

ANNEX 2: SUMMARY OF REQUESTS BY NAMMCO COUNCIL TO THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE, AND RESPONSES BY THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE				
This table provides a summary of all active requests by the NAMMCO Council to the Scientific Committee, and notes the response of the Scientific Committee (SC) to these requests. This document will be continually updated to serve as a resource for both the Council and the Scientific Committee. See List of References for sources of meeting documents. Codes beginning with: 1 – relevant to all Management Committees; 2 – relevant to seals; 3 – relevant to whales.				
Code	Meeting	Request	Response of the Scientific Committee	Status
1.1.0	MARINE MAMMAL – FISHERIES INTERACTIONS:			
1.1.5	NAMMCO/7 05-1997	The Council encourages scientific work that leads to a better understanding of interactions between marine mammals and commercially exploited marine resources, and requested the Scientific Committee to periodically review and update available knowledge in this field. MC will discuss whether outdated/completed at NAMMCO/26	The SC recommends (this request) should remain as standing request and also takes the place of R-1.1.3 (SC/21).	Standing
1.1.8	NAMMCO/17 09-2008	In addressing the standing requests on ecosystem modelling and marine mammal fisheries interaction, the SC is requested to extend the focus to include all areas under NAMMCO jurisdiction. In the light of the distributional shifts seen under T-NASS 2007, the SC should investigate dynamic changes in spatial distribution due to ecosystem changes and functional responses. See also 1.1.6 and 1.4.6. MC will discuss whether outdated/completed at NAMMCO/26	The SC convened in 2009 the WG on Marine Mammal Fisheries Interaction (MMFI) because it judged at its last meeting that the developments in modelling and other progress which had occurred in Norway, Canada and Japan warranted their review. SC has reviewed progress made in all areas and for all species. (SC/16). This request should be kept as ongoing until the results expected from Iceland are presented in the SC (SC21).	Ongoing

1.2.0	MULTISPECIES APPROACHES TO MANAGEMENT:			
1.2.1	NAMMCO/1 1992	<p>To consider whether multispecies models for management purposes can be established for the North Atlantic ecosystems and whether such models could include the marine mammals compartment. If such models and the required data are not available then identify the knowledge lacking for such an enterprise to be beneficial to proper scientific management and suggest scientific projects which would be required for obtaining this knowledge.</p> <p>MC will discuss whether outdated/completed at NAMMCO/26</p>	<p>Vikingsson updated the SC on the Ecosystem Modelling project for which funding was being sought. The initial NAMMCO research program has developed into a much broader project with modelling at the core, including more general fisheries management considerations and a socioeconomic component. The project has now been funded for 6 million Euros for the next 4 years. The funded project has been adapted for the call for research proposals from the EU, and now includes 29 institutes from 16 countries. It still contains parts of the original marine mammal components. Iceland is still a core area, and the project has been expanded to include many other areas, however multispecies modelling in the Barents Sea has been removed. The SC noted that the original NAMMCO project (coordinated by Lars Walløe) has been changed but the Icelandic component is still included. (SC/20)</p> <p>A large-scale ecosystem modelling project (MAREFRAME) is underway, which includes marine mammals in Icelandic and adjacent waters (SC/21).</p>	Ongoing
1.2.2	NAMMCO/5 02-1995	<p>In relation to the importance of the further development of multispecies approaches to the management of marine resources, the Scientific Committee was requested to monitor stock levels and trends in stocks of all marine mammals in the North Atlantic.</p> <p>MC will discuss whether outdated/completed at NAMMCO/26</p>	<p>It was clarified that the purpose of this request was to ensure that data on marine mammals was available for input into multi-species models for management. The Committee agreed that updated information on abundance and indications of trends in abundance of stocks of marine mammals in the North Atlantic should be clearly described in a new document for the internal reference of the Council, to replace the List of Priority Species. This document would be entitled Status of Marine Mammals in the North Atlantic and should include those cetacean and pinniped species</p>	Standing

			<p>already contained in the List of Priority Species, as well as other common cetacean species in the NAMMCO area for which distribution and abundance data is also available (fin, sei, humpback, blue, and sperm whales). (SC/5).</p> <p>This remains a standing request (SC/21).</p>	
1.3.0	SEALWORM INFESTATION:			
<i>No active requests</i>				
1.4.0	ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF MARINE MAMMAL-FISHERIES INTERACTIONS:			
1.4.7	NAMMCO/23 2015	<p>The Scientific Committee is requested to review the results of the MAREFRAME ecosystem management project when these become available. In particular, the results should be reviewed with respect to the ongoing and standing requests on marine mammal interactions (R1.1.0) and multispecies approaches to management (R 1.2.0)</p> <p>[The MC] await(s) the SC's review of the MAREFRAME project (NAMMCO/24).</p> <p>MareFrame is on schedule with a final meeting to be held in 2017 so it would be possible for the SC to review the results in line with the standing request at its meeting in 2018. (NAMMCO/25)</p>	<p>The MAREFRAME project is scheduled to be concluded in 2017, after which the SC will review the result as requested by the Council (SC/22).</p> <p>The SC expressed interest in the potential of developing the modelling effort from the Icelandic case study further by extending the study to the Barents Sea ecosystem. (SC/23-2016)</p>	Ongoing
1.5.0	ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:			
1.5.3	NAMMCO/24 2016	The Council requests the SC to monitor the development of the Mary River Project and assess qualitatively or if possible quantitatively	[The SC] recommends that the issues regarding belugas and narwhals be discussed further at the JCNB-NAMMCO JWG...[additionally] the JWG meetings routinely include	Ongoing

		the likely impact and consequences on marine mammals in the area.	information sharing between Canada and Greenland on new human activities that are occurring in either country that could affect narwhals and belugas (SC/23-2016).	
1.5.4	NAMMCO/25 2017	Committed to furthering its ecosystem approach to the management of marine mammals, and recognising the range of anthropogenic pressures facing North Atlantic marine mammals associated with the climate and environmental changes taking place, the Council requests the SC to advise on the best process to investigate the effects of non-hunting related anthropogenic stressors on marine mammal populations, including the cumulative impacts of global warming, by-catch, pollution and disturbance.		NEW
1.6.0	MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES:			
1.6.4	NAMMCO/24 2016	The SC has recommended that catch statistics include correction for struck but lost animals for different seasons, areas, and catch operations. NAMMCO Council request the SC and the Hunting Committee to provide advice on the best methods for collection of the desired statistics on losses.	...SL rates based on hunter interviews are often not reliable enough for use in assessments...the best method for collecting SL data was using observers in the different types hunts, as SL rates vary between species and hunts (SC/23-2016).	Ongoing
1.6.5	NAMMCO/25 2017	Greenland requests that struck and loss rates are subtracted from future advice on sustainable removals in Greenland, with the advice being given as total allowable landings.		NEW
1.7.0	MONITORING MARINE MAMMAL STOCK LEVELS AND TRENDS IN STOCKS /NORTH ATLANTIC SIGHTINGS SURVEYS (NASS):			

1.7.11	NAMMCO/16 02-2007	Once the survey has been completed, the Committee requested the Scientific Committee to develop estimates of abundance and trends as soon as possible, with the primary target species (fin, minke and pilot whales) as a first priority, and secondary target species as a second priority.	<p>This request is being addressed with the near completion of most of the analyses of T-NASS minke whale survey data. Abundance estimates for fin whales have been finalized (Icelandic-Faroese shipboard and Greenland aerial T-NASS surveys) or are on their way (Norway shipboard T-NASS survey). Some progress has been made in the analyses of pilot whale data, although further analyses are warranted, which will be presented to the next AE WG in October 2009. (SC/16).</p> <p>Estimates of abundance for some key species are available and referred to in the SC report (SC/17).</p> <p>Regarding R-1.7.11, the SC awaits results of NASS2015 and expects that these will allow for the development of an abundance estimate, and will be incorporated into the trend analysis. (SC/22)</p>	Completed (NAMMCO/25)
1.7.12		Greenland requests the SC to give information on sustainable yield based on new abundance estimates expected from TNASS2015 for all large baleen whales in West Greenland waters (NAMMCO 22).	The SC noted this new request, and will consider this again after T-NASS2015. (SC/21)	Ongoing
1.8.0	OTHER:			
<i>No active requests</i>				
2.1.0	HARP AND HOODED SEALS			
2.1.4	NAMMCO/12 03-2003	The Management Committee noted that new information recently had become available on the abundance of harp seals in the Greenland Sea and the Northwest Atlantic. In addition new information is available on movements and stock delineation of harp seals in the Greenland, Barents and White seas. The	An update of the stock status of North Atlantic hooded seals had been made by the WGHARP at its 2008 meeting, which in turn had been endorsed by the Committee. The SC notes that this is a standing request that will be taken up again when new data become available.	Standing

		<p>Management Committee therefore reiterated its previous request to the Scientific Committee to regularly update the stock status of North Atlantic harp and hooded seals as new information becomes available. The Management Committee noted the likely impact of increasing abundance of these species on fish stocks. For harp seals in the Northwest Atlantic, the immediate management objective is to maintain the stocks at their present levels of abundance.</p>	<p>Considering that the population in the Greenland Sea in 2007 is still well below Nlim, and the results of the 2007 survey were similar to those in 2005, the SC reiterates its recommendation from SC 14 that the catches in the Greenland Sea be restricted to necessary scientific catches and to satisfy local needs at roughly current levels. (SC/16).</p> <p>Updates on harp & hooded seals from WGHARP were presented at SC/20.</p> <p>The essential information for replying is anticipated to come from the planned 2018 survey (SC/23).</p>	
<p>2.1.9</p>	<p>NAMMCO/16 02-2007</p>	<p>The commission requested the SC to investigate possible reasons for the apparent decline of Greenland Sea stock of hooded seals; and assess the status of the stock on basis of the results from the planned survey in 2007.</p> <p>The Management Committee recommended that Council ask the Secretariat to review its cooperation with ICES in light of the Scientific Committee work on harp and hooded seals. It further underlined the importance in getting answers to request R 2.1.9 (NAMMCO/22-2013).</p>	<p>This request was forwarded to the ICES-NAFO WG, which dealt with this request at its meeting in Tromsø in 2008. (SC/15).</p> <p>On the basis of the conclusion of this group, the SC concludes that the reasons for the decline of the stock are still not understood. A reduction in extent and concentration of drift ice has occurred in the Greenland Sea between Greenland and the Jan Mayen Island. These changes must have resulted in substantial changes in breeding habitat for the Greenland Sea populations of harp and hooded seals.</p> <p>...The SC appreciates the efforts made by Norwegian and cooperating scientists to address the questions related to the apparent decline of hooded seals in the Greenland Sea. It strongly recommends that these activities are given high priority in the coming years. (SC/16)</p> <p>The SC advises the Council that a more formal cooperation between ICES and NAMMCO on harp and hooded seals such as through the ICES WGHARP would be desirable, and that</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

			<p>a formal request to ICES for such cooperation could be sent (SC/20-2013).</p> <p>The SC was informed that ICES and the North Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) have accepted NAMMCO's request to join the WGHARP (SC/22-2015).</p> <p>The essential information for replying is anticipated to come from the planned 2018 survey. The possible effects of the 2007 protection may be seen in 2018 (SC/23).</p>	
2.1.10	NAMMCO/17 09-2008	<p>The SC is requested to provide advice on Total Allowable Catches for the management of harp seals and the establishment of a quota system for the common stocks between Norway and the Russian Federation, leaving full freedom to the Committee to decide on the best methods to determine this parameter based on an ecosystem approach.</p> <p>For clarification, the Management Committee for Seals and Walruses wished to specify to the Scientific Committee that the "ecosystem approach" to management for one species involves the use of information about predation from or on other species when quotas are set, but multi-species modelling is not yet at a stage where this can be effected. The TAC are estimated by the Scientific Committee whereas quotas are traditionally set bilaterally by hunting nations (NAMMCO 18).</p>	<p>The Committee notes that in October 2008, ICES provided advice that was used to set the 2009 quotas for northeast Atlantic harp seals by the Joint Norwegian Russian Fisheries Commission. The SC endorses at its present meeting the advice provided.</p> <p>Dividing the total removals for each population into national allocations is traditionally carried out through bilateral negotiations in the Joint Norwegian Russian Fisheries Commission. Therefore the SC feels it needs clarification from the Council on the request of the establishment of a quota system. The SC also wishes a clarification from Council about the definition of "ecosystem approach" in the establishment of a quota system as stated in the request R-2.1.10. (SC/16).</p> <p>Updates on TACs for harp & hooded seals from WGHARP were presented at SC/23 (2016).</p>	Standing
2.3.0	RINGED SEALS:			
2.3.1	NAMMCO/5 02-1995	To advise on stock identity of ringed seals for management purposes and to assess abundance in each	The Scientific Committee established a Working Group on Ringed Seals. The Scientific Committee considered the	Ongoing

		<p>stock area, long-term effects on stocks by present removals in each stock area, effects of recent environmental changes (i.e. disturbance, pollution) and changes in the food supply, and interactions with other marine living resources.</p> <p>The Management Committee endorsed again this request as a standing request. (NAMMCO 19)</p> <p>The Management Committee took note of the report from the Scientific Committee and endorsed the idea of a Working Group in 2015 or later when enough information is available (NAMMCO 22).</p> <p>The MC recommended that Greenland continue the genetic work and planned survey, and encouraged Greenland to take a precautionary stand and protect the Ilulissat population until more information is available. (NAMMCO 24)</p>	<p>report of the Working Group and provided advice to Council. They also provided recommendations for future research. (SC/5).</p> <p>The SC noted that there is currently very little information on stock structure and stock size to consider in relation to both requests (2.3.1 and 2.3.2). Some movement information exists, but these do not give enough information to have understanding of population structure.</p> <p>The SC suggested that a Working Group be considered in the next few years (2015 or later). The WG could look into movements (from the available satellite tagging data) versus where catches are occurring in relation to stock structure. It may also be important to assess this species in light of climate change and changing ice conditions. The SC notes that it is very difficult to obtain the desired information on this species. The Arctic Council recently held a meeting on ringed seals, and it was suggested that the SC considers, at its next meeting, the report from that meeting, and data availability, and considers then the need for a WG (SC/20).</p> <p>...still not enough information...The SC recommended research (genetics, surveys) that will help towards responding to R-2.3.1 (SC/22)</p> <p>...new abundance estimates and information on stock structure that have been previously recommended would be the most helpful in answering [2.3.1 and 2.3.2] (SC/23-2016)</p>	
<p>2.3.2</p>	<p>NAMMCO/7 05-1997</p>	<p>The Scientific Committee was requested to advise on what scientific studies need to be completed to evaluate the effects of changed levels of removals of ringed seals in West and East Greenland.</p>	<p>It was noted that the exploitation level of ringed seals in Greenland has shown considerable variability over decades in this century. The Scientific Committee chose to focus on scenarios where exploitation is raised by more than twice the level reported in recent years. The Scientific Committee then</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

		<p>The Management Committee endorsed again this request as a standing request. (NAMMCO 19)</p> <p>See 2.3.1 for update from NAMMCO 22.</p>	<p>identified the main gaps in knowledge, and recommended research required to address them. (SC/6).</p> <p>See 2.3.1 for update from SC/20.</p> <p>The SC reiterated that data on this species is sparse and a full assessment is not possible. The SC recommends that a future WG should await results of ongoing tagging studies in central West Greenland, and future genetics studies to elucidate information on population structure (SC/21).</p> <p>...new abundance estimates and information on stock structure that have been previously recommended would be the most helpful in answering [2.3.1 and 2.3.2] (SC/23-2016)</p>	
2.4.0	GREY SEALS:			
2.4.2	NAMMCO/11 02-2002	<p>The Management Committee noted that there has been a decline in the numbers of grey seals around Iceland, possibly due to harvesting at rates that are not sustainable. The Scientific Committee had previously provided advice in response to a request to review and assess abundance and stock levels of grey seals in the North Atlantic, with an emphasis on their role in the marine ecosystem in general, and their significance as a source of nematodal infestations in fish in particular (NAMMCO 1995). Given the apparent stock decline in Iceland, an apparent increase in Southwest Norway and in the United Kingdom, and the fact that this species interact with fisheries in three NAMMCO member countries, the Management Committee recommended that the Scientific Committee provide</p>	<p>The Working Group on Grey Seals met in April 2003 and completed an initial assessment of stocks around Norway, Iceland, Great Britain and the Baltic. (SC/11).</p> <p>The SC recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment and/or continuation of standardised and regular monitoring programmes for seal abundance in all countries, including the development of appropriate survey methods. • Securing catch records and associated data from hunted seals. • Quantification and standardisation of methods to estimate struck and lost and by-catch. • Population assessment of both species in <i>Russia</i>. • Survey of harbour seals along the coast of <i>Iceland</i>. 	Ongoing

		<p>a new assessment of grey seal stocks throughout the North Atlantic.</p> <p>The Management Committee took note of the report from the Scientific Committee and endorsed that the Working Group on Grey and Harbour Seals meet in 2014/2015 in order to finalise requests 2.4.2 and 2.5.2. (NAMMCO 22).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Studies to identify the population structure of <i>Norwegian</i> harbour seals. • Exploration of the south-eastern <i>Greenland</i> coast for the presence of harbour and grey seals. • Estimation of the stock identity, size, distribution and structure of the <i>Faroese</i> population of grey seals. • Completion of the ongoing genetic analyses of grey seal population structures for the north Atlantic including new samples from the <i>Faroe Islands</i>. <p>The SC furthermore recommends</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of common sampling protocols for all areas in the North Atlantic in preparation for epidemic disease outbreaks, including establishment of blood serum stores for seals sampled. • Compilation of a database of samples stored in the NAMMCO countries. (SC/18) <p>The SC recommended that the Grey and Harbour Seals WG meet in 2014, reflecting the recommendations to finalise the request 2.4.2. (SC/19 and reiterated at SC/20)</p> <p>A Coastal Seals WG meeting has been tentatively scheduled for February 2016 to address R-2.4.2 and R-2.5.2. By February 2016, the CSWG will likely have bycatch estimates and a new complete grey seal estimate in Norway for consideration at the meeting (SC/21).</p> <p>The SC recommended that all of the available grey seal data from the Faroes is presented to the CSWG for review. The SC recommends that the CSWG develops specific plans for monitoring grey seals in the Faroes, e.g., obtaining a relative</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>series of abundance (if a full abundance estimate is not possible at this time).</p> <p>The 2015 abundance estimates from Norway will be available at CSWG. (SC/22-2015)</p> <p>CSWG met in March 2016 and agreed on abundance and trends for the grey seal populations in NA. SC gave specific recommendations for Norway, Iceland and the Faroes Islands with respect to research needs and by-catch issues in all countries, the Norwegian Management Plans and a monitoring plan in the Faroe Islands (SC/23-2016)</p>	
2.5.0	HARBOUR SEAL			
2.5.2	NAMMCO/16 02-2007	The Scientific Committee was asked to conduct a formal assessment of the status of harbour seals around Iceland and Norway as soon as feasible.	<p>At its meeting 2007 (SC/15), the SC recommended that an assessment be conducted in 2010 after the third Norwegian survey, leaving Iceland time for developing a management plan. However, the Norwegian survey will take place in mid-summer 2010, and the results of the survey will probably not be available before early 2011, therefore the SC recommends that an assessment be conducted early 2011. Data on removals are still needed both for Iceland and Norway. (SC/16).</p> <p>The SC reiterated the recommendation that a formal assessment of harbour seals in all areas be carried out by a WG meeting on coastal seals in 2011. SC recommended that a WG on coastal seals be held to review the <i>Norwegian</i> management plan for grey and harbour seals, to perform assessments for grey and harbour seals in all areas, and to develop a common management model for both species in all areas. The WG should also consider whether the age data from the catch of grey and harbour seals in <i>Iceland</i> would</p>	Ongoing

			<p>improve the assessment. If a meeting is planned for early 2011, another meeting is likely required to fulfil the task. (SC/17)</p> <p>The SC recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment and/or continuation of standardised and regular monitoring programmes for seal abundance in all countries, including the development of appropriate survey methods. • Securing catch records and associated data from hunted seals. • Quantification and standardisation of methods to estimate struck and lost and by-catch. • Population assessment of both species in <i>Russia</i>. • Survey of harbour seals along the coast of <i>Iceland</i>. • Studies to identify the population structure of <i>Norwegian</i> harbour seals. • Exploration of the south-eastern <i>Greenland</i> coast for the presence of harbour and grey seals. • Estimation of the stock identity, size, distribution and structure of the <i>Faroese</i> population of grey seals. • Completion of the ongoing genetic analyses of grey seal population structures for the north Atlantic including new samples from the <i>Faroe Islands</i>. <p>The SC furthermore recommends</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of common sampling protocols for all areas in the North Atlantic in preparation for epidemic disease outbreaks, including establishment of blood serum stores for seals sampled. 	
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>The Management Committee agreed to change the geographical focus of this request to entail ALL areas. (NAMMCO 19)</p> <p>See 2.4.2 for update from NAMMCO 22.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compilation of a database of samples stored in the NAMMCO countries. (SC/18) <p>The SC recommended that the Grey and Harbour Seals WG meet in 2014, reflecting the recommendations to finalise the request 2.5.2. (SC/19 and reiterated at SC/20)</p> <p>A Coastal Seals WG meeting has been tentatively scheduled for February 2016 to address R-2.4.2 and R-2.5.2. By February 2016, the CSWG will likely have bycatch estimates and a new complete grey seal estimate in Norway for consideration at the meeting (SC/21).</p> <p>CSWG met in March 2016 and agreed on abundance and trends for the harbour seal populations in NA. SC gave specific recommendations for Norway and Iceland with respect to research needs and by-catch issues, and the Norwegian Management Plan (SC/23-2016)</p>	
<p>2.6.0</p>	<p>ATLANTIC WALRUS:</p>			
<p>2.6.3</p>	<p>NAMMCO/15 03-2006</p>	<p>The Scientific Committee should provide advice on the effects of human disturbance, including fishing and shipping activities, in particular scallop fishing, on the distribution, behaviour and conservation status of walrus in West Greenland.</p> <p>The MC supports the continued planning of the disturbance workshop for beluga and narwhal, and also recommends including walrus (NAMMCO 22; see also R-3.4.9).</p>	<p>With the current actual state of knowledge, the SC is unable to answer this question. The walrus disturbance study on Svalbard will help only in answering the problem of disturbance by tourists. The SC referred, however, to the answer to request 3.4.9. (SC/16).</p> <p>Owing to a lack of explicit studies, the SC is not in a strong position to provide advice on the effects of human disturbance on walrus. (SC/17)</p> <p>With regard to R-2.6.3, the SC noted that there is no new information available to consider this request (SC/20).</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

			<p>Concerns were raised at both the Symposium and the SC meeting about a Canadian mining project currently under development in the Canadian Arctic, the Mary River Project operated by Baffinland Iron Mines Corp... It will have severe consequences for the large numbers of marine mammals [including] walrus, with unpredictable consequences for the populations themselves but also for the accessibility to hunting and/or its sustainability.</p> <p>Other industrial activities that were addressed at the symposium as being particularly important as disturbance factors for marine mammals were seismic exploration in Canada, and West and East Greenland. The SC draws the attention of the NAMMCO Council to the potentially severe consequences of these projects. The SC noted that these industrial activities will also likely have impacts on the hunting of these species, and could affect the advice that is given by this SC. (SC/22-2015)</p> <p>...answered as far as is possible with the information that is currently available. However, this request remains ongoing, and should be considered again when additional specific information is available. (SC/23-2016)</p>	
2.6.7	NAMMCO/25 2017	The SC is requested to provide assessments of, and advice on sustainable removals from, all stocks of walrus in Greenland covering the period from 2019 to 2023, with the advice for Qaanaaq starting in 2021.		NEW
3.1.0	FIN WHALE:			

<p>3.1.7 amended</p>	<p>NAMMCO 17 09-2008 amended NAMMCO/23 amended NAMMCO/24</p>	<p>The SC is requested to complete an assessment of fin whales in the North Atlantic and also to include an estimation of sustainable catch levels in the Central North Atlantic. This work should be initiated as soon as all estimates become available and before the meeting of the SC in 2009. Amended (NAMMCO/23) to include “While long-term advice based on the outcome of the RMP Implementation Reviews (with 0.60 tuning level) is desirable, shorter term, interim advice may be necessary, depending on the progress within the IWC. This work should be completed before the annual meeting of the SC in 2015.”</p> <p>MC endorsed this recommendation for a Large Whale Assessment Working Group to convene in Fall 2014 (NAMMCO 22).</p> <p>Iceland noted that it is very important for the LWAWG to occur this autumn and proposed that the MC amend request R-3.1.7 to include the following additional text: “While long-term advice based on the outcome of the RMP Implementation Reviews (with 0.60 tuning level) is desirable, shorter term, interim advice may be necessary, depending on the progress within the IWC. This work should be completed before the annual meeting of the SC in 2015.” The MC endorsed the amendment of R-3.1.7 to include this text (NAMMCO 23).</p> <p>At NAMMCO/24, R-3.1.7 was amended to read: The SC should complete an assessment of fin whales in the North Atlantic and also to include an estimation of sustainable catch levels in the Central North Atlantic. A long-term advice based on the new NASS-15</p>	<p>The fin whale assessment has been postponed to after the completion of the RMP Implementation Assessment of North Atlantic fin whales scheduled for June 2009. The WG on Large Whale Assessment is scheduled to meet 26-28 January 2010 in Copenhagen with fin whales on its agenda. (SC/16).</p> <p>The SC completed an assessment of North Atlantic fin whales at its 2010 meeting (SC/17). The SC considers that an annual strike of up to 154 fin whales from the WI sub-area is sustainable at least for the immediate 5-year period. It noted that the RMP-variant with a 60% tuning level has yet to be simulation-tested for trials involving stock structure uncertainty in the long term, thus it recommends that simulation trials be carried out as soon as possible and the long-term sustainability of the advice be reconsidered in the light of these results.</p> <p>As the present advice expires in 2015, the NAMMCO SC recommended convening a meeting of the working group on large whale assessments in the autumn of 2014 to provide further management advice on fin whales off Iceland (SC/20).</p> <p>A Large Whale Assessment meeting was previously planned for Fall 2014. This was postponed to Fall 2015, awaiting work to be completed by the IWC on the fin and minke whale RMP Implementation Reviews. The IWC SC has proposed a workshop in January 2015, and plans to complete this work by the IWC SC 66a meeting in June. Therefore, the NAMMCO LWAWG will plan on meeting in the Fall of 2015 in hopes that the work on the IWC SC will be complete (SC21).</p>	<p>Completed (NAMMCO/25)</p>
---------------------------------	--	--	--	----------------------------------

		abundance estimate and the available results from the RMP Implementation Reviews (with 0.60 tuning level) is needed in 2016. (NAMMCO/24)	<p>The SC agreed with the advice of the Large Whale Assessment WG and recommended a catch limit of 146 fin whales for fin whales that can be taken anywhere in the EG+WI (East Greenland + West Iceland) region is safe and precautionary, and that this advice should be considered valid for a maximum of 2 years (2016 and 2017). This is interim advice because the most recent abundance estimate is almost 10 years old. A new abundance estimate is expected from the NASS2015 conducted this past summer. (SC/22)</p> <p>The SC endorsed the work of the WG and the recommended that a catch limit of 161 fin whales in the WI area and 48 in EI/F area (based on application of the RMP to the EG+WI+EI/F region) is safe and precautionary, and that this advice should be considered valid for a maximum of 8 years (2018 to 2025). (SC/24 Intersess.-2017)</p>	
3.2.0	HUMPBACK WHALE:			
3.2.4 amend ed	NAMMCO/15 03-2006 amended NAMMCO/24	<p>The Commission requested the Scientific Committee to conduct a formal assessment following the completion of the T-NASS.</p> <p>In addition the Scientific Committee is requested to investigate the relationship between the humpback whales summering in West Greenland and other areas and incorporate this knowledge into their estimate of sustainable yields of West Greenland humpback whales.</p> <p>The MC recommends that the Large Whale Assessment working group should not consider</p>	<p>The SC recommended that the preliminary work to conclude such assessment be made in connection with the fin whale assessment meeting and that abundance estimate from all the surveys be made available to that meeting. (SC/15).</p> <p>.....</p> <p>With reference to the pending request from NAMMCO 15 (R-3.2.4) to conduct a formal assessment of humpback whales following the completion of T-NASS 2007, the SC noted that it had completed the assessment for West Greenlandic waters. The SC has not yet initiated assessment in other areas and agreed to seek further guidance from the Council regarding that aspect of the request.</p>	Pending

	<p>humpback whales at the upcoming meeting in Fall 2014 (NAMMCO 22).</p> <p>The MC noted that at last year’s MC meeting, it was recommended that humpback whales not be considered at the Large Whale Assessment WG. However, the advice for removals in West Greenland is for 2010-2015. Greenland noted that the situation regarding quotas in the IWC is not stable, and that they do not want to risk a situation where they do not have advice from either the IWC or NAMMCO. Therefore Greenland would like to ask the SC whether there is sufficient data available to conduct an assessment of humpback whales at the upcoming Large Whale Assessment Working Group meeting in Fall 2015.</p> <p>Greenland referred to the end of SC advice of humpback whales 2009-2015 and the risk of postponement of the NASS. Greenland also noted that a new quota negotiation in the IWC will be in 2018 and due to the uncertainty in allocation of quotas, Greenland proposed that R-3.2.4 is reiterated and ask that the assessment of humpback whales is completed at the Large Whale Assessment Working Group in fall 2015. The MC endorsed this reiteration of the request (NAMMCO/23).</p> <p>At NAMMCO/24, Council amended this request: "The SC is asked to provide advice on future catch levels of humpback whales in West Greenland at different probability levels for a non-declining population evaluated over a 5 year period, similar to the procedure for the advice generated for beluga, narwhal and</p>	<p>If the Commission considers request 3.2.4 a priority, the SC will consider this request in conjunction with the fin whale meeting (SC/20).</p> <p>.....</p> <p>The SC agreed with the advice of the Large Whale Assessment WG and recommended that the IWC’s <i>Strike Limit Algorithm</i> (SLA) that has been developed within the Aboriginal Whaling Management Procedure (AWMP) as the best current basis for providing management advice for West Greenland humpback whales. SC endorsed the advice of 10 strikes per year based on the SLA that was accepted by the IWC. The SC also noted that a higher number may be sustainable because the SLA calculations take into account the Greenlandic <i>Needs Statement</i> provided to the IWC of 10 whales.</p> <p>This advice applies up to and including 2017, and with an expected new abundance estimate from the NASS2015, a new calculation by the IWC SLA to provide advice should be straightforward. (SC/22)</p> <p>The humpback whale section of the Large Whale Assessment WG report will be discussed at the SC-24 meeting in November 2017. (Addresses both R-1.7.12 and parts of R-3.2.4) (SC/24 Intersessional-2017)</p>	
--	---	--	--

		walrus. The advice should include the latest abundance estimate."		
3.3.0	MINKE WHALE:			
3.3.4 amended	NAMMCO/17 09-2008 amended NAMMCO/24	<p>The SC is requested to conduct a full assessment, including long-term sustainability of catches, of common minke whales in the Central North Atlantic once results from the 2009 survey become available. In the meantime the SC is requested to assess the short-term (2-5 year) effects of the following total annual catches: 0, 100, 200 and 400.</p> <p>The MC noted that there was no new information regarding this request, and reiterates that the SC should address this request when new information becomes available. (NAMMCO/22)</p> <p>Council agreed to amend the request to read “The SC is requested to complete assessments of common minke whales in the North Atlantic and include estimation of sustainable catch levels in the Central North Atlantic. While long-term advice based on the outcome of the RMP Implementation Reviews (with 0.60 tuning levels) is desirable, a shorter-term, interim advice may be necessary, depending on the progress within the IWC. This work should be completed before the annual meeting of the SC in 2015.” (NAMMCO 23).</p> <p>At NAMMCO/24, the request was amended to read: The SC is requested to complete assessments of common minke whales in the North Atlantic and include estimation of sustainable catch levels in the Central North Atlantic. (NAMMCO 24)</p>	<p>The Assessment WG was convened to help answer with temporary advice. The SC recommends that 200 minke whales per year be considered as the largest short-term catch that should be contemplated over the short-term, 2-5 years. This catch level refers to total removals from the CIC or Central Medium areas, both Icelandic and others.</p> <p>A full assessment, including the 2009 estimate, will be conducted at the next meeting of the Assessment WG in January 2010. (SC/16).</p> <p>The SC considered that annual removals of up to 216 minke whales from the CIC area are safe and precautionary. The advice is conservative in the sense that it is based on the uncorrected, downward biased 2009 abundance estimate as well as the lower of the two accepted abundance estimates from 2007. Similarly, an annual removal of 121 minke whales from the CM area is a safe and precautionary management advice. (SC/17)</p> <p>Response to this request is awaiting the conclusion of IWC Implementation Review (see above), and will be considered at the LWAWG planned for Fall 2015 (SC/21).</p> <p>The SC endorsed the advice provided by the WG that a catch limit of 224 common minke whales in the CIC sub-area is safe and precautionary, and that this advice should be considered valid for a maximum of 3 years (2016 – 2018). This is interim advice because the most recent abundance</p>	Completed (NAMMCO/25)

			<p>estimate is from 2009, which will then be approaching 10 years old. (SC/22)</p> <p>The SC endorsed the advice of the WG that an annual catch of about 360 minke whales is a lower bound for the sustainable catch for the Central North Atlantic medium area and 217 common minke whales from the CIC sub-area. (SC/24 Intersessional-2017)</p>	
3.4.0	NARWHAL AND BELUGA:			
3.4.9	NAMMCO/14 03-2005	<p>The Scientific Committee should provide advice on the effects of human disturbance, including noise and shipping activities, on the distribution, behaviour and conservation status of belugas, particularly in West Greenland.</p>	<p>The SC conveyed this request to the JCNB/NAMMCO Joint Working Group to consider at their next meeting, probably in late 2007 or 2008 (SC/14).</p> <p>The SC recommended that this item be on the agenda of the meeting of the JCNB/NAMMCO Joint WG, recommended to meet before March 2009. (SC/15).</p> <p>The SC is not in the position to progress on this issue at this point and recommends that habitat-related concerns becomes a standing item on the JCNB/NAMMCO JWG agenda. It may be difficult, if not impossible, to answer the specific request for beluga for several years to come. The SC notes that many of the habitat concerns apply to other marine mammals besides beluga and therefore it may be appropriate to treat all species together in addressing this topic. As a way forward, the SC recommends that the Council consider extending the scope for a more general request with the SC establishing a WG on the impacts of human activities other than hunting on marine mammals in the North Atlantic. Ugarte is suggested as Chair. Terms of Reference for the first meeting would be the evaluation of impact of seismic,</p>	Ongoing

		<p>The MC supports the continued planning of the disturbance workshop for beluga and narwhal, and also recommends including walrus (NAMMCO 22).</p>	<p>shipping and tourist activities on the distribution, behaviour and conservation of marine mammals. (SC/16).</p> <p>The JWG and the SC (SC/19) recommended holding an international symposium on the effect of seismic and other development activities on arctic marine mammals with a focus on beluga and narwhal.</p> <p>Relating to Request 3.4.9: In 2011, the SC proposed a symposium on beluga and narwhals in relation to disturbance and industrial activities. The SC recommends this symposium to be held in 2015 and awaits further guidance from Council before proceeding with the planning (SC/20).</p> <p>The SC recommended broadening the scope of the Symposium and include presentations from other species/research. A number of external experts will be required for this meeting (SC/21).</p> <p>The Disturbance Symposium was held October 2015...the report will be considered at SC/23. Based on preliminary presentations of the results, the SC draws the attention of the NAMMCO Council to the potentially severe consequences of these projects. The SC noted that these industrial activities will also likely have impacts on the hunting of these species, and could affect the advice that is given by this SC. (SC/22)</p> <p>...answered as far as is possible with the information that is currently available. However, this request remains ongoing, and should be considered again when additional specific information is available. SC/23 (2016)</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

<p>3.4.11</p>	<p>NAMMCO/17 09-2008</p>	<p>The Scientific Committee is requested to update the assessment of both narwhal and beluga, noting that new data warrant such an exercise.</p>	<p>The SC endorses the assessment performed by the JWG.</p> <p>Narwhal: noted that the conclusion reached differed from those reached in 2005. It recommends that catches be set so that there is at least a 70% probability that management objectives (population increase) will be met for West and East Greenland narwhals, i.e. maximum total removals of 310 and 85 narwhals in West and East Greenland respectively.</p> <p>Narwhal update: The JWG and the SC (SC/19) agreed that narwhals in Scoresby Sound (Ittoqqortormiit) and Kangerlussuaq-Sermilik (Tasiilaq) should be treated as two separate stocks. The age structure from animals collected between 2007 and 2010 in Ittoqqortormiit was applied to both areas, and the harvest was found to select older animals. It was estimated that narwhals in the Ittoqqortormiit area have increased slightly, while narwhals in the Tasiilaq/Kangerlussuaq area might be stable. The current growth rate in the absence of harvest was estimated to lie between 1.2% (95% CI:0–3.5) and 3.7% (95% CI:1.6–5.9), depending upon model and area. Proposed quotas ranged from 17-70% (Ittoqqortormiit) with probability of 95-70% increase in population and 0-18 (Tasiilaq) with probability of 95-70% increase.</p> <p>Beluga: the catch of belugas in West Greenland has been reduced in response to previous advice. These reduced takes already seem to be having a positive effect on population size. The modelling for belugas rests on a more solid background than that of narwhals because of simpler stock structure, however since there is still uncertainty in the assessment, the SC strongly recommends that future catches be set according to the probability of population increase of</p>	<p>Standing</p>
----------------------	------------------------------	--	---	-----------------

			<p>at least 70%. Annual takes between 180 to 310 individuals over the next 5 years will leave the population an 70% to 95% probability of a continued increase until 2014. (SC/16).</p> <p>Beluga update: The JWG considered, and SC agreed (SC/19), that the revised assessment models, which incorporate the age structure data but no new abundance estimate, confirmed that the current removals based on the 2009 advice are sustainable. Based on a 70% probability of population increase, it is concluded that a total annual removal of 310 beluga in West Greenland (excluding Qaanaaq) is sustainable. A new and updated advice is expected at the next meeting based on a new abundance estimates from the spring survey in 2012, and the SC noted that new abundance estimates for assessments should be available at least every 10th year.</p> <p>No specific advice was given on the North Water (Qaanaaq), since the current removals remain at a low level relative to the population size. No advice was given for the harvest in Canada.</p> <p>Results from different scenarios of the age structured population dynamic model were presented, providing annual growth rate estimates from 3.2% to 5%, in the absence of harvest. The depletion ratio for 2012 was estimated to 44% (95% CI: 16%–88%), with a yearly replacement of 510 (95% CI:170–780) individuals. (SC/19)</p>	
<p>3.4.14</p>	<p>NAMMCO/24 2016</p>	<p>The Council requests the SC to examine the data existing on beluga in East Greenland (sightings, strandings, bycatch, catch) and examine how these material can be used in an assessment process and advice on how this data can be improved.</p>	<p>... there was one beluga sighting in East Greenland during NASS2015. The conclusion of the SC is that it is very unlikely that the SC would be able to conduct an assessment in the future (SC/23-2016)</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

<p>3.5.0</p>	<p>SEI WHALES:</p>			
<p>3.5.3 amended</p>	<p>NAMMCO/1909-2010</p>	<p>The Scientific Committee is requested to assess the status of sei whales in West Greenland waters and the Central North Atlantic and provide minimum estimates of sustainable yield.</p> <p>MC endorses the suggestion from the SC to wait for the outcome of the IWC SC review before conducting their own review (NAMMCO 22).</p> <p>The MC noted that the IWC has been considering whether they will conduct an assessment on sei whales for many years. Most previous sightings surveys have not included sei whales as a priority species, and therefore the survey areas did not cover far enough south to obtain complete abundance estimates. Iceland noted that they were hoping to conduct a separate sightings survey with the primary focus on sei whales in the future. It was suggested that the previous estimates from 1989 and 1995, while acknowledged that they are likely underestimates, could be used as a minimum estimate to base some advice.</p>	<p>The Scientific Committee notes that the RMP could be applied using existing data. The resulting catch limits would consequently be lower than the stock could sustain. A prerequisite for initial assessment work is the recalculation (including considerations of extrapolation) of abundance estimates for a comparable area and assessing the extent of negative bias for the reasons mentioned above. Advice based on an RMP approach would require an initial assessment and likely the development of implementation trials. (SC/18)</p> <p>There is no new information available with regards to this request.</p> <p>The SC noted that the SC of the IWC has initiated a review of available data on North Atlantic sei whales with the view conducting an RMP implementation. Given the busy schedule of the IWC RMP sub-committee, such an implementation is not expected to be completed until 2017 or later. To avoid double work, the NAMMCO SC agreed to monitor the outcome of the IWC SC review of available data scheduled in 2014 before proceeding with an assessment. (SC/20).</p> <p>Like in most previous surveys there were not enough sightings in NASS2015 to develop any abundance estimates (SC/24-2016)</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

		The MC suggested that request R-3.5.3 remains a pending request, and notes that this work will not be completed by the SC in 2015. The MC also notes that there may be future work in the IWC (NAMMCO 23).		
3.6.0	NORTHERN BOTTLENOSE WHALES:			
<i>No active requests</i>				
3.7.0	KILLER WHALES:			
3.7.2	NAMMCO/13 03-2004	<p>The Management Committee requested the Scientific Committee to review the knowledge on the abundance, stock structure, migration and feeding ecology of killer whales in the North Atlantic, and to provide advice on research needs to improve this knowledge. Priority should be given to killer whales in the West Greenland – Eastern Canada area.</p> <p>MC notes the SC report that there is no new information available for R-3.7.2 (NAMMCO 22).</p> <p>Greenland informed the MC that validation of these catches is expected to be completed in 2016, going back to 2010. The Ministry have received reports of catches in 2014 and 2015. (NAMMCO/24)</p>	<p>The Scientific Committee concluded that there was not enough information to carry out the assessment at this time, particularly for the West Greenland area. The Scientific Committee will review new information on killer whales annually with the aim of completing the assessment once sufficient information becomes available for a particular area.</p> <p>Not enough information still. (SC/15).</p> <p>Situation unchanged (SC/16).</p> <p>The SC again noted that there is not sufficient new information to answer this request at this time (SC/20).</p> <p>There is still not enough information to answer the request. Unfortunately catch information in Greenland was not available for review by the SC at this meeting (SC/21).</p> <p>At SC20, the SC noted higher levels of annual catches (19 on average per year from 2010 and 2012) in West Greenland. The SC was then informed that the recent catch statistics on killer whales in West Greenland have not been validated, and</p>	Ongoing

			<p>at this meeting the SC noted that these catch statistics still have not been validated. The SC reiterates the recommendation that all catch data on killer whales are validated before the next SC meeting, so that it is possible for the SC to monitor the development of the hunt.</p> <p>...at [SC/22] the SC noted that these catch statistics still have not been validated. The SC reiterates the recommendation that all catch data on killer whales are validated before the next SC meeting, so that it is possible for the SC to monitor the development of the hunt. (SC/22)</p> <p>Catches in Greenland have not been validated by the Ministry. The catches are now starting to be too old to be validated [and] the SC recommends that catch validation should be done on an annual basis.... in answer to R-3.7.2, this is a species that is hunted in Greenland, with uncertain catch statistics, and no abundance estimate. Work is ongoing that will help in answering this request, and the SC recommends that this information is gathered with more speed in order for the SC to be able to monitor the hunt (SC/23-2016)</p>	
3.8.0	LONG-FINNED PILOT WHALES:			
3.8.6	NAMMCO 2009 2011	The Scientific Committee is requested to continue work to complete a full assessment of pilot whales in the North Atlantic and provide advice on the sustainability of catches, as soon as necessary further information becomes available, with particular emphasis on the Faroese area and East and West Greenland. In the short term, the Scientific Committee was requested to provide a general indication of the level of abundance of pilot whales required to sustain	The SC (SC/19) agreed that it was unlikely that a full assessment could be attempted in the near future. Regarding a short term advice, the SC noted that both the AWMPc procedure (which has been used for preliminary advice for baleen whales in West Greenland by NAMMCO and the IWC), as well as the PBR approach, could be used for an inverse advice calculation of the minimum abundance required to sustain the average take by the Faroese.	Ongoing

		<p>an annual catch equivalent to the annual average of the Faroese catch in the years since 1997.</p> <p>MC awaits the results of NASS2015 and hopes that these will help address R-3.8.6.</p>	<p>With the average annual catch by the Faroese since 1997 being 678, and the CV of the latest abundance estimate being 0.27, the AWMPc procedure estimates that an abundance estimate around 50,000 pilot whales and a similar precision is required to sustain the catch. In comparison, the PBR approach (rmax of 3% and recovery factor of 1) calculates an abundance estimate around 80,000 whales. These calculations reflect precautionary estimates of the minimum abundance estimates required to sustain the Faroese hunt. However, the geographical range of the stock(s) that supply the Faroese hunt is unknown, and it is unresolved how the calculated estimates compare with the accepted estimate of 128,000 (95% CI: 75,700-217,000) pilot whales from the Icelandic and Faroe Islands area of T-NASS.</p> <p>The next assessment will not occur until after the next sightings survey (SC/21).</p> <p>The remaining unanswered portions of R-3.8.6 awaits new data from NASS2015. The West Greenland part was dealt with during SC/19 and the SC refers Council to that report.</p> <p>In response to R-3.8.6- a full assessment is planned once the abundance estimate from the Faroe Islands is complete (recommended to be completed within the next few months), and the information from samples for biological information is available. Estimates from East and West Greenland were accepted by the SC (SC/23-2016).</p>	
<p>3.9.0</p>	<p>DOLPHIN SPECIES (<i>Tursiops</i> and <i>Lagenoryhncus spp.</i>):</p>			
<p>3.9.6</p>	<p>NAMMCO/13 03-2004</p>	<p>The Management Committee has asked the Scientific Committee to carry out assessments of these species, but to date insufficient information has been available</p>	<p>There is still insufficient data on these species to conduct an assessment, but the SC recommended that abundance be estimated for white-sided and white-beaked dolphins from</p>	<p>Pending</p>

		<p>on stock delineation, distribution, abundance and biological parameters to initiate the work. The Committee was pleased to note that considerable progress has been made in the Faroes in describing the ecology and life history of white-sided dolphins and that information on white-beaked dolphins should be available from Iceland and Norway in about 2 years time. Abundance estimates are lacking in all areas except Icelandic coastal waters, and no information on stock delineation or pod structure is yet available. The SCANS survey planned for 2005/6 and coastal surveys planned for Norway (see 9.3) should provide information on distribution and abundance in some areas. The Committee endorsed the plan of the Scientific Committee to proceed with the assessments once the above-mentioned studies have been completed, probably by 2007.</p> <p>The MC notes the report of the SC, awaits the publication from the previous sampling. (NAMMCO/24)</p>	<p>the 2007 T-NASS survey as soon as possible. An assessment of the species could be attempted in 2009 at the earliest. (SC/15).</p> <p>The Committee notes that there are still not enough data (life history and abundance) for any of the three species to complete an assessment. The Faroes have samples for diet and life history parameters from 350 white-sided dolphins, but the analysis is not completed yet. (SC/16).</p> <p>The SC noted that the data on life history and abundance for any of the three species is still not sufficient for an assessment and recommended that Faroese samples for diet and life history parameters from 350 white-sided dolphins be finalised and at the same time that an abundance estimate from the 2007 survey be attempted. (SC/17)</p> <p>The SC noted that there is no new data available to answer this request. Mikkelsen informed that the data collected from the drive hunt of white sided dolphins in the Faroes will be published before the next SC meeting (SC/20).</p> <p>The SC noted that there is no new information for tursiops bottlenose dolphins from the Faroes and the analysis from previous studies of white sided dolphins have not been completed (SC/21).</p> <p>Some sampling has been occurring in the Faroes previously, however no new samples have been collected recently because there have been very few catches in recent years. The results from the previous sample collections have yet to be published. (SC/22)</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			Abundance estimates from East and West Greenland from NASS2015 were accepted by the SC. There were enough sightings that estimates can be developed by Iceland and Norway in the future. The analysis of the biological sampling from the 2007 catch in the Faroe Islands is still in progress (SC/23-2016)	
3.10.0	HARBOUR PORPOISES:			
3.10.1	NAMMCO/7 05-1997	<p>The Council noted that the harbour porpoise is common to all NAMMCO member countries, and that the extent of current research activities and expertise in member countries and elsewhere across the North Atlantic would provide an excellent basis for undertaking a comprehensive assessment of the species throughout its range. The Council therefore requested the Scientific Committee to perform such an assessment, which might include distribution and abundance, stock identity, biological parameters, ecological interaction, pollutants, removals and sustainability of removals.</p> <p>The Management Committee recommends that total removal estimates are made for all areas, and that abundance estimates from the 2007 survey in Iceland and the 2010 survey in the Faroe Islands are available before a WG meeting. (NAMMCO 19).</p>	<p>The Scientific Committee decided that the matter could best be dealt with by convening an international workshop / symposium on harbour porpoises ...including: distribution, abundance and stock identity; biological parameters; ecological interactions; pollutants; removals and sustainability of removals. (SC/6).</p> <p>The Scientific Committee utilised the report of the Symposium to develop its own assessment advice to the Council....The Scientific Committee developed research recommendations to address some of the information needs for management of this species. (SC/8).</p> <p>The SC considered that formal assessments for this species were warranted for Greenland, Iceland and Norway, but that there was insufficient information on abundance in all areas and removals in Iceland and Norway to conduct assessment at this time. (SC/ 14).</p> <p>Estimates of abundance and removals are still needed in all areas. (SC/15).</p> <p>Information was still lacking on abundance in all areas and removals in Faroes, Iceland and Norway in order to conduct an assessment. (SC/16).</p>	Ongoing

		<p>The MC endorses the recommendations of the SC (NAMMCO 22).</p>	<p>The SC recommended that an assessment meeting for harbour porpoises in all areas be held during the winter 2011/12. (SC/18)</p> <p>Update: A total annual by-catch estimate of 6,900 harbour porpoises in Norway was reported. This estimate is substantial, and it raises concerns that the by-catch of harbour porpoises in Norway may not be sustainable. Therefore the SC recommended initiating an assessment of harbour porpoises in Norway.</p> <p>Greenland reported that they had sufficient data for an assessment of harbour porpoises in West Greenland. The SC also noted the existence of abundance estimates from both Iceland and the Faroe Islands, as well as some estimates of by-catch in Iceland. (SC/19)</p> <p>The NAMMCO Working Group on Harbour Porpoises met in Copenhagen 4-6 November 2013.</p> <p>Taking into consideration the work of the HP WG, the SC provided a list of recommendations for Greenland and Norway.</p> <p>A future harbour porpoise WG will be scheduled after a report from the Bycatch WG, new data from TNASS2015, and progress on research requests from the 2013 HPWG (SC/21).</p> <p>The SC discussed a possible future HPWG. Norway and Iceland both stated that they will likely not have the information ready for a meeting until 2018 and Greenland is also fine with waiting until 2018 for the next HPWG. The SC also supported the idea that a future meeting should</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			include participants from ASCOBANS and other EU scientists (SC/23-2016).	
--	--	--	--	--