

- **LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS WITH WHOM THERE HAS BEEN COOPERATION WITH NAMMCO ON SCIENTIFIC ISSUES**
- **NAMMCO SECRETARIAT PARTICIPATION/COOPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS**
- **LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS TO WHICH NAMMCO MEMBERS ARE APPOINTED AS OBSERVERS ON BEHALF OF NAMMCO**

**Follow up on documents asked for by the PRP (skype 16/07, email and attached documents 2007), as well as previous list of requested documents.**

During the SKYPE call DG requested 3 additional documents:

1. list of organizations with whom there has been cooperation with NAMMCO on scientific issues including the Canada/Greenland joint Commission on narwhal and beluga, ICES, ICES/NAFO/NAMMCO working group on harp and hooded seals, IWC SC, NAMMCO WG on harbor porpoise (may include experts or observers from ASCOBANS) – are there others?
2. NAMMCO Secretariat participation/cooperation with other organizations including Regional Fishery Body Secretariats Network, FAO, OSPAR, NEAFC and others. Panel would appreciate brief comments from the Secretariat as to how this participation/cooperation is helpful for achieving NAMMCO objectives.
3. List of organizations to which NAMMCO members are appointed as observers on behalf of NAMMCO including Nordic Council of Ministers, Arctic Council, UN open ended Consultative Process on oceans and the law of the Sea, IMO, CAFF, PAME (are these examples correct? – are there others?)

## **1. LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS WITH WHOM THERE HAS BEEN COOPERATION WITH NAMMCO ON SCIENTIFIC ISSUES**

### **1.1 JCNB:**

JCNB and NAMMCO have a Joint Scientific Working Group which met the first time in May 2001.

The sensitive relationship between NAMMCO and JCNB at the beginning are exemplified by the following extracts from the NAMMCO AR (2000 and 2001). Since then, the relationship has been normalised and unproblematic. The Joint WG is meeting about every two years and the report of the WG goes both to NAMMCO and to JCNB.

*Extract from NAMMCO SC 8 (June 2000 in AR 2000, p. 124)*

**5.3 Canada/Greenland Joint Commission on Conservation and Management of Narwhal and Beluga**  
*The Joint Commission has not met since 1997. The NAMMCO Scientific Committee has been tasked with providing management advice for West Greenland beluga and narwhal (see items 9.4 and 9.5). Daniel Pike noted that he had suggested a joint meeting between the NAMMCO Scientific Committee Working Group on Narwhal and Beluga and the Scientific Working Group of the Joint Commission. This proposal, however, was not accepted. The Canadian Department of Fisheries and Oceans has since denied permission to Canadian scientists to participate in the NAMMCO Working Group. The Scientific Committee noted that this situation was not conducive to scientific cooperation and progress on this matter and urged the Council of NAMMCO to come to a cooperative agreement with the Joint Commission.*

*Extract from NAMMCO 10 (September 2000 in AR 2000, p. 33)*

### **9. EXTERNAL RELATIONS**

**Canada/Greenland Joint Commission on Conservation and Management of Narwhal and Beluga**

*In order to seek a constructive approach to co-operation and to clarify the role of NAMMCO and JCNB with respect to scientific advice and management advice on narwhal and beluga, a JCNB meeting primarily considering these matters was held 18-19 July in Nuuk, Greenland (see Section [5.3], page 124). A compromise was worked out that Greenland and Canada should consider that management advice would only be given by the JCNB, while both NAMMCO and the JCNB's Scientific Working Group could provide scientific advice. The Council also **agreed** to initiate a more active exchange with the JCNB including the exchange of observers at meetings.*

**Extract from NAMMCO SC 9 (October 2001 in AR 2001, p. 159)**

### **5.3 Canada/Greenland Joint Commission on Conservation and Management of Narwhal and Beluga (JCNB)**

*In 2000 the Scientific Committee advised that the beluga stock that winters off West Greenland is substantially depleted and that present harvests are several times the sustainable yield, and, if continued, will likely lead to stock extinction within 20 years. The Scientific Committee provided a number of harvest options for the stock, which required substantial reductions in take to have a significant chance of stopping the stock decline. At their meeting in 2000, the Council of NAMMCO expressed concern about this matter but recognised that the JCNB had primary management authority for this stock, which is shared between Canada and Greenland. It was therefore proposed that the NAMMCO Scientific Committee Working Group on the Population Status of Narwhal and Beluga in the North Atlantic and the JCNB Scientific Working Group should meet jointly to provide further advice about this stock and narwhal stocks in the area. A joint meeting was held in May in Qeqertarsuaq, Greenland (see 8.4 and 8.5).*

*Subsequent to this meeting, the Commission of the JCNB met in Iqaluit, Canada, and Daniel Pike attended as an Observer for NAMMCO. Pike reported that the JCNB had reflected the findings of the Joint Scientific Working Group in their advice to member countries, that the West Greenland Beluga were declining and that substantial harvest reductions were required. The JCNB had also provided prioritised research recommendations for both beluga and narwhal. The working relationship at the scientific level was seen as beneficial and the JCNB wished to continue this with further joint meetings.*

**Extract from NAMMCO 11 (February 2002 in AR 2001, p. 32)**

## **9. EXTERNAL RELATIONS**

### **Canada/Greenland Joint Commission on Conservation and Management of Narwhal and Beluga**

*Daniel Pike, Scientific Secretary to NAMMCO reported on the Commission meeting held in Iqaluit, Canada, 29 - 31 August 2001. The JCNB reflected the findings of the Joint Scientific Working Group (of NAMMCO and the JCNB), which met in Greenland in May 2001, in their advice to member countries that the West Greenland Beluga were declining and that substantial harvest reductions were required. Pike reported that the JCNB had provided prioritised research recommendations for both beluga and narwhal. The working relationship with NAMMCO at the scientific level was seen as beneficial and the JCNB wished to continue the joint meetings.*

*Pike gave a presentation to the JCNB meeting, which explained NAMMCO's interests in narwhal and beluga and outlined the benefits of co-operation between NAMMCO and the JCNB. Mr Pike also updated the JCNB on future activities of NAMMCO that might be of interest to the JCNB. The report was available to the meeting as NAMMCO/11/13-9.*

## **1.2 ASCOBANS:**

NAMMCO has observed at many meetings of ASCOBANS, both MOPs and AC meetings and both with the Secretariat as observer or NAMMCO being represented by Norway (see excel file).

ASCOBANS secretariat observed at NAMMCO's meetings only once, in 1996, when the Secretary of ASCOBANS, then Christina Lockyer, gave a presentation on recent development in ASCOBANS and reported that ASCOBANS was seeking cooperation and exchange of information.

*Extract from NAMMCO 6 (March 1996 in AR 1996, p. 33)*

### **8.1 Cooperation with other international organisations**

#### **Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic and North Seas (ASCOBANS)**

*The Secretary of ASCOBANS, Dr Christina Lockyer, gave a presentation to the Council on recent developments in ASCOBANS, referring also to written information which was circulated to the meeting. She informed the Council that meetings to date of the Advisory Committee of ASCOBANS had focussed on matters related to the Conservation and Management Action Plan of the Agreement, such as fisheries interactions involving bycatches of small cetaceans, criteria for protected areas, disturbance and the effects of pollution. In particular, Dr Lockyer pointed out that ASCOBANS was seeking cooperation and exchange of information with other organisations such as NAMMCO on issues such as distribution and abundance of small cetaceans, pollution, population structure and bycatches (see also the Report of the Scientific Committee, item 5.4).*

*... The Chairman thanked the Secretary of ASCOBANS for her presentation and welcomed the continuation of an active exchange of information which had already been established between ASCOBANS and NAMMCO.*

Likely because of the increasing power of some NGOs in ASCOBANS, such cooperation was not given any follow up by ASCOBANS. NAMMCO, however continued to send information, in regarding the planning and results of NASS. NAMMCO observation at ASCOBANS continued on a discontinuous manner, somewhat linked with the planning of NAMMCO activities which could have been of interest to ASCOBANS, such as T-NASS 2007 and NASS 2015, or request of information from ASCOBANS to the Faroe Islands on whaling issues.

Following up on the NAMMCO 24 decision to strengthening its scientific cooperation with other organisations, NAMMCO OS to ASCOBANS MOP8 conveyed a direct invitation to an increased scientific cooperation, associated to direct suggestions on possible target for this cooperation. See below extract from NAMMCO 24 and 25.

*Extract from NAMMCO 24 (February 2016 in AR 2015, p. 25)*

### **12.2 ASCOBANS**

#### **Comments**

*The Council **agreed** that a scientific cooperation between ASCOBANS and NAMMCO would be beneficial in some areas. It tasked the Secretariat to consult with the ASCOBANS Secretariat to explore which areas would be best suited for initiating such a scientific cooperation.*

### **12.3 Other business**

*In general, with climate change and unforeseeable consequences for marine mammals, the Council agreed that it was essential to increase the scientific cooperation between organisations dealing with marine mammals. NAMMCO should therefore aim at strengthening its cooperation with the Arctic Council, the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES), the International Whaling Commission (IWC), OSPAR, the Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans in the Baltic, North East Atlantic, Irish and North Seas (ASCOBANS) and any other international instrument, which may require the advice of NAMMCO.*

*Extract from NAMMCO 25 (April 2017 in AR 2016, p. 25)*

### **14.1 Cooperation with international organisations**

*... Following up on the NAMMCO 24 decision to strengthening its scientific cooperation with other organisations, the NAMMCO Opening Statement delivered at ASCOBANS MOP8 conveyed an invitation “to enhance the scientific cooperation between the two organisations to the benefits of small cetacean conservation. Three issues of shared concerns come to mind: by-catch monitoring, estimation and mitigation; the assessment of North Sea harbour porpoises, a shared stock between NAMMCO and ASCOBANS; and the monitoring of the effect of persistent organic pollutants on marine top predators.” ...*

Following this, NAMMCO Secretariat sent a letter to the ASCOBANS Secretariat on 22 June 2017 and made a presentation at AC23 for inviting ASCOBANS in cooperating with the Norwegian Institute of Marine research and NAMMCO in the organisation of a workshop on the status of North Atlantic harbour porpoises. The proposition first well received by ASCOBANS’ Secretariat was turned down by ASCOBANS AC 23, in direct opposition to the ASCOBANS MOP8 declaration on willingness of seeking an increased scientific cooperation with several organisations included NAMMCO.

***Extract from NAMMCO 26 (March 2018 in AR 2017, p. 21)***

### ***15.1 Cooperation with international organisations***

*... Following up on the decision of NAMMCO 24 to strengthening its scientific cooperation with other organisations dealing with marine mammals and the invitation forwarded to ASCOBANS MoP8 to an enhanced scientific cooperation, NAMMCO Secretariat had forwarded to ASCOBANS AC 23 the invitation to cooperate on the organisation of the joint IMR/NAMMCO harbour porpoise symposium seeking at reviewing the conservation status of harbour porpoises in the North Atlantic. AC 23 decided however not to engage in a scientific cooperation with NAMMCO and not to participate in the organisation of the harbour porpoise symposium.*

#### *Comments:*

*... Council noted with regrets the refusal of ASCOBANS to cooperate with NAMMCO on scientific matters regarding shared stocks of an iconic species for ASCOBANS, which clearly is subjected to significant levels of anthropogenic impacts, both direct and indirect removals, pollution and other anthropogenic disturbances.*

Following this, the ASCOBANS’ Secretariat forwarded an invitation to the ASCOBANS Secretariat for the ASCOBANS Harbour Porpoise Plans coordinator (North Sea, Gap area, Baltic) to participate to the WS. This was equally turned down.

It should be noted, however, that in a conducive attitude to conservation, the organisers of the WS agreed that the ASCOBANS HP coordinator was welcome to assist to the HP WS under another etiquette – likely Andenes (Vesterålen) Whale Centre. [Ironically enough, ASCOBANS HP coordinator will be housed at GD’s logis as she will not have any funding for participating].

**To summarise, there has not been any scientific cooperation with ASCOBANS**, because of the unwillingness of ASCOBANS to do so, and despite several invitations from NAMMCO, both general and regarding *ad hoc* specific and limited scientific cooperation.

## **1.3 ICES**

Scientific cooperation with ICES has been carried out at five levels.

### **1.3.1 ICES Study Group on long-finned pilot whale (1991 -1996) (SGLFPW)**

“An informal working relationship” with ICES was established by NAC in 1990. The ICES SGLFPW was established in 1992 following a request from NAC to ICES. The request was then taken up by NAMMCO at its inaugural meeting in 1992.

NAMMCO requested ICES, *inter alia*, to:

*“Provide an assessment of the state of the pilot whale in the north eastern Atlantic, based on the information sampled from the Faroese drive fishery and the NASS sightings surveys.”*

The ICES Study Group on long-finned pilot whale had participation of both scientists selected by ICES and NAMMCO scientists. It delivered its final report in 1997.

### **1.3.2 Requests for advice sent to ICES by member countries and forwarded to the ICES/NAFO WG on harp and hooded seals (WGHARP)**

This recurrent demand of advice to ICES on harp and hooded seals is also a heritage of NAC. The report from the WG were subsequently refused by the NAMMCO SC, which provided the management advice.

### **1.3.3 Joint ICES/NAFO/NAMMCO WG on harp and hooded seals.**

At the demand of NAMMCO (August 2014), and after consultation with NAFO, ICES agreed on the formalisation of a Joint ICES/NAFO/NAMMCO Working Group on harp and hooded seals (Letter to Jill Prewitt from ICES GS on 22 January 2015) - in continuation/replacement of the ICES/NAFO WG on harp and hooded seals.

The Joint ICES/NAFO/NAMMCO WG hold its first meeting in September 2016 and will have its second meeting in fall 2019.

### **1.3.4 ICES WG on By-catch (WGBYC)**

The cooperation with the ICES WG on By-Catch of protected species (WGBYC) developed when by-catch was transferred from the remit of the Management Committees to the remit of the Scientific Committee in 2007 (CN 16).

SC 15 (April 2008) recommended the organisation of a workshop to review the use and applicability of the by-catch monitoring systems in use in different countries. It suggested to seek contact with other organisations dealing with by-catch monitoring in view of initiating collaboration on this matter. Desportes (Chair of SC) conveyed the invitation to the ICES WGBYC at its 2009 meeting. This was accepted, and planning continued at the ICES WGBYC 2010 meeting

The Joint NAMMCO/ICES Workshop on Observation Schemes for Bycatch of Mammals and Birds (WKOSBOMB) took place in June 2010 at ICES headquarters.

Desportes renewed NAMMCO contact with the ICES WGBYC (of which she was a member for ASCOBANS until February 2015) at her inception as GS.

The chair of the ICES WGBYC was invited to the NAMMCO BYCWG as scientific Expert. Exchange of meeting reports were agreed upon (effective in 2017, when NAMMCO had had its BYCWG meeting).

The possibility for a closer cooperation of the ICES and NAMMCO WG was discussed between Desportes and the two Co-Chairs of the ICES WGBYC, with maybe partial common meeting of the groups. The issue was discussed at ICES WGBYC 2018 (Desportes participating through skype).

### **1.3.5 Sharing of information on population estimates with the ICES WGMME following T-NASS and NASS 2015.**

NAMMCO has sent update report to the ICES WGMME on new abundance estimate after T-NASS 2007 and NASS 2015 as they become available. These are reported in the report of the WG.

## **1.4 IWC SC**

### **1.4.1 Direct observation & Invited experts**

The cooperation with the IWC has been done through the existence of “common” scientists, most NAMMCO SC member of Iceland, Norway and Greenland participate to the IWC SC, sometimes formally observing for NAMMCO, sometimes not. Since 2002, the NAMMCO Scientific Secretary has regularly participating to the

meeting of the IWC Scientific Committee. A report of the relevant items from the IWC SC meeting is always made at the NAMMCO SC.

NAMMCO has had many VIP scientists from the IWC as invited expert (such as Phil Hammond, Debi Palka, Greg Donovan, Doug Butterworth...), especially in the Large Whale Management WG, Survey Planning WG and the Abundance Estimate WG. Some of them have also been observing for the IWC during the planning of T-NASS (Phil Hammond, Greg Donovan).

#### **1.4.2 Joint Activities**

At least one activity has been organised jointly, like the Joint Meeting of the NAMMCO WG on North Atlantic Fin whales and the IWC Scientific Committee in March 2006 in Reykjavík.

#### **1.4.3 NAMMCO Invitation to contribute**

NAMMCO has invited the IWC to be represented and report on relevant activities at the NAMMCO Symposium on Disturbances in October 2015 in Copenhagen.

#### **1.4.3 Establishment of a more formal collaboration between the WGs on Abundance Estimate**

As the IWC has now an Abundance Estimate WG, on the suggestion of Caterina, NAMMCO invited the IWC to a more formal cooperation between the two WGs, and proposed a.o. that the WG chairs (or convenors) would be reciprocally observing and that relevant documents from one meeting would be distributed to the other meeting (email from April 6, 2018). This was accepted by the IWC SC. Subsequently, Greg Donovan attended the NAMMCO AEWG in May 2018 on the behalf of Alex Zerbini, the chair of the IWC WGAE.

### **1.5 CAAF – CBMP**

#### **1.5.1 Collaboration of to SAMBR report**

NAMMCO (Desportes) became member of the CBMP Marine Expert Network on marine mammals in fall 2015 and participated to the CBMP Marine Annual meetings in 2015, 2016 and 2017.

NAMMCO thus contributed to the writing of the State of the Arctic Marine Biodiversity Report (SAMBR), a major undertaking of CAFF.

It was important for NAMMCO to have its work and assessments ascribed to NAMMCO when referred to, as the assessments of most marine mammal stocks in the Atlantic Arctic and adjacent waters were the remit of NAMMCO. NAMMCO had much to contribute to the CBMP. Re-enforcing links with AC and subsidiary bodies also offers NAMMCO the opportunity to make its work and success stories more widely known and reaffirm the rights of coastal communities to use all marine living resources.

#### **1.5.2 GROM**

NAMMCO invited CAFF Secretary to join the planning group of the Global Review of Monodontids (GROM). This was accepted.

NAMMCO's Scientific Secretary reported on the GROM (shortly), and other NAMMCO activities, to the CAFF WG meeting in September 2017. She also reported on the GROM findings and the status of the stocks at the CBMP meeting in October 2017.

### **1.6 General scientific cooperation**

NAMMCO update the assessment of marine mammal stocks in the NAMMCO area, but also aims at facilitating the conservation of marine mammals on a wider basis. In March 2017, it convened the Global Review of Monodontids (GROM) to support a circumpolar perspective of the status of Monodontids stocks. Scientists from Alaska, Canada, Greenland and Russia participated and cooperated in assessing the status of all the stocks. CAFF participated to the organising committee.

## 2. NAMMCO SECRETARIAT PARTICIPATION/COOPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Panel would appreciate brief comments from the Secretariat as to how this participation/cooperation is helpful for achieving NAMMCO objectives.

The participation/cooperation with other organisations is helpful for achieving NAMMCO objectives in several ways:

- 1- They represent an outing opportunity for NAMMCO to present its work and status results and therefore get it recognized, enhancing its credibility.
- 2- They represent an opportunity for NAMMCO to promote its 4 pillars
  - a. Principle of sustainable utilization of living natural resources,
  - b. The recognition of the role of science as the basis for sound and rational management,
  - c. The ecosystem approach to management,
  - d. Responsibility and transparency.
- 3- They represent a source of information and collaboration, for informing the work of NAMMCO and in particular the assessment of the MM stocks.
- 4- They also help building an ecosystem perspective, as other organization usually deal with issues NAMMCO is not directly dealing with, like other levels of the food chain, pollution, climate change, etc...

However, the two first opportunities may not have been/be always fully exploited, and NAMMCO observation may have been sometimes passive. The rule now established is that when the Secretariat intend to represent NAMMCO at a meeting or a conference it has to offer to make a presentation on a relevant topic. This input can also be like at conferences like the SMM biennials to have a stand with information on NAMMCO and its work.

### **RFMOs:**

Apart from the observation at meetings by NAMMCO's parties, not much actual scientific collaboration is ongoing. However, RFMOs could be a source of information on by-catch for example and maybe ship strikes.

**RSN:** Participation allows to keep abreast of the activities going on in the different organisations, both scientific but also relevant to the management/gestion of the secretariats themselves.

### **FAO/COFI:**

Relations with FAO/COFU have not been prioritised, although the importance of appointing a NAMMCO observer at meetings of FAO's Committee on Fisheries (COFI) was reiterated at Council 20, noting that FAO was one of the first international organisations originally identified by NAMMCO as an organisation with which NAMMCO should exchange observers. COFI represents the only global forum for discussion among governments on fisheries conservation and management.

### **OSPAR:**

The OSPAR Commission is tasked to draw up programmes and measures for the control of human activities that have actual or potential adverse effects on specific species, communities, habitats or ecological processes. OSPAR Annex V, as pertaining to 'fisheries measures' does address marine mammals. OSPAR conduct assessments of marine mammal populations including *inter alia* identifying threats to the populations and considers marine mammals in the context of the ecosystem approach to management of the North-East Atlantic. OSPAR is also advising the EU with regards to the implementation of the EU MSFD.

It would be important for NAMMCO to follow much more closely up what is happening in OSPAR for a, to bring its voice and information and makes sure that NAMMCO information is taking into account in the preparation of forthcoming Quality Status Report (QSR) for the Northeast Atlantic.

Maintaining active working relations with OSPAR will allow to provide up-to-date reliable information on the status of marine mammal stocks dealt with through NAMMCO and to make sure that the QSR not only focus on stocks and species classified as "threatened and/or in decline", but also provide a broader overview of marine

mammals as resources in the Northeast Atlantic region, as indeed OSPAR do in relation to fish stocks and fisheries.

**CAFF and related groups dealing with MM:**

These are typically fora where the work of NAMMCO can contribute to the work of the organisation, as assessment of MM in the Arctic/Atlantic area are performed in NAMMCO regi. Again, in exchange, NAMMCO gains an ecosystem perspective.

**3. LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS TO WHICH NAMMCO MEMBERS ARE APPOINTED AS OBSERVERS ON BEHALF OF NAMMCO**

NAMMCO members have been appointed as NAMMCO observers to the following organisations. The appointments seem mostly on an ad hoc basis, except for North Atlantic RFMOs (see below).

Arctic Council, Ministerial, SAO and Expert Group meetings  
ASCOBANS MOPs and ACs  
Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region  
CITES COP  
CMS COP  
FAO Expert Meeting  
IWC (Commission and SC)  
ICES 83d Statutory Meeting and WGBYC  
OSPAR Biodiversity Commission

The appointment, and by the same token the representation, has been and is more systematic for the Atlantic RFMOs, following established practice and formal agreement at Council 17 (2008):

*Extract from AR 2007-2008, Report of CN meeting 17, Agenda point 12. External Relations (p. 26)*  
**12. EXTERNAL RELATIONS**

...

*“For the guidance of the Secretariat in responding to invitations from other organisations, the Council agreed to delegate NAMMCO observers among member countries as follows: Norway would represent NAMMCO at relevant meetings of NEAFC, Iceland at relevant meetings of NAFO, and the Faroe Islands at relevant meetings of NASCO.”*

At Council 19, Norway proposed that NAMMCO seek observer status to SEAFO, which was granted. Since then, i.e. since the 7<sup>th</sup> SEAFO annual meeting, Norway has been NAMMCO observer to SEAFO annual meeting.

Details of these observation activities can be found in the excel file in the sheet called “NAMMCO rep - IGOs & Rec. events”.

Regarding other examples provided by D. Goodman, such as the UN open ended Consultative Process on oceans and the law of the Sea, IMO and PAME, GD was not sure those were correct, as she did not find any traces of this representations in the Council Reports and/or Council meetings’ documents.