

NAMMCO



MEETING OF THE JOINT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

*2 April 2019
Tórshavn, Faroe Islands*

REPORT

© North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission

Please cite this report as:

North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission (NAMMCO) (2019). Report of the Joint Management Committee, Tórshavn, Faroe Islands

Available at https://nammco.no/topics/mc_reports/#2019

NAMMCO

Postbox 6453, Sykehusveien 21-23, N-9294 Tromsø, Norway,

+47 77687371, nammco-sec@nammco.no, www.nammco.no, facebook.com/nammco.no, twitter.com/NAMMCO_sec

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Chair’s Opening Remarks	4
2. Adoption of Agenda	4
3. Ecosystem Approach	4
3.1 Disturbance	5
3.2 Pollution	6
3.3 Marine Mammal – Fisheries Interactions	7
3.3.1 By-catch.....	7
3.3.2 MareFrame Project	9
4. Procedures for Decision-Making on Conservation and Management Measures	9
4.1 Struck and Lost	9
4.2 Development of Management Advice	10
5. User Knowledge in Management Decision-Making	12
6. Any Other Business	13
7. Closing Remarks	14
Appendix 1: Agenda	15
Appendix 2: List of Participants	17
Appendix 3: List of Documents	19

1. CHAIR'S OPENING REMARKS

The Chair of the NAMMCO Joint Management Committee, Nette Levermann (GL) welcomed delegates and observers to the meeting and passed to the General Secretary of NAMMCO, who provided some practical details for the meeting.

The Chair then noted the schedule for the meeting and the list of documents. She drew particular attention to the following documents (including the explanation of their colour coding):

- NAMMCO/27/MC/06 summarising active requests to the Scientific Committee and responses to these requests.
- NAMMCO/27/MC/05A summarising recent (from 2016) proposals for conservation and management and recommendations for research to member countries and responses to these.

The Chair advised that during the meeting she would be asking for updates from member countries under the different agenda points, including from those who had provided updates in writing prior to the meeting. These updates would then be recorded in document NAMMCO/27/MC/05A, an updated version of which is attached to this report as Annex 1.

The Chair also noted that she would open for feedback on the new style of reporting on proposals and recommendations from the SC to the MCs under any other business and would be interested in having a discussion on an appropriate procedure for changing the status of these proposals and recommendations. She also noted that there would be a remote presentation by Nina Young from NOAA later in the day as an additional item under any other business.

The Chair then informed the joint management committee (MCJ) that the Chair of the Scientific Committee, Tore Haug would present the updates from the 2018 Scientific Committee report (NAMMCO/27/08) under all agenda items.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

3. ECOSYSTEM APPROACH

Active Requests from Council

- **R1.2.1 (ongoing):** *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.*
- **R-1.5.1 (outdated?):** *To describe the possible pathways of radioactive material from blowouts and leakage in existing nuclear power plants, leakage from dumped material and possible accidents in planned recycling plants in the northern part of Scotland into the food web of the North Atlantic and hence into the top predators like marine mammals. This request was sent to ICES by NAC.*
- **R-1.5.3 (ongoing):** *SC/25 received an update regarding the plan to build a railway to increase shipments from the mine to Milne Inlet and to increase shipping from Milne Inlet to Europe. The SC reiterated its recommendation that all information on the Mary River Project be presented to the next meeting of the NAMMCO-JCNB JWG in 2020.*
- **R-1.5.4 (ongoing):** *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.

- **R-2.3.1 (standing):** *To advise on stock identity of ringed seals for management purposes and to assess abundance in each 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.*
- **R-2.6.3 (ongoing):** *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.*
- **R-3.4.9 (ongoing):** *To 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.*

3.1 DISTURBANCE

Updates from the Scientific Committee

During the 25th meeting of the NAMMCO Scientific Committee (SC25), Mike Hammill (observer from Canada) provided an update on the Mary River project, particularly regarding the plan to build a railway to increase shipments from the mine to Milne Inlet and to increase shipping from Milne Inlet to Europe. SC25 reiterated its previous recommendation that all information on the Mary River Project be presented to the next meeting of the NAMMCO-JCNB JWG in 2020.

Comments from Member Countries & Observers

Canada provided an additional update on the Mary River project and the text of the intervention is included below.

The Mary River Project is an iron ore mine located on Baffin Island, near Pond Inlet, Nunavut. The project proponent is [Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation](#) (BIMC). Ore from the mine site is shipped through Milne Inlet and then south through Davis Strait. The project proponent is currently authorised to ship a maximum of 6 million tons of ore per year. This amount represents an increase from the previous Project Certificate which authorized total annual shipping of 4.26 million tons. The Project Certificate, which specifies the terms and conditions under which a project is authorized to operate, was amended in the fall of 2018 following the Nunavut Impact Review Board's (NIRB) review of a production increase proposal from the project proponent. In 2017, 4.05 million tonnes were shipped by 56 vessels. This is an increase from 2016, where 3.25 million tonnes were shipped, and 2015, when 1.33 million tonnes were shipped.

Since the last update at NAMMCO 26, the project proponent has submitted a proposal to expand certain project activities. The proposal is referred to as the Phase 2 expansion. This proposal is currently in the Technical Review Period as per the NIRB process, for which technical review comments were submitted by regulators and interested parties to the NIRB on March 7th, 2019. The Technical Review Period will conclude with a Technical Review Session, currently scheduled for April 8-10, 2019 in Iqaluit, Nunavut where all interested parties intend to discuss technical aspects of the project proposal in person. A final hearing will be held, as required for the process, and is currently scheduled for September 2019 following final submissions from parties and subsequent responses from Baffinland.

In 2017, Baffinland submitted an application to the NIRB to undertake winter sealift through Pond Inlet, but due to community concerns the application was withdrawn. Baffinland is currently proposing to build a North Railway connecting the mine site to the existing port at Milne Inlet. If approved, this could eventually enable the project to expand production and related shipping to 12 million tonnes of

iron ore per year. This proposal was reviewed by the Nunavut Planning Commission (NPC) as it required an amendment to the North Baffin Regional Land Use Plan. The amendment to this land use plan was approved prior to Baffinland's submission of the Phase 2 expansion proposal to the NIRB. The NPC has, however, opened a new public review to determine if further assessment of the Mary River project is required in light of potential cumulative effects associated with proposed operations at both Milne and Steensby Ports as well as both a North and South Railway.

With regards to project monitoring in relation to marine mammal interactions, it was noted that Baffinland suspended its ship-observer program in 2016 due to safety concerns (a program required as a term and condition of the project certificate). However, in 2018, Baffinland implemented a revised Ship-Board Observer program, which operated during the shoulder seasons between July 28 and August 7 and between September 28 to October 17, 2018. The Marine Wildlife Observers completed their surveys on board the Ice Management Vessel SMV *Botnica*.

As an intervenor in the NIRB process, Fisheries and Oceans Canada's review of the Phase 2 expansion proposal is centred on potential impacts to marine mammals. All materials pertaining to the NIRB's Mary River Project (File No.: 08MN053) can be accessed online from the NIRB's online public registry at www.nirb.ca/project/123910.

Canada suggested that NAMMCO could consider reaching out directly to the Nunavut Impact Review Board for further information regarding this project. In doing so, NAMMCO Members should consider refining information requests specific to the project so as to facilitate corresponding responses.

Recommendations from the Scientific Committee

The Chair drew attention to document NAMMCO/27/MC/05A, noting that prior to NAMMCO 27, there were 2 existing proposals for conservation and management related to disturbance and 1 completed recommendation for research. There were no new proposals for conservation and management or recommendations for research from SC25. No updates were provided by member countries.

For reference, all recommendations and updates are recorded in document NAMMCO/27/MC/05A, which is also available as Annex 1 to this report.

Conclusion

The MCJ thanked Canada for the comprehensive update on the Mary River projects and agreed with the proposal from the SC that all information on the Mary River Project be presented to the next meeting of the NAMMCO-JCNB JWG in 2020.

3.2 POLLUTION

Updates from the Scientific Committee

SC25 noted that request R-1.5.1 related to radioactivity was outdated and suggested that Council consider closing this request. This issue is returned to in the discussion under section 4.2 of this report.

SC25 discussed the issue of pollution particularly in relation to the impact of PCBs on killer whales. This included discussion of the published paper by Desforges and colleagues (2018) and a working paper critically reviewing this article by Witting (SC/25/20). The SC agreed that it is important to continue monitoring impacts on killer whale populations and that further research on pollutants in marine mammals is highly valuable for understanding anthropogenic impacts.

SC25 also noted that as a response to request R-1.5.4, assessing impacts from non-hunting related anthropogenic stresses (including disturbance and pollution) was a topic that should now be on the agenda for consideration in all future working groups.

Comments from Member Countries

Norway asked for further information on R-1.5.1 and an explanation for why it was considered outdated. The SC Chair noted that this request was specifically related to pollution from the Sellafield nuclear site in the UK. It was already proposed as outdated by SC21 and had not been dealt with by the SC since that time.

Greenland stated its support for the development that all working groups of the SC will now include a consideration of non-hunting related anthropogenic impacts.

Recommendations from the Scientific Committee

There were no proposals for conservation and management or recommendations for research prior to NAMMCO 27. SC25 made one new recommendation for research relating to pollution.

All recommendations and updates are recorded in document NAMMCO/27/MC/05A, available as Annex 1 to this report.

New Recommendation for Research

- SC25 recommended that the NAMMCO Secretariat conduct a review of pollutants in all marine mammals relevant for NAMMCO and report results to SC26.

Conclusion

The MCJ endorsed the recommendation that the NAMMCO Secretariat prepare a review of pollutants in all marine mammals relevant for NAMMCO.

3.3 MARINE MAMMAL – FISHERIES INTERACTIONS

Active Requests from Council

- ***R-1.1.5 (standing):*** *To periodically review and update available knowledge related to the understanding of interactions between marine mammals and commercially exploited marine resources.*

The SC Chair briefly described research projects examining the consumption of resources by marine mammals presented at SC25 before going on to provide information on this agenda item under the specific topics of by-catch and the MareFrame project.

3.3.1 By-catch

Updates from the Scientific Committee

The SC Chair outlined the work and recommendations for each country from the 2018 meetings of the by-catch working group (BYCWG). This included two telephone meetings, one in April and the other in October. These recommendations are available in the 2018 reports from the BYCWG and in the SC25 report (available to the meeting as NAMMCO/27/MC/08). The SC endorsed all new recommendations from the BYCWG. The SC Chair also acknowledged and commended considerable efforts being made to improve the reliability of the by-catch data available in Member Countries.

Recommendations from the Scientific Committee

The Chair drew attention to document NAMMCO/27/MC/05A, noting that prior to NAMMCO 27, there were 11 existing proposals for conservation and management related to interactions between marine mammals and fisheries and 9 recommendations for research. SC25 also made 7 new proposals for conservation and management, which are listed below. Updates on the proposals and recommendations were provided by Norway, Greenland, Iceland and the Faroe Islands.

For reference, all recommendations and updates are recorded in document NAMMCO/27/MC/05A, which is also available as Annex 1 to this report.

New Proposals for Conservation & Management

- FO: Implement a reporting system for vessels below 15 GMT.
- FO/IS: Add the selection of local marine mammal species to e-logbook design.
- FO/IS: Information available on by-catch from foreign vessels should be presented to BYCWG
- IS: Provide a description of the coverage in by-catch reports (even if there is none since it provides evidence of by-catch risk)
- IS: Provide details of the amount of observer effort in pelagic trawl fleets
- NO: Modify the design of the Coastal Reference Fleet, both the selection process and the number of vessels in areas of concern according to recommendations from the BYCWG.
- ALL: Logbooks should not be used for calculating by-catch rates, only as a qualitative indicator for raising concern

Comments from Member Countries

Norway noted that it had calculated a by-catch estimate for harbour porpoise in two gillnet fisheries and these fisheries are assumed to have the majority of harbour porpoise by-catch in Norway. This has been accepted by NAMMCO as a preliminary estimate for use in assessment and has been submitted for peer review publication. It noted that it is still working on an estimate for by-catch of seals and that there is a meeting planned for 2019 to further develop the method for this.

Norway also informed that the number of vessels in the coastal reference fleet had already been increased and a workshop is being planned to discuss how sampling design may be improved. It also noted that logbooks are not used to calculate bycatch rates in Norway.

Iceland noted that it has already responded to several of the requests and is actively working to address and respond to the requests from the SC. Information related to specific requests is recorded in NAMMCO/27/MC/05A, included as Annex 1 to this report.

The Faroe Islands informed that an observer had been on pelagic vessels since 2018, with a primary task to look at by-catch of different pelagic species and to note any by-catch of marine mammals. No marine mammal by-catch had been observed during this period.

Greenland noted that in general, it is mandatory to report all by-catch. The Association of Fishers and Hunters in Greenland (KNAPK) were contacted for comments on this issue prior to the meeting and informed that problems were being experienced with the destruction of fishing gear through whale entanglements. This was particularly a problem for the inshore cod fishery and it is currently not possible to receive compensation for this damage. It was also noted that there is an increasing problem with competition between the Greenland halibut fishery and narwhals. In the Upernavik area (Melville Bay) there is an annual quota of 52 narwhals and often this quota is caught within a short time in a small area. When narwhals are present in the area after the quota is caught a decline is observed in catches of Greenland halibut. This has also been experienced in other areas. Due to this situation, municipalities have often requested additional narwhal quota as a way to compensate for the losses in the halibut fishery and as a way to reduce the competition. It was also noted that the offshore Greenland halibut, shrimp and lump fisheries in Greenland are all certified by the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC). This means that measures are being taken to record and report by-catch of marine mammals since this is mandatory under this scheme. Greenland also noted that much information is still needed in this regard, including data on bycatch of marine mammals and that by-catch is an issue where all involved stakeholders can work together to improve the situation.

Conclusion

MCJ noted the SC report and the updates provided by Member Countries. It endorsed all of the new recommendations from the SC related to by-catch.

3.3.2 MareFrame Project

Updates from the Scientific Committee

SC25 was provided with a review of the outputs from the newly completed MareFrame project and noted that the project delivered useful results that can now be built upon to address R-1.2.1. This project aimed to develop a decision support framework in 8 areas, which included Icelandic waters. Three ecosystem models were developed, although their primary focus on was commercial fish stocks and they did not include specific attention to marine mammals. The SC Chair noted that modelling ecosystems is a challenging task but that it is important to continue developing this work.

Comments from Member Countries

Iceland noted that it was heavily involved in the MareFrame project and agreed with the SC Chair that this project and related activities have moved the field forward significantly. It also agreed that since marine mammals were not a specific focus of the work in this project, it is important to continue this work and further develop the models to specifically focus on marine mammals.

Recommendations from the Scientific Committee

The Chair drew attention to document NAMMCO/27/MC/05A, noting that prior to NAMMCO 27 there was 1 recommendation for research regarding the MareFrame project and that the SC now considered this recommendation completed. SC25 also proposed 1 new recommendation for research.

For reference, all recommendations and updates are recorded in document NAMMCO/27/MC/05A, which is also available as Annex 1 to this report.

New Recommendations for Research

- SC25 recommended that funding should be sought to apply and extend the approach of the MareFrame project to focus on marine mammals and the unique needs of NAMMCO.

Conclusion

The MCJ agreed that the recommendation to review the MareFrame project had now been completed. It also endorsed the recommendation that funding be sought to apply and extend the MareFrame project models to focus on marine mammals and the needs of NAMMCO.

4. PROCEDURES FOR DECISION-MAKING ON CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES

4.1 STRUCK AND LOST

Active Requests from Council

- **R-1.6.4 (new):** *[SC and CHM are requested] to provide advice on the best methods for collection of the desired statistics on losses, as SC recommended that catch statistics include correction for struck but lost animals for different seasons, areas, and catch operations.*
- **R-1.6.5 (new/standing):** *Struck and loss rates should be subtracted from future advice on sustainable removals in Greenland, with the advice being given as total allowable landings.*

Updates from the Scientific Committee

In relation to R-1.6.4, SC25 noted that this request is in the process of being answered through different working groups. The issue had been specifically addressed within the walrus working group, which also followed the request of R-1.6.5, with this information reflected in its recommendations. The walrus working group also concluded that collecting struck and lost data was of equal importance for walrus, narwhal and beluga.

SC25 discussed different methods for collecting struck and lost data and the benefits and challenges associated with different approaches. It concluded that there was a need to invest in good time series rather than observer schemes and that ensuring hunters provide accurate reports is useful, noting however that further work and collaboration with hunters would be beneficial for achieving this.

Recommendations from the Scientific Committee

The Chair drew attention to document NAMMCO/27/MC/05A, noting that prior to NAMMCO 27 there no proposals for conservation and management or recommendations for research. SC25 proposed one new recommendation for conservation and management.

For reference, all recommendations and updates are recorded in document NAMMCO/27/MC/05A, which is also available as Annex 1 to this report.

New Proposals for Conservation & Management

- SC25 recommended that the issue of ensuring reliable reporting on struck and lost data should be forwarded to the Committee on Hunting Methods and advanced as a joint effort together with the SC.

Comments from Member Countries

Norway reported that it has now made space for reporting struck and lost in the sealing logbook and hopes that this will lead to improved reporting on this matter.

Greenland appreciated the work of the SC on this topic and emphasized the importance that all advice on marine mammal quotas is now being given in the same way in terms of how struck and lost reporting is used in the calculation of quotas. It was also noted that the SC had suggested reducing the quota for walrus in some areas, however, the Government of Greenland was not fully implementing the SC advice in this case as it had also received inputs from hunters noting that their use of traditional methods (i.e. hand held harpoons) allows them to secure and minimize struck and lost. The Government of Greenland has an obligation to listen to advice from both scientists and users when taking management decisions. Before the change of scientific advice as implemented now, the scientists and hunters didn't agree on struck and lost rates for walrus. At that time the Government had followed advice from users and used a rate of 3% rather than 11% as advised by the SC.

Conclusion

The MCJ endorsed the new proposal that reporting on struck and lost should be forwarded to the Committee on Hunting Methods and advanced as a joint effort together with the SC.

4.2 DEVELOPMENT OF MANAGEMENT ADVICE

Active Requests from Council

- *R-1.6.6. To conduct a review of the management procedures used by the Committee for generating management advice (RMP, AWMP, Bayesian assessment, Hitter Fitter, etc). The Committee should advise on which procedure is the most suitable for each species (or category of species) with the data that is currently available, while also meeting the management principles of NAMMCO. The Committee should further advise where additional data could allow for more suitable management procedure(s) to be implemented.*

Updates from the Scientific Committee

In relation to request R-1.6.6, SC25 recommended that an *ad hoc* working group containing a mix of expertise on large and small cetaceans and seals be established to provide an overview of working procedures in the SC, including the rationale behind specific decisions. This group will work together with the Secretariat to develop a draft document providing such a review.

Recommendations from the Scientific Committee

The Chair drew attention to document NAMMCO/27/MC/05A, noting that prior to NAMMCO 27 there no proposals for conservation and management or recommendations for research. SC25 made one new proposal for conservation and management related to procedures for the development of management advice.

For reference, all recommendations and updates are recorded in document NAMMCO/27/MC/05A, which is also available as Annex 1 to this report.

New Proposals for Conservation & Management

- The SC asked that Council consider automatically retiring requests that are older than 10 years (unless they are specifically renewed) and to investigate the possibility of altering NAMMCO meeting times to ensure the most efficient work flow.

Comments from Member Countries

Iceland requested that if requests are to be automatically retired, that a system be put in place to warn the heads of delegation (HoDs) when this is about to occur and that they then be given an opportunity to respond. Norway expressed that the warning and opportunity to respond would be more appropriately directed towards the management committees rather than the HoDs. The Faroes agreed that the management committee level was the most appropriate and asked that the retired requests be retained in an archive at NAMMCO so that the information regarding past requests is not lost.

The MCJ agreed that it could accept the retirement of requests older than 10 years so long as an appropriate warning and response procedure was in place for the management committees. Given this agreement, the Chair then highlighted to the group all of the requests that are currently older than 10 years as marked in blue in document NAMMCO/27/MC/05A. A discussion was then had on each of these requests to consider if retirement was appropriate or whether the MCJ wished to renew them.

On R-1.1.8, the MCJ noted that this work is still ongoing, with an aim to be finalised this year. The committee therefore agree that the request should be renewed until the publication of the analysis was complete.

On R-1.2.1, it was noted that information is now available from the MareFrame project that can be built upon to address this request. The MCJ therefore agreed that this request should be renewed and remain ongoing on the basis of the SC25 recommendation that funding be sought to develop the results of the MareFrame project specifically for marine mammals.

On R-1.7.2, the SC Chair noted that this request specifically related to NASS 2007 and therefore similar to R-1.1.8, the analysis remained ongoing. The MCJ therefore agreed to also renew this request.

Before taking the decision on R-2.4.2 and R-3.10.1, Norway noted that species specific requests should be taken by the management committees for cetaceans and seals and walrus, instead of the MCJ. This was agreed to by all.

On the proposal to reconsider the meeting schedule of the Council and the SC, Norway noted that changing the timing of the annual schedule would need to be considered holistically and should therefore be addressed within the FAC. This was agreed to by all.

On the SC proposal to address request R-1.6.6 through the establishment of an *ad hoc* working group, Norway asked if this needed to be handled within the FAC since it had not been considered there at

this time. The Chair noted that this was the proposed SC response to an active request from Council. The Faroes asked if this was a working group of the SC and the reply was that it contained active members of the SC, as well as one participant from Canada. Greenland asked if this included the question of how advice was given on humpback whales in Greenland and it was responded that this would be a general review of methods used to generate management advice and therefore would also include methods for generating advice for humpback whales in Greenland.

Conclusion

The MCJ endorsed the proposal that requests older than 10 years be retired, with agreement that a warning and review process for those requests approaching retirement take place first within the management committees and that all retired requests be retained within an archive by NAMMCO. The MCJ then agreed that requests R-1.1.8, R-1.2.1, and R-1.7.2 should be renewed.

The MCJ also endorsed the establishment of an ad hoc working group to review working procedures and answer R-1.6.6.

5. USER KNOWLEDGE IN MANAGEMENT DECISION-MAKING

The Scientific Secretary gave a short presentation on integrating user knowledge in management decision-making, highlighting NAMMCO's history of work on the topic, describing key issues for consideration and inviting discussion about how to move forward with this approach in light of the request from SC25 to develop a joint initiative between the CHM and the SC on the topic of struck and lost reporting. The presentation given by the Scientific Secretary was available on the NAMMCO web portal as document NAMMCO/27/MCJ/13.

Presenter's Summary

The integration of science and user knowledge in management decision-making is a foundational principle of NAMMCO and has had a long history of discussion and development. Key milestones of this history were presented to demonstrate how activities and proposals on this topic have developed through time. The links with related concepts, such as transdisciplinary research and public engagement, were outlined and the conceptual framework of the intergovernmental platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services (IPBES) presented. The notion of a 'ladder of engagement' (with different levels of integration, mutual learning and power sharing) was described, as well as different rationales that may be used (e.g. instrumental, substantive or normative rationales and scientific and/or social reasons). An overview of different methods with increasing levels of engagement was also given (e.g. inviting submissions, surveys, interviews, focus groups, scenario workshops, advisory committees, participatory appraisals, co-management committees, consensus conferences, citizen science). Following this background information, the lessons learned from the NAMMCO conference, the work of IPBES, and efforts to conduct transdisciplinary research and public engagement in science were summarised. Key challenges include: different cultures & worldviews, diverging approaches to knowledge, lack of shared language & terminology, uneven power relations, no stable funding sources, the patience required. The elements of particular importance for conducting this kind of work were identified as: trust & confidence building, humility & respect, common objectives & shared terminology, documenting traditional & local knowledge, regular interactions & contact, formal and informal meeting sites, long term stability of initiatives. Finally, it was noted that a concrete opportunity for future work on integrating user knowledge and science exists in relation to the recommendation from the SC that the SC & CHM collaborate on the issue of struck and lost. For advancing its work on user knowledge in management decision-making, the presentation concluded by highlighting questions of particular relevance for NAMMCO to consider. Why do we want users involved in management decision-making? (instrumental/substantive/normative rationales; scientific &/or social reasons); Who should be involved? (organisations or selected individuals; member countries or also others); What form should this involvement take? (parallel or integrated; standing or

ad hoc); When should it be done? (before/during/after development of scientific advice/management decision), and; How should it be conducted? (country specific/species, specific/universal).

Comments from Member Countries

Greenland thanked the Scientific Secretary for the presentation and appreciated the opportunity to increase collaboration between users and scientists. Greenland noted that unfortunately it was not possible to have a user delegate present at the meeting this year. However, KNAPK did provide a statement on this topic for the meeting.

KNAPK hosted a workshop in 2018 on national and international wildlife management in Greenland, with participation from hunters, scientists and other experts on wildlife and ecosystem management from Greenland, Denmark and Alaska. The workshop presentations highlighted the benefits of local monitoring of wildlife species (often based on traditional knowledge), which was particularly useful for highlighting gaps in scientific knowledge. The workshop also highlighted the challenge that international and cross-border management (whether federal, national or regional) is typically based only on scientific advice and locals often feel that they are not being heard when it comes to final decisions.

Following the workshop, a set of recommendations and a draft executive order on user monitoring were delivered to the Government of Greenland. The recommendations suggest the use of the existing community-based documentation and management program PISUNA (Piniakkanik Sumiiffinni Nalunaarsuineq, www.pisuna.org) for advice regarding the decision-making on living resources by the management authority. This monitoring program is based on observations gathered by local Natural Resource Councils during everyday activities in the nature. The Natural Resource Councils provide management advice every quarter. The observations and management advice recorded in this system cover a wide range of natural resources and parameters. Presently the Natural Resources Councils are operating in three Greenlandic communities. With partners from central government and municipalities, KNAPK is currently working towards enabling the establishment of more local natural resource councils across Greenland.

Norway highlighted the need for science and knowledge in management decision-making and the importance of user knowledge as a basic and important factor in this process. It was also noted that this is a central principle for democratic societies. The tools available for enhancing this involvement are particularly relevant and Norway thanked the Scientific Secretary for the overview provided.

6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Chair noted that document NAMMCO/27/MC/05A represented a new approach to providing an overview of proposals from the SC to the management committees, as well as the responses from the member countries and NAMMCO to these proposals. The previous approach used was presented in document NAMMCO/27/MC/05B for those proposals arising prior to 2016. The Chair then opened for a discussion on the appropriateness of this new approach to record keeping and information sharing, particularly inviting participants to comment on the best way to provide a clear overview and transparent recording of how requests are being followed up.

Greenland noted that the approach in the document provided (NAMMCO/27/MC/05A) was useful and that the document should continue to be used in the future, with updates from Member Countries made prior to the management committee meetings.

Presentation on the US Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) Import Rule

A presentation was made via Skype by Nina Young, team leader for the MMPA Import Rule at the National Marine Fisheries Service, USA. A copy of the presentation was uploaded to the NAMMCO web portal.

No follow-up questions to the presentation were possible due to the poor quality of the connection. Had this been possible, questions would have been raised about the implementation in the USA of the same standards regarding marine mammal by-catch which the USA is now requiring of foreign fishing nations. Members of the Committee exchanged brief information on their respective processes to engage with the US authorities on these new import requirements. It was noted that further communication and coordination between the relevant experts in NAMMCO member countries working on the issue would be useful.

7. CLOSING REMARKS

The chair thanked all delegates and observers for their participation and closed the meeting.

APPENDIX 1: AGENDA**JOINT MEETING OF THE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEES***2 April 2019, Tórshavn, Faroe Islands***ANNOTATED AGENDA**

AGENDA ITEMS	DOCUMENT REFERENCE
1. CHAIRMAN'S OPENING REMARKS	
2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA	
3. ECOSYSTEM APPROACH	NAMMCO/27/08, Item 7 NAMMCO/MC/06, R-1.5.4
3.1. Disturbance (esp. Mary River project)	NAMMCO/27/08, Item 7.3, 9.4, 9.5, 8.3, 8.7 NAMMCO/MC/06, R-1.5.3, R-1.5.4, R-3.4.9, R-2.6.3, R-2.3.1
3.2. Pollution	NAMMCO/27/08, Items 7.3, 9.8 NAMMCO/MC/06, R-1.5.4, R-2.3.1
3.3. Marine Mammal – Fisheries Interactions	NAMMCO/27/08, Items 7.1, 7.2 NAMMCO/MC/06, R-1.1.5
3.3.1. By-catch	NAMMCO/MC/06, R-1.1.5
3.3.2. MareFrame project	
4. PROCEDURES FOR DECISION MAKING ON CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES	NAMMCO/27/08, Items 5.4 & 5.6
4.1. Struck and Lost	NAMMCO/27/08, Item 5.4.1 NAMMCO/MC/06, R-1.6.5
4.2. Development of Management Advice	NAMMCO/27/08, Item 5.6 NAMMCO/MC/06, R-1.6.6
5. USER KNOWLEDGE IN MANAGEMENT DECISION-MAKING	NAMMCO/27/08, Item 5.4.1
6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS	

ANNOTATIONS

Documents NAMMCO/27/MC/05 *Recent proposals for Conservation and Management and Research Recommendations* and NAMMCO/27/MC/06 *Summary of Requests by NAMMCO Council to the Scientific Committee, and Responses by the Scientific Committee* are relevant to all agenda items.

Requests from Council to the Scientific Committee are numbered using the format R-X.Y.Z. The request numbers are listed in the agenda above while the full text of the request can be found in document NAMMCO/27/MC/06.

Document NAMMCO/27/08 is the *Report of the 25th meeting of the Scientific Committee*.

Agenda Item 5: A short presentation from the Secretariat will be given on this topic to provide an update on participatory approaches to science and policy and opportunities for further work on this within NAMMCO.

APPENDIX 2: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

MEMBER COUNTRIES

Faroe Islands

Bjarni Mikkelsen
Museum of Natural History
V. U. Hammersheimbsgøta 13
FO-100 Tórshavn, Faroe Islands
+ 298 790576, bjarnim@savn.fo

Páll Nolsøe
Foreign Service
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
Tinganes
FO-110 Tórshavn, Faroe Islands
+298 551028, palln@uvmr.fo

Kate Sanderson (C)
Foreign Service
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
Tinganes
FO-110 Tórshavn, Faroe Islands
+298 551007, KateS@uvmr.fo

Ulla Svarrer Wang
Ministry of Fisheries
POB 347
FO-110 Tórshavn, Faroe Islands
+ 298 553242, ulla.svarrer.wang@fisk.fo

Greenland

Amalie Jessen (Chair)
Ministry of Fisheries, Hunting and Agriculture
Government of Greenland
POB 269
DK-3900 Nuuk, Greenland
+299 345304, Amalie@nanoq.gl

Nette Levermann (C)
Ministry of Fisheries, Hunting and Agriculture
Government of Greenland
POB 269
DK-3900 Nuuk, Greenland
+299 345344, NELE@nanoq.gl

Iceland

Ásta Einarsdóttir (C)
Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture
Ministry of Industries and Innovation
Skúlagötu 4,
IS-150 Reykjavik, Iceland.
+ 354 5459700, asta.einarsdottir@anr.is

Kristján Loftsson
Hvalur H.F.
POB 233
IS-222 Hafnafjordur, Iceland
+ 354 5550565, kl@hvalur.is

Gísli Víkingsson
Marine Research Institute,
POB 1390,
IS-121 Reykjavík, Iceland
+354 5752000, gisli.vikingsson@hafogvatn.is

Norway

Alessandro Astroza
Ministry of Trade, Industry and Fisheries
POB 8118 Dep
NO-0032 Oslo, Norway
+47 22 2464 63, ata@nfd.dep.no

Arne Bjørge
Institute of Marine Research
University of Oslo,
NO-0316 Oslo, Norway
+47 91314810, arne.bjoerge@hi.no

Guro Gjelsvik
Directorate of Fisheries
POB 185 Sentrum
NO-5804 Bergen, Norway
+47 90063839, guro.gjelsvik@fiskeridir.no

Kathrine A. Ryeng
Institute of Marine Research
POB 6404
NO-9294 Tromsø, Norway
+47 91315292, kathrine.ryeng@imr.no

Truls Soløy
 Norwegian Whalers Union
 Soløya
 NO-8380 Ramberg
 +47 97776790, trul-so@online.no

Ole-David Stenseth (C)
 Ministry of Trade, Industry and Fisheries
 POB 8118 Dep
 NO-0032 Oslo, Norway
 + 47 92497825, ods@nfd.dep.no

Hild Ynnesdal
 Directorate of Fisheries
 POB 185 Sentrum
 NO-5804 Bergen, Norway
 + 47 46804937, hild.ynnesdal@fiskeridir.no

SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

Tore Haug
 Institute of Marine Research
 POB 6404
 NO-9294 Tromsø, Norway
 +47 95284296, tore.haug@imr.no

OBSERVER GOVERNMENTS

Canada

Seth Reinhart
 Fisheries and Oceans Canada
 200 Kent St.,
 CA-Ottawa, ON, K1A 0E6, Canada
 +1 6139937968, seth.reinhart@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

Japan

Sonoko Ichimura
 Fishery Division, Economic Affairs Bureau
 Ministry of Foreign Affairs
sonoko.ichimurai@mofa.go.jp

Yuki Morita
 International Affairs Division,
 Fisheries Agency of Japan
 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki,
 JP-Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8907, Japan
 +8 1335022443, Yuki_morita470@maff.go.jp

Hideki Moronuki
 International Affairs Division,
 Fisheries Agency of Japan
 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki,
 JP-Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8907, Japan
 +8 1335022443,
hideki_moronuki600@maff.go.jp

Daisuke Nihei
 Fishery Division, Economic Affairs Bureau
 Ministry of Foreign Affairs
daisuke.nihei@mofa.go.jp

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS

Makivik Corporation
 +1 5147458880 ext:2228,
solpinski@makivik.org
 Observers: Gregor Gilbert
 Stas Olpinski

Nunavut Tunngavik Inc.
 POB 638 Iqaluit, Nunavut X0A 0H0, Canada
 +1 8679754900, DLee@tunngavik.com
 Observer: David Lee

SECRETARIAT

Geneviève Desportes
 Solveig Enoksen
 Fern Wickson
 Charlotte Winsnes

APPENDIX 3: LIST OF DOCUMENTS

DOCUMENT NO	TITLE	AGENDA ITEM
NAMMCO/27/MC/01	Joint List of Documents for the Management Committees	
NAMMCO/27/MC/02	Draft Agenda MCJ	
NAMMCO/27/MC/03	Draft Agenda MCSW	
NAMMCO/27/MC/04	Draft Agenda MCC	
NAMMCO/27/MC/05-A	Recent (from 2016) proposals for Conservation and Management and Research Recommendations	MCJ, MCC, MCSW
NAMMCO/27/MC/05-B	Proposals for Conservation and Management and Research Recommendations up to 2016	MCJ, MCC, MCSW
NAMMCO/27/MC/06	Summary of Requests by NAMMCO Council to the Scientific Committee, and Responses by the Scientific Committee	MCJ, MCC, MCSW
NAMMCO/27/08	Report of the 25th Meeting of the Scientific Committee	MCJ, MCC, MCSW

MC: Management Committee

MCJ: Joint Meeting of the Management Committees

MCC: Management Committee for Cetaceans

MCSW: Management Committee for Seals and Walruses