	Iceland's whaling season begins with a quota of 40 minke whales
2/6/2008	70 tonnes of whalemeat (65 tonnes from Iceland and 5 tonnes from Norway) exported from Iceland to Japan
6/6/2008	Japanese factory ship ‘Nisshin Maru’ leaves port to begin JARPNII offshore ‘research’ with the aim to kill 100 sei whales, 50 Brydes’ whales, 100 minke whales and 10 sperm whales
23/8/2008	Nisshin Maru arrives back in port following JARPNII offshore hunt having killed 59 minke whale, 100 sei whales, 50 Bryde’s whales and 3 sperm whales
31/8/2008	Norwegian whaling season ends – 534 minke whales caught
9/2008	Icelandic whaling season ends – 36 minke whales caught
20/10/2008	Small type coastal whalers in Kushiro complete their JARPNII coastal hunt, killing a total of 50 minke whales
18/11/2008	Japanese whaling fleet sets sail to the Southern Ocean whale Sanctuary with the aim of killing up to 935 minke whales and 50 fin whales, despite a Japanese stockpile of some 3,300 tonnes of whale meat.
28/11/2008	Whale meat imported from Iceland goes on sale in Japanese markets
10/12/2008	Government of Norway issues a quota for 885 minke whales in 2009
28/1/2009	Government of Iceland announces annual quota of 100 minke whales and 150 fin whales per year for five years – five times higher than 2008 quota
18/2/2009	New Icelandic Minister for Fisheries confirms annual quota of 150 fin and 100 minke whales for 2009
3/4/2009	Norwegian whaling season begins as first whale is killed off Vestfjorden
13/4/2009	JARPAII (2008-9 season) results released by ICR – 679 minke and 1 fin whale killed.
23/4/2009	Meeting convened in Tokyo, Japan, entitled ‘The shared Interests of International Whaling Commission Members Supporting the Principle of Sustainable Use’. The meeting, amongst other conclusions, welcomes the resumption of international trade in whale products; rejects the creation of sanctuaries and supports lethal scientific research on whales
11/5/2009	BBC reports that a meeting of some members of the Small Working Group in San Francisco heard from Japan its offer to cut the haul to 650 minke whales per year, only 29 fewer than were caught last season, in exchange for a coastal whaling quota of 150 minkes.
11/5/2009	Japanese factory ship ‘Nisshin Maru’ leaves port to begin JARPNII offshore ‘research’ with the aim to kill 100 sei whales, 50 Brydes’ whales, 100 minke whales and 10 sperm whales