

**NAMMCO**



**COMMITTEE ON HUNTING METHODS  
REPORT**

**7 February 2019**

@ North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission

Please cite this report as:  
NAMMCO (2019) Report of the NAMMCO Committee on Hunting Methods 7 February 2019

**NAMMCO**

*Postbox 6453, Sykehusveien 21-23, N-9294 Tromsø, Norway,  
+47 77687371, [nammco-sec@nammco.no](mailto:nammco-sec@nammco.no), [www.nammco.no](http://www.nammco.no), [www.facebook.com/nammco.no/](https://www.facebook.com/nammco.no/)*

The Committee on Hunting Methods (CHM) met on 7 February 2019 at the Greenland Representation in Copenhagen. Present were Guðni Magnús Eiríksson (Iceland), Kathrine A. Ryeng and Hild Ynnesdal (Norway), Nette Levermann (Greenland), Signar Petersen (Faroe Islands) and Charlotte Winsnes. Kristján Loftsson (Iceland) participated via phone.

### **Actions arising:**

#### **Secretariat:**

Secretariat investigate database possibilities with a view to how other organisations like the IWC are doing it.

#### **Greenland:**

Finalise narrative for video with Henriksen Mekaniske verksted and investigate price for English version.

## **1. OPENING REMARKS AND ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

The chair, Guðni Magnús Eiríksson, welcomed the participants to the meeting. The meeting reviewed and adopted the agenda and list of documents – appendix 1. It was noted that document NAMMCO/CHM-2019-01/05 draft Terms of reference had not been prepared.

## **2. INFORMATION FROM MEMBERS**

Documents NAMMCO/CHM-2019-01/02 and NAMMCO/CHM-2019-01/03 references on hunting methods and list of laws and regulations in member countries respectively were updated with amendments from FO and NO – see appendices 2 and 3.

CHM had previously (CHM November 2018) agreed to recommend that Council that the National Progress Reports (NPR) currently submitted by member countries annually to the SC be expanded to also include information required by CHM, BYCELS and CIO. This would facilitate member countries submitting all requested data to all committees once a year. Presently member countries report annually at different times depending on the various committees meeting schedule.

Document NAMMCO/CHM-2019-01/06 contained a draft excel file developed by the Secretariat. It reflects CHM discussions at the last meeting and similar discussions held in CIO and BYCELS pertaining to what data should be requested in addition to the data already submitted through the NPR. Recognising that the members of CHM and BYCELS largely overlap (with the exception of Loftsson who only meet in CHM) the meeting included the categories of by-catch, strandings and ship strikes. Hunting effort data, although a CIO concern, was also incorporated in the database. The presented excel file thus covered the data categories required by all these committees i.e. catches, by-catch, strandings, hunting effort and ship strikes.

CHM reiterated its **recommendation** that NAMMCO develop and keep a proper database at the Secretariat. It was emphasised that such a database would require suitable soft wear – excel would not cover all needed functionalities – and it was recommended that the Secretariat investigate possibilities with a view to how other organisations like the IWC are doing it.

The discussion on a future database touched upon different issues like:

- The current deadline for NPR of 1 March is not ideal for CHM. CHM RoP state that it should hold its annual meeting “preferably prior to the Council meetings”, and CHM has normally held these meetings in January/February.

- The importance of a clear and detailed description and definition of type and format of requested data. Ideally all data columns should be accompanied with a note depicting format and explaining type of data where necessary.
- Aggregated versus individual data. For catches including hunting effort, by-catch of small cetaceans and pinnipeds aggregated data are sufficient. Individual data should be reported for incidents of entanglement including by-catch of large whales, strandings and ship strikes. CHM underlined that fishing gear is the most important factor with respect to mitigation of by-catch whereas time of year is less important.

CHM also noted that it is essential to define whether it is estimates or real numbers that are submitted.

- Re. catches whales:  
It is not customary to ask hunters to report if they use the secondary weapon thus in the database the reference should be first/primary weapon. Number of active vessels/skiffs/drives should be reported where applicable
- Re. catches seals:  
Norwegian seal catches operate with 2 pups as the equivalent of 1 adult seal. Number of vessels is only registered in relation to the pack ice sealing in Norway, and for the other countries there are no available information on platforms.

CHM discussed whether culling of seals i.e culling of grey seals around fish farms in the Faroes, should be included in the catch table or not, and agreed that for the time being it should be included.

CHM amended document 06 based on its discussions. Time did not permit a full review of all the categories in the document and Levermann volunteered to continue standardising the table after the meeting. A joint Skype meeting of CHM and BYCELS was held 14 March discussing the tables as these had been further developed by Levermann (catches including hunting effort, by-catch, strandings and ship strikes). CHM agreed that this was a working document and before finalising it would be important to forward it to the SC WG on By-catch for input.

### **3. WORKSHOP ON HUNTERS SELF-REPORTING OF DATA**

CHM recognised that the issue of self-reporting had been part of the overall follow up of tasks given to CHM by Council at NAMMCO 24, NAMMCO 25 and NAMMCO 26. Furthermore, it was noted that the discussion under this agenda item overlapped with discussions under agenda items 5 Workplan and 6 Recommendations from Council 26 below.

For the benefit of summarising actions and discussion in CHM leading up to the present meeting the Chair noted that NAMMCO 24 had asked CHM to focus on the 2 following main issues and give recommendations on how to best deal with these:

#### **To look at alternative means of collecting standardised TTD data:**

Council had previously agreed that TTD and IDR data should be monitored at 10-year intervals except if special circumstances dictated a more frequent sequence. Acknowledging the high cost implications of the scientific method established by Norway to collect TTD data and also that for some hunts this method is not feasible, Council had asked CHM to look into the possibility of alternative methods that might be used.

CHM had responded by suggesting to

- look further into the possibility of implementing self-reporting methods to describe the killing efficiency of the hunt, and ultimately to
- convening a workshop on alternative methods to collect data on the efficiency of the hunt.

**To review the underlying reasons for struck and lost (S&L):**

In its discussion on S&L, CHM like the Scientific Committee has acknowledged that the collection of S&L data represents a big challenge. Both committees have noted that a possible solution to identify reasons for and to estimate the extent of S&L could be self-reporting by hunters. CHM has in previous meetings commented on the successful project PISUNA in Greenland, where GoPro cameras were used by participants on a trial basis to document local knowledge. Thus, in relation to S&L, self-reporting has been discussed as a means of obtaining better information.

Parallel to the discussion on self-reporting CHM had asked the Secretariat to initiate a review of available literature to compare hunting efficiency and TTD between terrestrial and marine mammals. CHM has repeatedly expressed an interest in obtaining an overview of what has been done on TTD measurements for terrestrial animals, especially game animals. Sam Smith, intern at NAMMCO had been tasked to undertake the review which was contained in document [NAMMCO/CHM-2019-01/04](#) *Overview of recent developments in time-to-death reporting for hunted terrestrial species* (appendix 4). Smith had carried out the review under the supervision of Kathrine Ryeng.

Ryeng presented the review which show that the hunting of marine mammals has been subject to substantial scrutiny for decades. Consideration for animal welfare outcomes has led to the development of a quantitative framework to assess hunting methods. Reporting time-to-death, the proportion of animals rendered instantaneously insensible, as well as *post-mortem* examinations, allows the humaneness of hunts to be inferred and further improved.

Knudsen (2005) had noted that the welfare of other animals during hunting is rarely assessed through combined *ante-* and *post-mortem* observations. However, recent work conducted in Australia represents considerable efforts made in assessing welfare outcomes using the framework parameters developed for large cetacean hunts. The work documented in the thesis by Hampton (2017) has successfully demonstrated the application of *ante-mortem* parameters such as time-to-death, instantaneous death rate, and wounding rate (a rough analogue to Struck-and Lost), in the assessment of terrestrial management programmes. Assessments were conducted on the lethal control of European rabbit (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*), eastern grey kangaroo (*Macropus giganteus*), feral dromedary camels (*Camelus dromedarius*), and feral horses (*Equus caballus*) - the latter two utilising helicopter shooting; a controversial method in Australia. With *post-mortem* observations additionally considered, the work presents the first application of the large cetacean framework in a terrestrial welfare assessment programme. Furthermore, welfare outcome variability dependent on projectile type have also been quantified, as well as flight behaviour of conspecifics, thus broadening the scope of the assessment framework. Additionally, in the evaluation of welfare in lethal control of feral horses using helicopters, a chase-time has also been determined that can be combined with time-to-death to give time-frame for the whole hunt. The incorporation of this parameter is significant due to its broader scope for quantifying stress during a hunt.

CHM acknowledged these studies and noted the importance of including additional welfare variables, such as chasing time in the overall welfare assessment where relevant.

CHM complimented Sam Smith for his very thorough work and excellent summary of his findings. An important-outcome of the review is that within science on hunting methods and animal welfare, scientists on terrestrial mammals have acknowledged the scientific methods developed by Dr Egil Ole Øen, (Øen

EO, 1995) in Norway to measure time to death (TTD) and instantaneous death rate (IDR) for marine mammals.

The conclusion of the review confirms CHM's position that the scientific method for collecting TTD data used in Norway and Iceland which includes *post mortem* examinations, is the best method available.

CHM also recognises that for most of the hunts carried out in NAMMCO, self-reporting is the only manner in which TTD and hunting efficiency is registered. Many hunts take place in such an opportunistic manner and under challenging conditions precluding planning aimed at efficient scientific studies carried out by inspectors/observers. In addition, post mortem examinations require veterinary knowledge and expertise, something that is not always easily available.

Previously CHM has discussed the idea of comparing self-reporting by hunters with the controlled scientific method through

- analysing already collected Norwegian data together with Greenlandic data to see how these compared and
- carrying out preliminary studies on-board a Norwegian whaling vessel during the 2018 season.

The idea behind was to obtain information on how the results of self-reporting would compare to the scientific method. However, comparing data that is collected by different methods may affect the TTD estimates as well as the uncertainty of the estimates and CHM did not recommend taking this further.

It had previously agreed that self-reporting, although vulnerable to criticism for not being a scientific method, could represent a tool to identify possible problem areas with respect to efficiency of the hunts and as such could represent a good supplement to the 10-year sequence of the scientific collection (CHM February 2018). Recognising that scientists and managers depend on self-reporting to get essential and necessary data for generating advice and making management decisions, CHM had agreed that it would be important to explore what could be the best possible methods for self-reporting. As a way forward CHM had suggested to organise a Workshop investigating the concept of and various existing methods for self-reporting and to discuss the feasibility of convening a workshop on alternative methods to collect data on the efficiency of the hunt.

With reference to Councils endorsement of CHMs recommendation to look into the possibility of developing a simple method to assess TTD (probably involving self-reporting) CHM discussed whether to organise a Workshop on self-reporting or not. This discussion on developing alternative methods was initiated in recognition that the "Norwegian" scientific method was not feasible for all hunts in NAMMCO. Several different aspects came up:

- A more technical and theoretical Workshop to look at what is possible within existing technologies
- Extending the topic to killing efficiency in a broad sense
- To prioritise the limited resources available most efficiently – to critically look at what should be the focus of CHM – the anticipated outcome of a Workshop must correspond to a probable use and must be weighed up against other important issues like improving the animal welfare outcomes of certain hunting methods where the animal sinks when dead, i.e. hunts that require the animal to be harpooned first in order not to be lost. Examples of such hunts could be the minke whale rifle or the walrus hunts in Greenland.
- Bearing this in mind, the question would be if it is an optimal use of resources to monitor the Norwegian and Icelandic hunts between the 10-year intervals when the killing efficiency is documented to be high?
- Should all hunts be included in a Workshop on self-reporting? Is there any meaning in improving the way of self-reporting for a hunt that is known to have a poor animal welfare outcome?

Various suggestions were discussed without any concrete decision taken and it was agreed that to propose convening a Workshop was premature. It was agreed to look more closely at the overall workplan – agenda item 5 - and to also revisit previous recommendations and work of CHM before making a final decision on how to proceed.

#### **4. VIDEO ON HANDLING OF THE PENTHRITE WHALE GRENADE-99 ON HARPOON GUNS**

NAMMCO 26 supported the work to finalise the instruction video on the handling of the penthrite Whale grenade-99. Greenland had financed the video and it had been developed in cooperation with Henriksen Mekaniske Verksted. NAMMCO 26 welcomed the initiative and supported that the video be further developed so it could be used by all interested NAMMCO countries.

CHM had received the video and the text of the narrative at the last meeting and had agreed to send their comments to Nette Levermann by 31.12 2018 after which time she would finalise the video in cooperation with Henriksen Mekaniske Verksted. Only Norway had submitted comments.

Levermann will follow this up and also investigate the price for English version.

#### **5. WORKPLAN 2019 – 2020**

At the last meeting CHM had identified several issues for inclusion in its workplan 2019 – 2020. CHM had also agreed that the main criteria for future work should be: *To focus on hunts where animal welfare aspects are highlighted in recommendations and where improvements are important and possible.*

The identified issues had not been prioritised at the last meeting anticipating further discussion during the present meeting. CHM discussed the workplan and associated tentative time schedule. It was agreed to include activities extending beyond 2020.

##### **Finalising the video on handling Whale grenade 99 together with Henriksen Verksted.**

Time: February – June 2019

Responsible: Nette Levermann

##### **EGM on hunting efficiency of small cetaceans**

Time: during 2020 depending on status of new lance and availability of Greenlandic data.

FO had informed that the spinal lance developed for the long-finned pilot whales was not optimal for white sided dolphins. CHM anticipated that the blade of the lance is probably too broad and therefore not suitable for the smaller sized dolphin. However, trials should be carried out to identify the best design of a blade for dolphin drives.

GL informed that they have collected the data recommended by the 2011 EGM on narwhal and beluga. The data had not been analysed yet and this will have to be carried out before convening a meeting.

CHM agreed that invitations should be extended to relevant Canadian territories, Canada and Japan to participate in the EGM.

##### **Tentative Terms of Reference**

The overall aim of the EGM would be to look at efficiency of killing method in regard to animal welfare and safety of the hunter. CHM agreed that the EGM should give focus to hunting methods where death was not immediately, e.g. types of hunts requiring harpooning before killing in order not to lose the animal, or netting.

CHM agreed to focus on the hunts where SC has said that S/L represents an assessment problem (presently relevant species are narwhal and beluga).

- Review and assess current hunting and killing methods for small cetaceans
- Review and assess information on recent and ongoing research on improvements and technical innovations in hunting methods and gear used for hunting of small cetaceans
- Review and assess time to death (TTD) data on the killing of small cetaceans
- Give recommendations with respect to possible improvements.

**Workshop/EGM on hunting methods where the combined use of harpoon and rifle is not one weapon**

Time: to be placed together with or back to back with the EGM on hunting efficiency of small cetaceans, because of the overlap in participants and to reduce expenses.

CHM agreed that the EGM focus should on the hunting method where death was not immediately, e.g. types of hunts requiring harpooning before killing in order not to lose the animal.

**3<sup>rd</sup> EGM TTD large cetaceans**

Time: earliest in 2025

Following recommend schedule Norway should collect TTD in 2022 and Iceland in 2024.

CHM agreed to forward the list of activities to Council for its approval.

**6. RECOMMENDATIONS TO CHM FROM COUNCIL 26 AND RESPONSES TO COUNCIL 27**

Recommendations endorsed by Council at NAMMCO 26:

1. Collection of TTD data
  - o Looking further into the possibility of implementing self-reporting methods to describe the killing efficiency of the hunt.
  - o Convening a workshop on alternative methods to collect data on the efficiency of the hunt.

With reference to agenda item 3 above CHM finds it premature to plan a Workshop now and will return to Council when its deliberations have been finalised. CHM draws attention to the literature review on TTD and hunting efficiency in terrestrial mammals which reiterates that the scientific methods used in marine mammal hunts are considered the best method to assess TTD at present and thus has been utilised for terrestrial mammals.

**2. Struck and lost recommendations to member countries:**

- o Greenland to collect S&L data on narwhal and beluga  
**Response:** S/L are reported by hunters. There are presently no plans to do a scientific collection of S/L
- o Iceland to collect S&L data on harbour and grey seals  
**Response:** reporting S/L by hunters is presently not mandatory but bill has been introduced to the Parliament addressing the issue. Seal hunt in Iceland is small scale making scientific collection of S/L information impractical.
- o Norway to collect S&L data on harp seal  
**Response:** Scientific collection of S/L will take place in the 2019 season.

**7. NEXT MEETING**

CHM did not set a date for the next meeting as this will depend on the outcome of discussions in Council.

**8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

- Filter paper testing - Levermann asked if the method which is used in Alaska by hunters have the potential to measure stress in animals? In case it could, it might be useful in regards to animal welfare hunting related questions.
- CHM agreed to restructure the annotations in the agenda so that they appear under the agenda items and not as footnotes.

**9. ADOPTION OF REPORT**

The report was approved on 15 March 2019.

**AGENDA**

1. Adoption of agenda and review of documents
2. Information from members
3. Workshop on hunters self-reporting of data
4. Video on handling of the penthrite grenade-99 on harpoon guns
5. Workplan 2019 – 2022
6. Recommendations from Council 26 and to Council 27
7. Next meeting
8. AOB

**List of documents**

NAMMCO/CHM-2019-01/01: Annotated agenda and list of documents

NAMMCO/CHM-2019-01/02: List of references on Hunting methods

NAMMCO/CHM-2019-01/03: List of laws and regulations in member countries

NAMMCO/CHM-2019-01/04: Literature overview: hunting efficiency terrestrial and  
marine mammals – draft

NAMMCO/CHM-2019-01/05: Draft ToR for WS on self-reporting – not prepared

NAMMCO/CHM-2019-01/06: Draft National Progress Report data request table

**LIST OF REFERENCES ON HUNTING METHODS**

(Updated February 2019)

**NAMMCO**

- Manual on maintenance and use of weaponry and equipment deployed in hunting of baleen whales in NAMMCO member countries
- Manual on Pilot whaling
- Manual on small whale hunting in Greenland

**FAROE ISLANDS**

- Olsen, J. 2006. Hunting activities in the Faroe Islands: how user knowledge is garnered, kept and transmitted among pilot whale hunters in the Faroe Islands. *In: Hovelsrud, G.K. and Winsnes, C. (eds). 2006. Users Knowledge. Proceedings from Conference, Reykjavík January 2003: 38-43.*
- Anonymous 1993. Comments from Denmark on IWC44/HKW/9, "Humane Killing Aspects of the Pilot Whale Hunt in the Faroe Islands". IWC Document IWC/45/HK2.
- Bloch, D., Desportes, G., Zachariassen, M. and Christiansen, I.: "The Northern Bottlenose Whale in the Faroe Islands, 1584-1993." *J. Zool., Lond.*(1996) 239, 123-140
- Faroese Home Government 1988. Response from the Danish Government on the Methods used in the Faroese Pilot Whale Hunt, submitted to IWC/40.
- Hoydal, K. 1986. Recent Changes to Faroese Legislation on Whaling. IWC Document IWC/38/HKW. [www.hval.djoralaeknin.com](http://www.hval.djoralaeknin.com)

**GREENLAND**

- Born, E.W. 2005. The Walrus in Greenland. Ilinnisiorfik, ISBN 87-7975-221-7. Pp. 80 (Available in Danish and Greenlandic language versions)
- Caulfield, R. A. 1991. Qeqartarsuarmi arfanniarneq: Greenland Inuit Whaling in Qeqartarsuaq Kommune, West Greenland. IWC Document TC/43/AS4.
- Caulfield, R.A. 2002. Whaling and Sustainability in Greenland. IWC Document IWC/54/AS4.
- Dahl, J. 1989. The Integrative and Cultural Role of Hunting and Subsistence in Greenland, *Inuit Studies*, 13(1): 23-42.
- Donovan, G et al. 2010. Report of the Small Working Group on Conservation Factors (from Whales to Edible Products) for the Greenlandic Large Whale Hunt. IWC Document IWC/62/9.
- Greenland Home Rule 1987. Hunting Methods including the Cold/Warm Harpoon Question, IWC Document TC/39/AS2.
- Greenland Home Rule. 1988. *Arfanniariaaserput - Our Way of Whaling*
- Greenland Home Rule 1988. Denmark's Answers to the Remaining Questions stated in Document IWC/39/19 "Report of the Humane Killing Working Group", Annex 4. IWC Document TC/40/HK3.
- Greenland Home Rule 1988. Implementation of the Detonating Grenade Harpoon in Greenland's Whaling on an Experimental Basis. IWC Document TC/40/HK4.
- Greenland Home Rule 1989. Introduction of the Detonating Grenade Harpoon in Greenland Whaling on an Experimental basis. IWC Document TC/41/HK2.
- Greenland Home Rule 1990. Greenland Licenses for Hunting Minke Whales with Rifles. IWC Document TC/42/HK2.
- Greenland Home Rule 1990. Introduction of the Detonating Grenade Harpoon in Greenland on an Experimental Basis. IWC Document TC/42/HK1.
- Greenland Home Rule 1991. Designation of Types of Rifles in Greenland. IWC Document TC/43/AS1.
- Greenland Home Rule 1991. Introduction of the Detonating Grenade Harpoon in Greenland, 1991. IWC Document TC/43/HK2.
- Greenland Home Rule 1992. Introduction of the Detonating Grenade Harpoon in Greenland, 1992. IWC Document TC/44/HK1.

- Greenland Home Rule 1993. Greenland Action Plan on Whale Hunting Methods, 1992. IWC Document TC/45/HK3.
- Greenland Home Rule 1994. Greenland Action Plan on Whale Hunting Methods. IWC Document IWC/46/AS3.
- Greenland Home Rule 1995. Comments regarding the Terms of Reference to the second Workshop on Whale Killing Methods. - Greenland Action Plan on Whale Hunting Methods. IWC Document IWC/47/WK4 rev.
- Greenland Home Rule 1997. New Technologies, New Traditions: Recent Developments in Greenlandic Whaling. IWC Document IWC/49/AS3.
- Greenland Home Rule 1999. Efficiency in the Greenlandic Hunt of Minke and Fin whales, 1990-1998. IWC Document IWC/51/WK8.
- Greenland Home Rule 1999. Report on improving in ASW in Greenland. IWC Document IWC/51/WK7.
- Greenland Home Rule 1999. Status for Greenland Action Plan on Whale Killing Methods. 1999. IWC Document IWC/51/WK6.
- Greenland Home Rule 2000. A note regarding information encouraged in IWC-resolution 51/44. IWC Document IWC/52/WKM & AWI2.
- Greenland Home Rule 2000. Report on improvements in ASW in Greenland. IWC Document IWC/52/WKM & AWI4.
- Greenland Home Rule 2000. Status for Greenland Action Plan on Whale Hunting Methods. IWC Document IWC/52/WKM & AWI3.
- Greenland Home Rule 2001. A note regarding information encouraged in IWC-resolution 51/44I. IWC Document IWC/53/WKM & AWI1.
- Greenland Home Rule 2001. Report on improvements in ASW in Greenland. IWC Document IWC/53/WKM & AWI3.
- Greenland Home Rule 2001. Status for Greenland Action Plan on Whale Hunting Methods. IWC Document IWC/53/WKM & AWI2.
- Greenland Home Rule 2002. A note regarding information encouraged in IWC-resolution 1999. IWC Document IWC/54/WKM & AWI2.
- Greenland Home Rule 2002. Report on improvements in ASW in Greenland. IWC Document IWC/54/WKM & AWI3.
- Greenland Home Rule 2002. Status for Greenland Action Plan on Whale Hunting Methods, 2001. IWC Document IWC/54/WKM & AWI5.
- Greenland Home Rule 2003. A note regarding information encouraged in IWC-resolution 1999. IWC Document IWC/55/WK9.
- Greenland Home Rule 2003. Report on improvements in ASW in Greenland. IWC Document IWC/55/WK10.
- Greenland Home Rule 2003. Status for Greenland Action Plan on Whale Hunting Methods, 2002. IWC Document IWC/55/WK11.
- Greenland Home Rule 2003. Times to death in the Greenlandic minke and fin whale hunt in 2002. IWC Document IWC/55/WK12 rev.
- Greenland Home Rule 2004. A note regarding information encouraged in IWC-resolution 1999. IWC Document IWC/56/7.
- Greenland Home Rule 2004. Report on improvements in ASW in Greenland. IWC Document IWC/56/6.
- Greenland Home Rule 2004. Status for Greenland Action Plan on Whale Hunting Methods, 2003. IWC Document IWC/56/8.
- Greenland Home Rule 2004. Summary of activities related to the Action Plan on Whale Killing Methods. IWC Document IWC/56/5.
- Greenland Home Rule 2005. A note regarding information encouraged in IWC-resolution 1999. IWC Document IWC/57/WKM & AWI6.
- Greenland Home Rule 2005. Report on improvements in ASW in Greenland. IWC Document IWC/57/WKM & AW7.
- Greenland Home Rule 2005. Status for Greenland Action Plan on Whale Hunting Methods, 2004. IWC Document IWC/57/WKM & AW8.
- Greenland Home Rule 2006. A note regarding information encouraged in IWC-resolution 1999, for the Greenland catch of 2005. IWC Document IWC/58/WKM & AWI3.
- Greenland Home Rule 2006. Report on improvements in ASW in Greenland. IWC Document IWC/58/WKM & AWI4.

- Greenland Home Rule 2006. Status for Greenland Action Plan on Whale Hunting Methods. IWC Document IWC/58/ WKM & AWI5.
- Greenland Home Rule 2006. Summary of activities related to the Action Plan on Whale Killing Methods. IWC Document IWC/58/WKM & AWI6.
- Greenland Home Rule Government 2006. Whale killing methods and associated welfare issues in Greenland. IWC Document IWC/58/WKM & AWI7.
- Greenland Home Rule Government 2007. Summary of Activities Related to the Action Plan on Whale Killing Methods (based on Resolution 1999-1). IWC Document IWC/59/WKM&AWI/3
- Greenland Home Rule Government 2007. White Paper on Hunting of Large Whales in Greenland. IWC Document IWC/59/ASW8rev.
- Greenland Home Rule Government 2008. Summary of Activities Related to the Action Plan on Whale Killing Methods (based on Resolution 1999-1). IWC Document IWC/60/20
- Greenland Home Rule Government 2009. Summary of Activities Related to the Action Plan on Whale Killing Methods (based on Resolution 1999-1). IWC Document IWC/61/WKM&AWI/6
- Greenland Government 2010. Summary of Activities Related to the Action Plan on Whale Killing Methods (based on Resolution 1999-1). IWC Document IWC/62/22
- Greenland Government 2011. Summary of Activities Related to the Action Plan on Whale Killing Methods (based on Resolution 1999-1). IWC Document IWC/63/WKM&AWI9
- Greenland Government White Paper on Management and Utilization of Seals in Greenland (April 2012)
- Greenland Government 2013. Summary of Activities Related to the Action Plan on Whale Killing Methods (based on Resolution 1999-1). IWC Document IWC/65/WKM&AWI06
- Greenland Government 2014. Summary of Activities Related to the Action Plan on Whale Killing Methods (based on Resolution 1999-1). IWC Document IWC/65b/ WKM&AWI07
- Greenland Government White Paper on Management and Utilization of Seals in Greenland (April 2012)  
Updated data to: White Paper on Management and Utilization of Seals in Greenland (February 2015)
- Greenland Government 2015. Summary of Activities Related to the Action Plan on Whale Killing Methods (based on Resolution 1999-1). IWC Document IWC/66/ WKM&AWI05
- Greenland Government 2016. Summary of Activities Related to the Action Plan on Whale Killing Methods (based on Resolution 1999-1). IWC Document IWC/66b/ WKM&AWI05
- Greenland Government 2018. Summary of Activities Related to the Action Plan on Whale Killing Methods (based on Resolution 1999-1). IWC Document IWC/66b/ WKM&AWI
- Greenland Government 2018. White paper on Management and Utilization of Large Whales in Greenland. IWC Document IWC/66/ASW5.
- Happynook, K. 2004. Whaling around the world. World Council of Whalers. ISBN 0-9733760-0-7 Pp.74 (Greenland in p. 25 – 34)
- Jessen, A. 1992. *Modern Inuit Whaling in Greenland*.
- Josefsen, E, Cutter 1990. Hunting of Minke Whale in Qaqortoq (Greenland): Case Study. IWC Document TC/42/SEST5.
- Larsen, S. E. and Hansen, K. G. 1990. Inuit and Whales at Sarfaq (Greenland): Case Study. IWC Document TC/42/SEST4.
- Petersen, R. 1987. *Communal Aspects of Preparation for Whaling, of the Hunt Itself and of the Ensuing Products*.
- Rosing, J. 1986. Havets Enhjørning. Højbjerg Wormianon.
- Silis, I. 1997. Hvalernes Fjord. Atuakkiorfik, ISBN 87 558 1250 3. Pp. 88
- Stevenson, M., G., Madsen A. and Maloney E., editors. 1997. *The Anthropology of Community-Based Whaling in Greenland, A Collection of Papers Submitted to the International Whaling Commission. Studies in Whaling No 4, Occasional Publication No 42, Canadian Cumpolar Institute, University of Alberta, Canada*
- Ting, H. 1990. Encounters with wildlife in Greenland. Atuakkiorfik. ISBN 87 558 0547 7. Pp. 61
- Video – 1998. Hvalfangst i Grønland.
- Video – 1989. Introduktion om hvalgrnat i Greenland.
- (WWC) World Council of Whalers. 1998. Whaling and Whale Use around the World – Greenland. *General Assembly Report*: p. 21.

**ICELAND**

- Lambertsen, Richard H. and Moore, Michael J. 1983. Behavioral and post mortem observations on fin whales killed with explosive harpoons with preliminary conclusions concerning killing efficiency: report to the International Whaling Commission from the Icelandic Whales research laboratory. IWC Document TC/36/HK3.
- Rowell, Harry C. 1979. Assessment of harpooning as a humane killing method in whales: A report to the International Whaling Commission.
- Øen E. O. 1987. Progress Report on Penthrith as Detonating Charge for 90 mm Harpoons. IWC Document TC/39/HK4.
- Øen E. O. 2015. Killing efficiency in the Icelandic fin whale hunt 2014. Report to the Directorate of Fisheries in Iceland.
- Øen E. O. 2015. Killing efficiency in the Icelandic minke whale hunt 2014 and 2015. Report to the Directorate of Fisheries in Iceland

**NORWAY**

- Knudsen S. K., Mørk S. and Øen E. O. 1999. A study on methods to assess time to unconsciousness or death in minke whale after penthrith grenade detonation. IWC Document IWC/51/WK12.
- Knudsen S. K., Rud H. J. and Øen E.O. 1999. The position of the brain in the minke whale in relation to external features. IWC Document IWC/51/WK13.
- Knudsen S. K., Mørk S. and Øen E. O. 2002. A novel method for *in situ* fixation of whale brains. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods* 120: 35-44
- Knudsen S. K. and Øen EO. 2003. Blast-induced neurotrauma in whales. *Neuroscience Research* 46(3):265-386.
- Knudsen S. K. 2003. Criteria of death in whales. A comparative review. IWC Document IWC/55/WK.
- Knudsen S. K. 2004. Assessment of insensibility and death in hunted whales. A study of trauma and its consequences caused by the currently used weapon and ammunition in the Norwegian hunt for minke whales, with special emphasis on the central nervous system. Thesis for the degree of Doctor Medicinae Veterinariae. The Norwegian School of Veterinary Science, Tromsø. ISBN 82-7725-096-7.
- Knudsen S. K. 2005. A review of the criteria of insensibility and death in hunted whales compared to other species. *The Veterinary Journal*. In press.
- O'Hara T.M., Albert T.F., Øen E.O., Philo L.M., George J.C. and Ingling A.L. 1999. The role of Eskimo hunters, veterinarians, and other biologists in improving the humane aspects of the subsistence harvest of bowhead whales. *JAVMA*, 214, 1193-1198.
- Skoglund, K. 1997. Documentary film on Norwegian sealing. Polarfangst.
- Øen E. O. 1982. Progress Report on Studies to increase the Efficiency of Killing Methods in Norwegian Small-Type Whaling. IWC Document SC/34/010.
- Øen E. O. 1983. Electrical Whaling - A Review. *Nord. Vet.-Med.* 35: 319-323.
- Øen E. O. 1983. Progress report on research to develop more humane killing methods in Norwegian whaling. IWC Document TC/35/HK1.
- Øen E. O. 1983. Killing Times of Minke Whales in the Norwegian Coastal Whaling in the 1981 and 1982 Seasons. *Nord. Vet.-Med.* 35, 314-318.
- Øen E. O. 1984. Progress report on research in 1983-84 to develop more humane killing methods in Norwegian whaling. IWC Document TC/36/HK1.
- Øen E. O. 1984. The Use of Drugs in Whaling. IWC Document TC/36/HK2.
- Øen E. O. 1985. Progress report on research in 1984-85 to develop more humane killing methods in Norwegian whaling. IWC Document IWC/37/19.
- Øen E. O. 1989. Chemical Immobilization and Marking of Minke Whales. A Report of Field Trials in 1988. IWC Document SC/41/NHMi10.
- Øen E. O. 1990. A new VHF-Transmitter for Minke Whales. IWC Document SC/42/NHMi17.
- Øen E. O. 1990. A Review of Attachment Techniques for Radio Transmitters to Whales. In: Vestergaard, E. (ed.); *North Atlantic Studies - Whaling Communities*, Vol. 2, Nos 1 & 2, Aarhus Universitet, 82-84.
- Øen E. O. 1990. Trials of Chemical Immobilization of Minke Whales with Etorphine Hydrochloride in 1989. IWC Document SC/42/NHMi16.

- Øen E. O. 1992. A new Penthrite Grenade for the Subsistence Hunt of Bowhead Whales by Alaskan Eskimoes. Developmental Work and Field Trials in 1988. IWC Document IWC/44/HKW6.
- Øen E. O. 1992. The Norwegian Hunt of Minke Whales: A Norwegian Penthrite Grenade for Minke Whaling. Description of the Model and Developmental Work. IWC Document IWC/44/HKW4.
- Øen E. O. 1992. The Norwegian Hunt of Minke Whales: Description and Analysis of the Minke Whale Hunt with Cold Harpoons in the 1981, 1982 and 1983 Seasons. IWC Document IWC/44/HKW2.
- Øen E. O. 1992. The Norwegian Hunt of Minke Whales: Hunting of Minke Whales with Modified Cold Harpoons in 1983. IWC Document IWC/44/HKW1.
- Øen E. O. 1992. The Norwegian Hunt of Minke Whales: Hunting Trials using 20mm High-Velocity Projectiles in 1982. IWC Document IWC/44/HKW3.
- Øen E. O. 1992. Norwegian Penthrite Grenade for Minke Whales: Hunting Trials with Prototypes of Penthrite Grenades in 1984 and Results from the 1985 and 1986 Seasons. IWC Document IWC/44/HKW5. Øen E. O. 1993. Avliving av strandet Hval. *Nor. Vet. Tidsskr.* 105, p. 748-749.
- Øen E. O. 1993. Avliving av standet Hval. *Nor. Vet. Tidsskr.* 105, p. 845-846.
- Øen E. O. 1993. Hunting Methods for Minke Whales in Norway. Report from the 1992 Scientific Catch. IWC Document IWC/45/HK 1.
- Øen E. O. 1993. Norwegian Penthrite Grenade for Minke Whales: Results from the 1992 Season.
- Øen E. O. 1995. A New Penthrite Grenade Compared to the Traditional Black Powder Grenade: Effectiveness in the Alaskan Eskimo's Hunt for Bowhead Whales. *Arctic.* 48, No 2:177-185.
- Øen E. O. 1995. A Norwegian Penthrite Grenade for Minke Whales: Hunting Trials with Prototypes and Results from the Hunt in 1984, 1985 and 1986. *Acta vet. scan.* 36: 111-121.
- Øen E. O. 1995. Description and Analysis of the use of Cold Harpoons in the Norwegian Minke Whale Hunt in the 1981, 1982 and 1983 Hunting Seasons. *Acta vet. scan.* 36: 103-110. 1995.
- Øen E. O. 1995. High Velocity Projectiles for Killing Whales. Hunting Trials using 20 mm High Velocity Projectiles for Minke Whales in 1982. *Acta vet. scan.* 36: 153-156.
- Øen E. O. 1995. Killing Methods for Minke and Bowhead Whales, Dissertation presented for the degree of Doctor Medicinae Veterinariae.
- Øen E. O. 1996. Avlivingsmetoder for store pattedyr. En dyrevernmessig vurdering av de vanligste former for avliving ved eutanasi, slakting, jakt og fangst i Europa. *Nor. Vet. Tidsskr.* 108, p. 313-321.
- Øen E. O. 1997. Norwegian minke whaling 1996. Rep. IWC Document.
- Øen E. O. 1998. Norwegian minke whaling 1997. IWC Document.
- Øen E. O. 1999. Improvements in hunting and killing methods for minke whales in Norway. IWC Document IWC/51/WK11.
- Øen E. O. and Mørk S. 1999. Observations of agonal movements, injuries and pathological changes in minke whales after intra-body detonation of penthrite. IWC Document IWC/51/WK10.
- Øen E. O. and Walløe L. 1999. Norwegian minke whaling 1996, 1997 and 1998. Whaling activities, inspection routines, new developments and research 1996-99. IWC Document IWC/51/WK9.
- Øen E. O. 2000. Norwegian minke whaling 1999. IWC Document IWC/WKM & AWI1.
- Øen E. O. 2001. Hunting of whales in Norway in historical perspective. Proceedings of the 32<sup>nd</sup> International Congress on the History of Veterinary Medicine, 15-18 August, Oslo.
- Øen, E. O. 2001. Norwegian minke whaling in 2000. IWC Document IWC/53/WK.
- Øen, E. O. 2002. Norwegian minke whaling in 2001. IWC Document IWC/54/WKM & AWI6.
- Øen E. O. 2003. Improvements in hunting and killing methods for minke whales in Norway 1981-2003. IWC Document IWC/55/WK17.
- Øen E. O. and Knudsen S. K. 2007. Euthanasia of whales: The effect of .375 and .458 calibre round-nosed full metal jacketed rifle bullets on the central nervous system of the common minke whale. *J. Cetacean Res. Manage.* 9(1):81-88.
- Øen E. O. 2015. The Norwegian minke whale hunt 2011 and 2012. Studies on killing efficiency in the hunt. Report to the Directorate of Fisheries in Norway.

**LIST OF LAWS AND REGULATIONS IN NAMMCO MEMBER COUNTRIES**

(Updated February 2019)

**FAROE ISLANDS**

- Parliamentary Act      No 57 of 5 June 1984 on whale hunting, as last amended by Parliamentary Act No 54 of 20 May 1996  
                                  No 56 of 19 May 2015 on pilot whale and other small whales, as last amended by Parliamentary Act No 44 of 6 May 2016  
                                  No 49 of 30 April 2018 on animal welfare  
                                  No 43 of 22 May 1969 on weapons etc., as last amended by Parliamentary Act No 81 of 22 May 2015
- Executive Order        No 87 of 20 September 2007 on protection of whales  
                                  9 of 26 January 2017 on pilot whale and other small whales  
                                  No 57 of 12 September 1969 on weapons etc.  
                                  No 74 of 28 June 2016 on registration of shooting weapons, as amended by Executive Order No 92 of 7 September 2016  
                                  No 93 of 7 September 2016 on weapon certificate

**GREENLAND**

- Greenland Home Rule Act  
                                  No 1 of 16 Mai 2008 on revisions to Greenland Home Rule Act No 12 of 29 October 1999 on hunting  
                                  No 25 of 18 December 2003 on animal welfare  
                                  No 29 of 18 December 2003 on nature protection
- Executive Order        No 26 of 24 October 1997 on extraordinary check and approval of harpoon cannons  
                                  No 22 of 19 August 2002 on trophy-hunting and fishing  
                                  No 20 of 27 October 2006 on protection and hunting of walrus  
                                  No 16 of 12 November 2010 on protection and hunting of seals  
                                  No 12 of 16 July 2010 on reporting from hunting and strike of large whales  
                                  No 13 of 30 December 2014 on hunting licenses for full time hunters  
                                  No 14 of 30 December 2014 on hunting licenses for part-time hunters  
                                  No 3 of 27 January 2017 on protection and hunting of beluga and narwhal  
                                  No 9 of 6 December 2018 on protection and hunting of large whales

Catch registration form (1993-present) "*Piniarneq*"

## ICELAND

- Law
- No 26 of May 3, 1949 on whaling
  - No 40 of June 1, 1979 on amendments to Law No 26/1949 on whaling
  - No 23 of April 17, 1991 on amendments to Law No 26/1949 on whaling (cf. Law No 40/1979)
  - No 92, July 1, 1991 on amendments to Law 26/1949 on whaling (cf. Law No 40/1979 and 23/1991)
- Regulation
- No 163, May 30, 1973 on whaling
  - No 359, April 6, 2009 on amendments to Regulation No 163 of May 30, 1973 on whaling (cf. Regulation No 304/1983, 239/1984, 862/2006, 822/2007, 456/2008 58/2009 and 263/2009)
  - No 1035, November 2017 on the ban on whale hunting in specific areas.
- Minke whaling licenses Rules in the licenses for minke whaling.

## NORWAY

- Act of 27 March 1999 No 15 relating to the right to participate in fisheries and hunting
- Act of 6 June 2008 No 37 relating to the management of wild living marine resources
- Act of 19 June 2009 No 97 The Animal Welfare Act

Executive Orders from the Department of Fisheries and Coastal Affairs:

- 31 March 2000 Regulation of the practice of hunting minke whales.
- 11 March 2003 Regulation of the practice of hunting seals in the West Ice and the East Ice
- 27 February 2014 Regulation of the practice of hunting seals on the coast of Norway

The Ministry of Trade, Industry and Fisheries and the Directorate of Fisheries issues each year executive orders relating to the participation and governing of the hunt of Whales and Seals.

## OVERVIEW OF RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN TIME-TO-DEATH REPORTING FOR HUNTED TERRESTRIAL SPECIES.

In 2005, Knudsen published a review of the criteria used to assess insensibility in hunted whales in comparison to other species. Within this review, it was noted that official criteria have only been considered when applied to humans or large whales. Following that, several studies on terrestrial species were discussed that purported to assess hunting efficiency. However, lacking in these studies were quantitative data related to insensibility and time to death (TTD).

The issue of animal welfare has been discussed at the International Whaling Commission (IWC) since the 1950's, prompting increased scrutiny of hunting methods (IWC 1959, Knudsen 2005, Gales *et al.* 2008). With a view to increasing hunt efficiency, improve animal welfare outcomes, and increase hunter safety, changes were made to hunting methods and the use of cold harpoons was largely abandoned. This effort culminated in the development of the Norwegian "Whale Grenade-99", leading to significant decreases in TTD, and increases in the Instantaneous Death Rate (IDR – the proportion of animals killed instantly during a hunt) (Øen 1995). With the increased opposition to whaling, there was even more impetus to demonstrate that this form of harvest could not only be sustainable, but also as humane as other practices that involve the slaughter of animals. Therefore, following the North Atlantic Marine Mammals Committee (NAMMCO) Committee on Hunting Methods Expert Group meetings of 2010 and 2015, it was acknowledged that a further review of the literature was necessary to see if quantitative data on TTD was available for terrestrial mammals.

After online searches of relevant journals and literature sources, there remains few quantitative assessments of hunting methods that assess time to death in terrestrial animals. However, since 2014, several papers have been published in the journals of *Wildlife Research* (Hampton *et al.* 2014, 2017, Hampton & Forsyth 2016), *Animal Welfare* (Hampton *et al.* 2015), and the *Wildlife Society Bulletin* (Hampton *et al.* 2016) by J. O. Hampton. This body of work was subsequently included in the author's thesis submitted for the Doctor of Philosophy degree at Murdoch University, Australia (Hampton 2017).

Hampton's thesis and associated papers discussed their findings with reference given to the extensive information on cetacean hunting methods. It was acknowledged that a framework has been developed in the hunting of large whales from which the assessment of terrestrial hunting can model (Hampton 2017). Improving animal welfare outcomes for the physical killing of animals should aim for the reduction of the duration of suffering (Lewis *et al.* 1997, Hampton *et al.* 2014). The ideal approach would be to record the time to insensibility, yet practical assessment of this is often difficult in the field. Recording TTD is therefore identified as an alternative that has been successfully implemented for cetaceans (Knudsen 2005, Brakes & Donoghue 2006). Hampton's studies have been modelled on similar criteria and methods, incorporating the parameters of TTD and IDR used to evaluate whaling efficiency.

The following sections aim to provide an overview of the recent work conducted in the assessment and evaluation of animal welfare outcomes from terrestrial shooting programs by Hampton. The thesis (Hampton 2017) contains further chapters discussing non-lethal control

methods as well, yet these will not be the focus of this review. Instead, the overview will predominantly report on the evaluation of lethal control methods used, namely those using rifles for herbivore management in Australia.

**I: Quantitative analysis of animal welfare outcomes in helicopter shooting: a case study with feral dromedary camels (*Camelus dromedarius*).**

**Introduction**

Presented here is a summary of the paper published in *Wildlife Research* (Hampton et al. 2014). This paper addresses the animal welfare concerns arising from helicopter shooting as a method for feral camel population control. Helicopter shooting has been widely employed as a management tool for large mammals (Saunders 1993), particularly for invasive species in Australia where introduced animals such as camels are considered to be overabundant. It was noted by the authors that, while studies exist that evaluate the efficacy of the method from a population control perspective (Choquenot et al. 1999), little effort has been made to quantify the animal-welfare parameters. Further, where the practice has been discontinued, this has been largely due to public opinion shaping policy, and not whether the technique is effective (Nimmo & Miller 2007).

**Methods**

The methodological approach for assessing the welfare and humaneness of helicopter shooting of camels consisted of two parts; an *ante-mortem* observation, and a *post-mortem* examination. Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for helicopter shooting programs are highly regulated in Australia, and those used conducted under the Australian Feral Camel Management Project (AFCMP) were required to follow these, and Civil Aviation Safety Authority regulations.

Two Robinson<sup>®</sup> 44 helicopters (Robinson Helicopter Co. Torrance, California, USA) were used in the shooting operations. Shooting was conducted from one helicopter, with the other making observations and recordings while flying approx. 30m above the other. Two types of firearms were used in the operations; the M1A (Springfield Armory, Geneseo, Illinois, USA) and the LR-.308 (DPMS Panther Arms, St Cloud, Michigan, USA). Both were semi-automatic, firing 0.308 Winchester<sup>®</sup> ammunition, and the target area on the animal was either the cranium or thorax. (Hampton et al. 2014). Repeat shooting is required in Australia and as such, a ‘fly-back’ procedure was performed as detailed along with further SOPs in Sharp (2012).

*Ante-mortem* observations were performed by recording the interval between the first shot impacting the animal, and the moment at which the animal fell to the ground and did not move (Lewis et al. 1997). This time was recorded as the TTD, yet it was noted that as physiological responses could not be measured, there is a chance that this measure merely represents a time to insensibility. However, it was also mentioned that with the requirement for repeat shooting, it is unlikely that animals will return to sensibility (Knudsen & Øen 2003, Sharp 2012), therefore making this assessment of TTD representative of the duration of animal suffering.

*Post-mortem* observations were conducted for a separate series of shooting operations. These were conducted by veterinarians within four hours of shooting. Animals were initially assessed

for signs indicating a non-instantaneous death. These included blood-trails, evidence of paddling or thrashing, and any disturbance to the substrate in which their carcass was found. Further examinations were conducted to assess the gross pathology of vital organs, the damage sustained by non-target organs, and the location and direction of bullet-tract wounds. Shots to the cranium, thorax and cervical spine were considered fatal (Urquhart & McKendrick 2006, Cockram et al. 2011).

## Results

The results of the *ante-mortem* operation described 192 camels, 83% (95% CI: 77-88%) of which were shown to have died instantly (Table 1.). The TTD ranged from 0s to 242s, with a mean TTD of 4s. 32 animals were not considered to have been killed instantaneously and have a mean TTD of 22s ( $\pm 11$ s).

**Table 1.** Summary of results obtained through *ante-mortem* observations by (Hampton et al. 2014). Mean Time-to-death (TTD, given in seconds) and Instantaneous Death Rate (IDR) is given for 192 camels shot in a helicopter shooting operation.

Parameter	<i>n</i>	Mean	95% CI (lower)	95% CI (upper)
<b>TTD</b> (all)/s	192	4.00	1.00	6.00
<b>IDR</b>	192	0.83	0.77	0.88
<b>TTD</b> (non-instantaneous)/s	32	22.00	11.00	33.00

*Post-mortem* observations were conducted on a total of 715 animals, three of which were found to still be alive upon examination, and thus a wounding rate of 0.4% was given. This is similar to the Struck-and-Lost parameter given in the assessment of the hunting efficiency for marine mammals, yet struck-and-lost may include animals that were killed instantly (Kestin 1995, Knudsen 2005, Hampton 2017). From initial observations of the animal upon inspection, from the gross pathologies of vital organs, bullet wound locations and bullet-hole tracts, an IDR of 77% (95% CI: 74-80%) was inferred. Although inferences of TTD and IDR from *post-mortems* should be treated with caution, This IDR is very close to the above stated IDR given for the *ante-mortem* observations (Table 1.).

## Discussion

Further statistical analysis found strong support for the shooter's identity to have affected the proportion of animals rendered instantaneously dead (Hampton et al. 2014). Shooter training, experience, skill, and selection for the operations will likely impact any animal welfare outcomes on an individual basis. Furthermore, vegetation was found to be a factor in reducing the likelihood of achieving improved IDRs. It was also noted by the authors that the stability of the platform, and the need to hit a moving target would likely act as a barrier to improved welfare outcomes. Likewise, harpoon operation, sea conditions, and angle of the shot in minke whale (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*) are known factors influencing the efficiency of whaling

operations (Kestin 1995, NAMMCO 2015). As such, NAMMCO provides a manual to skippers in recognition of the optimum outcomes for animal welfare during the hunts; “NAMMCO Instruction manual for the maintenance and use of weaponry and equipment deployed in hunting of baleen whales in NAMMCO member countries” (Øen 2015).

Repeat shooting has been stated by some to be the product of ineffective first shots, and therefore as an indication of non-humane killing (see Daoust et al. 2013, Butterworth & Richardson 2014). However, as per regional regulations and SOPs (Hampton et al. 2014, 2017), and practices routinely carried out by hunters (Knudsen 2005), the assumption that a secondary shot equates to poor welfare outcomes is not warranted. Indeed, the present study states an average of 2.4 bullet-wounds tracts were present in camels from *post-mortem* observations, even with the inferred 77% IDR.

This study provides the first quantitative evaluation of the animal welfare outcomes for helicopter shooting of a large terrestrial mammal. This is also one of the only studies to produce time-to-death values for terrestrial wildlife shooting, and as such, builds upon the extensive body of work previously conducted in cetacean hunts. It demonstrates that animal welfare outcomes can be judged by a combination of *anti-* and *post-mortem* observations which, when combined, give a wealth of information regarding the humaneness of physical killing methods. The results of this study by Hampton et al. (2014) are comparable to the IDRs currently achieved by Norwegian minke, and Icelandic fin whale hunts (82% and 84% respectively) (NAMMCO 2015). Similarly, it identifies certain variables that can influence the animal welfare outcomes of hunts, the likes of which are analogous to those observed in whaling operations.

## **II: A simple quantitative method for assessing animal welfare outcomes in terrestrial wildlife shooting: The European rabbit as a case study**

&

## **III: Improving Animal Welfare in Wildlife Shooting: The Importance of Projectile Energy**

### **Introduction and Methods**

The following papers describe the application of terrestrial wildlife shooting on European rabbits (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*). Hampton et al. (2015) assessed the welfare aspects of shooting programs used in population control. It combines *ante-* and *post-mortem* observations and examinations to infer the humaneness of hunting methods. This follows the benchmark parameters developed and established for the study of cetacean hunting methods, such as the recording of time-to-death (TTD), instantaneous death rate (IDR), and *post-mortem* analysis of location of shot (Kestin 1995, Øen 1995, Knudsen 2005, Gales et al. 2008, Hampton et al. 2014). Further, an analysis of Struck-and-lost rate also gives an impression of welfare outcomes for hunted marine mammals. Hampton (2014, 2015) equates this to the wounding rate (WR) obtained from some terrestrial studies. This is not strictly correct as the WR is defined as “the

estimated proportion of animals shot but not killed”, whereas the NAMMCO definition of Struck-and-lost incorporates all animals hit but not landed, with no indication of whether they are dead or not. Although this may seem a technicality of the different environments, an equivalence of the two terms would not account for those whales that were killed instantly but subsequently lost if, say, the harpoon becomes dislodged (Knudsen 2005, NAMMCO 2017).

Hampton et al. (2016) discusses the importance of projectile choice in improving the welfare outcomes of the shooting of European rabbits. *Ante-* and *post-mortem* observations were made for rabbits shot with two different projectile types; a low energy 40-grain .22 long rifle rimfire (.22LR) bullet, and a high energy 40-grain .222 Remington® centrefire (.222R) bullet. The muzzle energies for each were found to be 198J, and 1433J respectively. The welfare parameters, as discussed above, were contrasted for each projectile used, and conclusions made regarding best practices for improved animal welfare outcomes. Hampton et al. (2015) uses solely .22 long rifle ammunition.

These studies represent some of the few terrestrial studies reporting on *ante-mortem* parameters such as TTD and IDR. They apply the cetacean hunting methods template for assessment to the control of European rabbits, an invasive population where lethal control is considered necessary in Australia (Hampton et al. 2015). Following standard operating procedures (SOPs) as described by Sharp (2016), rabbits were shot opportunistically at night, with distance of shot recorded as an additional variable. Analysis TTD and IDR were calculated as per Hampton et al. (2014), based the framework established for cetaceans. However, for both these studies, it appears that the mean TTD reported includes those in which the TTD = 0. This differs from the studies of Hampton et al. (2014) and Norwegian reporting of TTD in minke whale (*Balaenoptera acutorostra*) hunts, where those reported as instantly dead were excluded from an average survival time reporting (NAMMCO 2015, Øen 2015). The wounding rate (WR) was defined as above; the proportion of animals that were hit but not recovered.

**Table 2.** Animal welfare parameters for shooting of European rabbits as reported in Hampton et al. (2015). Mean Time-to-death (TTD, given in seconds), Instantaneous Death Rate (IDR) and Wounding rate (WR) are given for 127 animals hit during assessment.

<i>Parameter</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>95% CI (lower)</i>	<i>95% CI (upper)</i>
<b>TTD/s</b>	12	8	16
<b>IDR</b>	0.60	0.50	0.69
<b>WR</b>	0.12	0.07	0.19

## Results

The results of Hampton et al. (2015) reported that rabbits fatally shot had TTDs ranging from 0 to 90 seconds, with 60% (95% CI: 50-69%) killed instantaneously (Table 2.). Out of a total of 141 animals shot at, 127 were hit with 15 individuals (12%) escaping wounded.

The second study discussing comparing projectile choice (Hampton et al. 2016) demonstrates similar *ante-mortem* results as Hampton et al. (2015) when assessing the welfare outcomes of .22LR ammunition (Table 3.). Following the assessment of .222R ammunition, it was found that welfare outcomes were substantially improved when the higher energy projectile was used. IDR was increased from 66% to 92%, while mean TTD was reduced by 8 seconds (Table 3.). WR also decreased by 4%.

**Table 3.** Comparison of projectile choice with respect to animal welfare parameters as stated in Hampton et al. (2016). Mean Time-to-death (TTD, given in seconds), Instantaneous Death Rate (IDR) and Wounding rate (WR) are given for 500 animals shot during assessment.

<i>Projectile</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean TTD/s</i>	<i>Mean IDR</i>	<i>Mean WR</i>
<b>.22 Long Rifle</b>	224	10 (7-13)	0.66 (0.59-0.72)	0.06 (0.03-0.09)
<b>.222 Remington®</b>	276	2(1-3)	0.92 (0.88-0.95)	0.02 (0.00-0.03)

*Post-mortem* observations from both studies identified bullet tract locations as Hampton et al. (2014). Shooting distance was found to be an important explanatory variable when assessing animal welfare outcomes. Increasing shooting distance decreased the probability of hitting a rabbit in one of the recommended locations defined as likely to cause instantaneous insensibility and death (Hampton et al. 2015, 2016, Sharp 2016). The SOPs stipulate a recommended shooting distance; reducing this distance as much as possible is thought to improve welfare outcomes for rabbits. The comparison of projectiles also found that successful shooting of rabbits was possible at greater distances when using the .222R given the higher energy profile of this ammunition. *Post-mortem* also found that use of the .222R ammunition also increased the probability of inducing trauma in multiple anatomical zones (Hampton et al. 2016). Even when distance was controlled for following statistical analysis, the .222R ammunition were found to increase animal welfare outcomes derived from *ante-mortem* parameters over the .22LR projectiles.

## Discussion

The results obtained from studies observing the shooting of the European rabbits has demonstrated further successful use of the framework developed for hunting method assessment in marine mammals (Øen 1995, Knudsen 2005, Hampton et al. 2015, 2016).

Assessment of terrestrial mammal welfare outcomes has demonstrated that a combination of *ante-* and *post-mortem* observations is able to infer parameters such as TTD, IDR and WR. Further, Hampton et al. (2016) also demonstrated the importance of projectile choice when considering welfare improvements. High energy projectiles were able to improve all welfare parameters and enabled more humane physical killing at greater distances.

The higher the wounding rate, the greater the number of animals that escape after being hit. This is widely considered the worst possible outcome of animal killing from a welfare perspective (Bradshaw & Bateson 2000, Hampton et al. 2015, 2016). The duration of suffering experienced by an animal that escapes after being hit by a projectile is unable to be quantified and could be substantial. The above study has shown that increasing the projectile energy by selecting a higher calibre can reduce the likelihood of non-lethal wounding occurring (Hampton et al. 2016). Even when controlled for distance, this equates to increased kinetic energy being transferred to the animal, followed by trauma observed in multiple critical anatomic zones as per standard operating procedures (Sharp 2016).

Potential drawbacks of using higher energy projectiles such as the .222R ammunition were discussed in terms of primary objective of animal killing. Given the higher cost of the .222R over the .22LR bullets (more than 10 times greater), the practicality of using more expensive methods will not suite every situation (Hampton et al. 2016). This can be comparable to the situation where the ammunition determined by experts to be the most efficient, has not always been available in the stores. This has remained a problem in several of the NAMMCO member countries (NAMMCO 1999, 2001). As an example, the collective minke whale hunt in Greenland consists of a multiple of small boats first using large calibre rifles and then attaching several hand-held harpoons to not lose the whale before killing it. This contrasts with larger, single vessels, operating explosive harpoons fired from cannons. Any hunting methods where the combined use of cold harpoons and rifles often results in prolonged TTDs and low IDRs. In this situation, the Greenlandic whalers cannot kill for instantaneous death given the whale's propensity to sink before a harpoon can be attached (NAMMCO 2010, 2015). While this has raised welfare concerns, the lack of whaling vessels, the need for food supply and the geographic isolation of communities practicing the collective hunts has limited animal welfare outcomes (NAMMCO 2015).

Furthermore, there is a concern that, although the .222R ammunition used in Hampton et al. (2016) provided improved welfare outcomes, it also damaged a greater proportion of the target animal. Therefore, if shooting is to be conducted for meat, rather than population control, animal welfare concerns may have to be balanced against the cost of the ammunition and the potential wastage of usable product. Likewise, Daoust & Cattet (2004) observed that accuracy of the shot had less impact on the probability of negative welfare outcomes if the projectile used had a higher energy profile on impact. This may be of greater benefit to wildlife population control than it would be to harvest of wildlife, given the greater potential for damage to usable meat.

Nevertheless, the discussion of projectile choice in regard to animal welfare in terrestrial shooting mirrors the improvements made to whaling operations in the 1980's and 1990's (Øen 1995, 2015, NAMMCO 2015). As parameters have been used to quantify the humane killing

of animals, so the understanding of positive and negative outcomes has improved (Kestin 1995, Knudsen 2005, Hampton et al. 2015). In recognition of the work conducted in whaling operations to reduce the intensity of duration of animal suffering, the discussion in Hampton et al. (2016) turned to relevance of projectile choice. Again, quantitative data combining both *ante-* and *post-mortem* observations provide insights into the welfare outcomes of hunting methods in terrestrial shooting.

#### **IV: An assessment of animal welfare for the culling of peri-urban kangaroos**

##### **Introduction**

The following paper introduces the assessment of animal welfare during night shooting of peri-urban kangaroos (*Macropus sp.*). Eastern grey kangaroos (*Macropus giganteus*) are subject to population control when numbers become over abundant in proximity to human settlements (Hampton & Forsyth 2016). As with the previous studies discussed, questions surrounding the welfare aspects of this practice remain, especially as the target is a charismatic mammal endemic to Australia. Also as in previous studies, both *ante-* and *post-mortem* observations were used in the assessment, enabling the accurate quantification of IDR, TTD and WR. Furthermore, in addition to these parameters quantified for the individual animals, the duration of stress was also quantified for pouch young and conspecifics. The quantification of stress on young animals is particularly important, given that the welfare of ‘orphaned’ animals has previously received considerable attention (Hampton & Forsyth 2016). The assessment of flight responses of conspecifics may also have implications for animal welfare assessments in other social species.

##### **Methods**

Shooting took place at night during June 2015 in the Australian Capital Territory. It took place in the winter months to minimise number of young-at-foot (juveniles outside the pouch) and furred pouch young, which would likely have poorer welfare during the shooting operation (McLeod & Sharp 2014, Hampton & Forsyth 2016). A shooting team consisting of a driver, an observer and a shooter operated a modified four-wheel-drive-vehicle driven at 5-10kmph around an estate in which the shooting program was conducted. The shooter used a bolt-action rifle, using .223 Remington® calibre ammunition. The rifle was fitted with a telescopic sight and sound suppressor to reduce noise. Typically, shooting is conducted with the use of spotlights (see Hampton et al. 2015, 2016), yet for the purposes of this study, an infrared imaging technology was utilised. Once a kangaroo was spotted, the vehicle was stopped within 75m of the animal, and the marksman aimed for the cranium of the animal, as per standard operating procedures (Commonwealth of Australia 2008, Hampton et al. 2016).

Retrieval of the animals once shot occurred as soon as possible, yet multiple animals including young-at-foot sometimes shot in cohort. Females assessed for presence of pouch young, and these were euthanised through blunt-force trauma or decapitation. An independent veterinary observer recorded *ante-mortem* welfare parameters (TTD, IDR, WR), while infrared video recordings were reviewed later to assess the flight behaviour of conspecifics. Flight behaviour

was defined as either the animal remaining calm and stationary after another animal in the vicinity was shot, or an alarmed flight response away from the animal that was shot. The duration of the flight response (FD) was recorded, with those that remained stationary recorded as FD = 0.

*Post-mortem* examinations were performed to determine the location of the bullet wounds and bullet wound tracts as per Urquhart & McKendrick (2006). This was conducted by an independent observer who also conducted an examination of the euthanised pouch-young.

## Results

During the shooting program, 136 kangaroos were shot at, with two animals escaping unwounded. Of the 134 animals that were hit, 131 animals were rendered instantaneously insensible (Table 4.). For the three animals not rendered immediately insensible, the median TTD recorded was 12 seconds (range = 4-81s). *Post-mortem* observations demonstrated that 98% of kangaroos had bullet-wound trauma to the brain. Young-at-foot (juveniles outside the pouch) were, when present, shot with 60s of the mother (n=17).

**Table 4.** Summary of *ante-mortem* observations of peri-urban kangaroos described by Hampton & Forsyth (2016). Animals subject to night-shooting, and observed through thermal imaging cameras by independent observers. IDR = Instantaneous death rate; WR = wounding rate (animals escaping after being hit).

<i>Parameter</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Probability (95% CI)</i>
Shot at	136.00	1.00
Hit	134.00	0.99 (0.97-1.00)
Killed	134.00	0.99 (0.97-1.00)
IDR	131.00	0.98 (0.95-1.00)
WR	0.00	0.00

66 pouch young were found in 90% of the females shot (n=72), 57 of which were described as 'unfurred'. Young marsupials without fur, and that have not yet opened their eyelids, are thought to not have sufficiently developed neurological system in order to feel pain and therefore to suffer (Mcleod & Sharp 2014, Hampton & Forsyth 2016). Young were euthanised by either blunt force trauma (furred and unfurred) or decapitation (unfurred). For sentient furred pouch young (n=9), median stress time (duration from pouch removal to insensibility) was 4 seconds (range = 1-10s). Median flight time of conspecifics was 5 seconds, with 22% of animals exhibiting no alarmed flight response. *Post-mortem* examinations confirmed that

## Discussion

To the knowledge of the authors, this study represents the first quantified review of animal welfare outcomes in the culling of peri-urban kangaroos. It has implemented the parameters developed for cetaceans to assess hunting methods, and has produced a methodology designed to reduce bias associated with the measurement of these parameters by combining both *ante-* and *post-mortem* examinations (Kestin 1995, Øen 1995, Lewis et al. 1997, Knudsen 2005).

The results obtained show a very high percentage of animals shot and killed instantaneously (IDR=98%). This value is comparable to those obtained in abattoir slaughtering of cattle (*Bos taurus*) described by Grandin (2010), and higher than those observed in the Norwegian minke whale (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*, 82%) hunt (NAMMCO 2015, Øen 2015). Furthermore the WR, widely considered the worst of all animal welfare outcomes (Bateson & Bradshaw 1997, Hampton & Forsyth 2016), was zero and therefore a very positive welfare outcome.

Duration of suffering for pouch-young was conserved low (median 4s), and the flight time, with a median value of 5s was also relatively low. The fact that 22% of animals exhibited no flight response at all indicates that the behaviour of conspecifics in the vicinity of targeted animals was minimally affected. A number of factors may contribute to this, namely the use of a sound suppressor, the absence of a spotlight, and the habituation of the animals to the presence of humans. These are important considerations for methods designed to improve welfare outcomes in shooting programs. The fact that the behavioural responses of conspecifics were also quantified has allowed appraisal of welfare outcomes for all animals potentially affected by shooting. This will be especially important in animals where social behaviour is perceived to be well-developed. In this study, negative welfare implications for conspecifics were accounted for in the shooting protocol, with the use of suppressors and thermal imaging cameras over spotlights. Both the sound of the shot, and the bright spotlights have been associated with negative welfare outcomes (Hampton & Forsyth 2016). For marine mammals, the duration of stress of conspecifics during hunting activities may be an important welfare concern, especially with respect to species and methods employed during the hunt.

To summarise, Hampton & Forsyth (2016) have demonstrated a quantitative approach towards assessing welfare outcomes for kangaroo culls, with respect to methods used, and the effects of conspecifics. This study has reported very low duration of suffering and stress experienced by the animals, and this has been evidenced by both *ante-* and *post-mortem* observations. The utilisation of the parameters developed for the assessment of cetacean hunts demonstrates that a quantified approach to assessing welfare outcomes has again be successfully applied to terrestrial animals using this framework. Furthermore, the observations of conspecific behaviour in the vicinity of targeted animals may indicate an area in which the assessment of marine mammal welfare could pursue in further studies.

## **V: Assessment of animal welfare for helicopter shooting of feral horses**

### Introduction

In this final paper, Hampton et al. (2017) provides *ante-* and *post-mortem* observations made during population control operations for feral horses (*Equus caballus*) through helicopter

shooting. This follows from the initial study, Hampton et al. (2014), where the same technique used in the control of dromedary camels (*Camelus dromedarius*) was assessed. The techniques in question involved the application of the parameters, such as TTD, used to assess welfare outcomes for large cetaceans (Øen 1995). Furthermore, it has long been recognised that time-to-death is not the sole measure of the duration of suffering inflicted upon a hunted animal. The period of time in which an animal is under stress may begin long before the first shot makes contact. This is especially evident when animals are being chased, such as the present study where the shooting platform is a fast-moving helicopter. This defined ‘chase-time’ can be combined with TTD to give an overall quantification of the stress experienced in the different stages of a hunt.

## Methods

Shooting protocol was identical to those used in (Hampton et al. 2014). *Ante-mortem* observations were made using the parameters of TTD and IDR used to assess animal welfare. Unlike previous studies discussed, the present study did not state a wounding rate, instead only gave a minimum estimate of 1% inferred from *post-mortem* (Hampton et al. 2014, 2015, 2016, Hampton & Forsyth 2016). This was however not regarded as reliable since it was estimated from *post-mortem* observations alone (Hampton et al. 2017). Also incorporated into the *ante-mortem* observations was the recording of ‘Chase-time’. This was defined as the time from the onset of flight behaviour in response to the helicopter, to the time of the first shot (Linklater & Cameron 2002, Hampton et al. 2017). The value recorded here was combined the TTD to give an overall total time (TT), providing an overall representation of *ante-mortem* stress endured.

*Post-mortem* examinations were conducted by independent veterinary observers, and the anatomical location of bullet-wounds and bullet-wound tracts were recorded. Further information was also obtained as per Hampton et al. (2014), such as variables associated with shooter skill, vegetation type, and physical condition of the horses. *Post-mortem* observations dichotomised the perceived outcome; whether instantaneous death could be inferred or not.

## Results

A total of 937 animals were shot during the helicopter shooting operation. All animals that were chased by the helicopter were shot, 63% of which were regarded to have been rendered instantaneously insensible. For those that were not killed instantly (TTD > 0), the mean survival time was 19 seconds (Table 5). The range for CT and TT was equivalent, indicating that at least one individual was chased for nearly 11 minutes, before being killed instantly. The wounding rate observed was at least 1%.

*Post-mortem* observations conducted on 630 animals obtained through separate shooting operations demonstrated that the number of bullet-wound tracts ranged from 1-6. 3% of animals did not display at least one bullet-wound in either the cranium, cervical spine or thorax, and an inferred IDR of 70% was estimated from these examinations. This is slightly greater than that which was recorded during *ante-mortem* observations.

Statistical analysis of additional variables found shooter identity, as with Hampton et al. (2014), to be the most important determinant of higher IDR.

**Table 5.** Summary of *ante-mortem* parameters used to infer welfare outcomes for helicopter shooting of feral horses (*Equus caballus*) as reported by (Hampton et al. 2017). CT= Chase time, TTD = Time-to-death, **TT** = Total time. CT and TT incorporate data recorded for all animals, while the values for TTD solely includes animals for which TTD was greater than zero seconds.

Parameter	Mean/s	Median/s	Range (lower)/s	Range (upper)/s
CT	73.00	42.00	2.00	654.00
TTD (non instant)	19.00	15.00	3.00	242.00
TT	80.00	52.00	2.00	654.00

## Discussion

As with the previous studies, the present example of welfare assessment has successfully applied parameters developed for the assessment of large cetaceans in a terrestrial setting. Further, it has demonstrated similar outcomes for TTD and IDR as reported for feral camels; this is only other animal subject to helicopter shooting that has had associated welfare parameters quantified (Hampton et al. 2014). In addition to these parameters, a key development of the present study is the recording of ‘chase-time’, and thus quantifying the total duration in which the animal is subject to stress from the hunt (Table 5). This is a key aspect of addressing welfare concerns for hunted animals, and challenges the notion that it is only the physical killing methods that must be assessed. Bateson & Bradshaw (1997) analysed samples from red deer (*Cervus elaphus*) subjected to hunting with dogs, some of which were pursued across 19km of rough terrain. They found an increase in so-called ‘stress-hormones’ such as cortisol following *post-mortem* examinations. Similarly, other studies have found significant effects of hunting at the population level that can indicate strong physiological responses in species subject to heavy hunting pressure. Bryan et al. (2015) compared hair samples obtained from two populations of wolves (*Canis lupus*); one subject to heavy hunting pressure, and one where this pressure is significantly less. The study recorded higher progesterone, testosterone and cortisol levels in the samples from the heavily hunted population. It is thought that this is an indication of increased reproductive output in response to higher anthropogenic mortality. Specifically, the increased cortisol was thought to reflect social instability among the heavily hunted population, demonstrating the need for physiological effects to be accounted for in management plans for targeted animals.

With the potential for substantial physiological impacts upon hunted animals, both directly and indirectly, the quantification of chase time by Hampton et al. (2017) is an important parameter in assessing the welfare outcomes of hunts. With respect to hunts of large cetaceans, hunts vary between region in terms of methods used in the pursuit of an animal. Using a comparison of minke whale hunts (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*) in Norway and Japan as an example, the

manner in which the whales are approached has been subject to discussion (NAMMCO 2010, 2015). Norwegian vessels, once a whale has been identified, will try and estimate its next point of surfacing and attempt to move into position along side the whale without a definite 'chase-phase' occurring in the hunt (NAMMCO 2015, Øen 2015). By contrast, Japanese offshore whaling vessels may actively pursue an animal, sometimes with the assistance of a sonar device and attempt to harpoon the animal during a fast chase (NAMMCO 2010). This difference could be of significant interest to those wishing to assess welfare outcomes in marine mammal hunts. If the duration and intensity of the chase were to be parametrised in the same way as TTD and IDR are recorded, then this will add to the developed framework for hunting methods assessment. Hampton's various papers have discussed how techniques used in the assessment of large cetaceans has been applied in terrestrial setting. The quantification of chase time in horse population management should be considered as a useful addition to the suite of parameters assessed in whaling operations.

### **Summary**

The intensive study of large whale hunts led to the development of key parameters used to quantitatively assess welfare outcomes. The combination of *ante-* and *post-mortem* observations allow an accurate evaluation of the duration and intensity of suffering during the killing process (Øen 1995, Knudsen 2005, Hampton 2017). Knudsen (2005), along with NAMMCO Expert Groups have remarked upon the notable lack of studies quantifying similar parameters in the hunts of terrestrial mammals, especially with regard to time-to-death. Moreover, this is surprising given the disparity between the criticism received by whaling operations in comparison to terrestrial shooting and wildlife management programs. Working with the assessment framework developed for cetaceans, potential terrestrial studies now have a benchmark from which to assess their respective hunting methods.

The work documented by Hampton (2017) has successfully demonstrated the application of *ante-mortem* parameters such as time-to-death, instantaneous death rate, and wounding rate (a rough analogue to Struck-and Lost), in assessment of herbivore management programs. With *post-mortem* observations additionally considered, the work presents the first application of the large cetacean framework for welfare assessment.

Furthermore, the papers associated with the shooting of rabbits, kangaroos, horses and camels evaluate hunting methods, and aim to quantify additional variables associated with the improvement of animal welfare outcomes. Specifically, Hampton et al. (2016) relates TTD, IDR and WR to projectile energy and distance at which animals have been shot, while Hampton & Forsyth (2016) evaluate flight behaviour of conspecifics with regard to efforts made to reduce disturbance. While in the study of helicopter shooting of camels (Hampton et al. 2016), recognition is given to the importance of shooter identity, the use of a helicopter prompted scrutiny of the total duration of stress using this technique for wildlife control. In the study of feral horses, the authors presented the first quantification of the duration of the chase, commencing at the first observed avoidance behaviour from the helicopter shooting platform. Studies demonstrating the physiological importance of stress allow the full appreciation stress and suffering of total duration of a hunt, not just the moment of bullet or harpoon impact. It

would be of interest to incorporate chase time into the assessment of marine mammal hunting methods, enabling further improvement of welfare outcomes.

## **References**

- Bateson P, Bradshaw EL (1997) Physiological effects of hunting red deer (*Cervus elaphus*).  
Proc R Soc B Biol Sci
- Bradshaw EL, Bateson P (2000) WELFARE IMPLICATIONS OF CULLING RED DEER.  
Anim Welf:3–24
- Brakes P, Donoghue M (2006) Comprehensive and standardised data on whale killing :  
welfare considerations. :16–19
- Bryan HM, Smits JEG, Koren L, Paquet PC, Wynne-Edwards KE, Musiani M (2015) Heavily  
hunted wolves have higher stress and reproductive steroids than wolves with lower  
hunting pressure. *Funct Ecol* 29:347–356
- Butterworth A, Richardson M (2014) A review of animal welfare implications of the  
Canadian commercial seal hunt - a response to critique of paper MP13 172. *Mar Policy*  
43:379–381
- Choquenot D, Hone J, Saunders G (1999) Using aspects of predator-prey theory to evaluate  
helicopter shooting for feral pig control. *Wildl Res* 26:251–261
- Cockram MS, Shaw DJ, Milne E, Bryce R, McClean C, Daniels MJ (2011) Comparison of  
effects of different methods of culling red deer (*Cervus elaphus*) by shooting on  
behaviour and post mortem measurements of blood chemistry, muscle glycogen and  
carcass characteristics. *Anim Welf*
- Commonwealth of Australia (2008) National code of practice for the humane shooting of  
kangaroos and wallabies for non-commercial purposes. Australian Government,  
Canberra
- Daoust P-Y, Cattet M (2004) Consideration of the use .22 caliber rimfire Winchester magnum  
cartridge for instant killing of young harp seals (*Pagophilus groenlandicus*). 3848
- Daoust P-Y, Hammill M, Stenson G, Caraguel C (2013) A review of animal welfare  
implications of the Canadian commercial seal hunt: A critique. *Mar Policy*:1–5
- Gales N, Leaper R, Papastavrou V (2008) Is Japan's whaling humane? *Mar Policy*
- Grandin T (2010) Auditing animal welfare at slaughter plants.
- Hampton JO (2017) Animal Welfare for Wild Herbivore Management. Murdoch University
- Hampton JO, Adams PJ, Forsyth DM, Cowled BD, Stuart IG, Hyndman TH, Collins T (2016)

Improving animal welfare in wildlife shooting: The importance of projectile energy.  
Wildl Soc Bull

Hampton JO, Cowled BD, Perry AL, Miller CJ, Jones B, Hart Q (2014) Quantitative analysis of animal-welfare outcomes in helicopter shooting: A case study with feral dromedary camels (*Camelus dromedarius*). *Wildl Res*

Hampton JO, Edwards GP, Cowled BD, Forsyth DM, Hyndman TH, Perry AL, Miller CJ, Adams PJ, Collins T (2017) Assessment of animal welfare for helicopter shooting of feral horses. *Wildl Res* 44:97–105

Hampton JO, Forsyth DM (2016) An assessment of animal welfare for the culling of peri-urban kangaroos. *Wildl Res* 43:261–266

Hampton JO, Forsyth DM, Mackenzie DI, Stuart IG (2015) A simple quantitative method for assessing animal welfare outcomes in terrestrial wildlife shooting: The European rabbit as a case study. *Anim Welf*

IWC (1959) Chairman's Report of the Eleventh Meeting. In: p 19

Kestin SC (1995) Welfare aspects of the commercial slaughter of whales. *Anim Welf* 4:11–27

Knudsen SK (2005) A review of the criteria used to assess insensibility and death in hunted whales compared to other species. *Vet J*

Knudsen SK, Øen EO (2003) Blast-induced neurotrauma in whales. *Neurosci Res* 46:377–386

Lewis AR, Pinchin AM, Kestin SC (1997) Welfare implications of the night shooting of wild impala (*Aepyceros melampus*). *Anim Welf* 6:123–131

Linklater WL, Cameron EZ (2002) Escape behaviour of feral horses during a helicopter count. *Wildl Res* 29:221–224

McLeod SR, Sharp TM (2014) Improving the humaneness of commercial kangaroo harvesting.

NAMMCO (1999) North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission Report of the NAMMCO workshop on hunting methods.

NAMMCO (2001) North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission report from the workshop on marine mammals: weapons, ammunition and ballistics. Comfort Home Hotel Atlantic, Sandefjord, Norway. Presentations

NAMMCO (2010) Report of the NAMMCO expert group meeting on assessment of whale killing data. p 30

NAMMCO (2015) Report of the expert group meeting on assessing time to death data from the large whale hunts. :1–46

- NAMMCO (2017) NAMMCO Information sheet on Struck and Lost - February 2017.
- Nimmo DG, Miller KK (2007) Ecological and human dimensions of management of feral horses in Australia: A review. *Wildl Res* 34:408–417
- Øen EO (1995) Killing methods for minke and bowhead whales. The Norwegian School of Veterinary Science, Oslo, NO-0033
- Øen EO (2015) The Norwegian minke whale hunt 2011 and 2012: studies on killing efficiency in the hunt. In: Paper NAMMCO/EG-TTD/Doc 8 presented to the North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission.
- Saunders G (1993) Observations on the effectiveness of shooting feral pigs from helicopters. *Wildl Res* 20:665–671
- Sharp T (2012) Standard Operating Procedure CAM001: Ground shooting of camels.
- Sharp T (2016) RAB009: Ground shooting of rabbits. :1–5
- Urquhart KA, McKendrick IJ (2006) Prevalence of “head shooting” and the characteristics of the wounds in culled wild Scottish red deer. *Vet Rec* 159:75–79