

-- DRAFT, NOT FOR FURTHER CIRCULATION --

REVIEW REPORTS
CONCERTED ACTION SPECIES

PART II: MARINE MAMMALS

INTRODUCTION

The present Rapid Review of Concerted Action Species was conducted by UNEP-WCMC and follows on from the exercise presented to the consideration of the CMS Scientific Council at its 12th Meeting. This version of the review sheets takes on board some of the feedback received at that meeting, and in particular it has reduced its reliance on information from the grey literature in favour more exclusively of peer-reviewed content. Similarly, following the advice received from the Council, the review sheets have been complemented with summary sheets, which indicate the overall perceived trend of the species in each country. A synopsis of the status and level of action for each species is also provided in each section.

As explained at the 12th meeting of the Council, there are a number of characteristics and methodological considerations that need to be kept in mind in order to understand the nature and purpose of the review sheets. In particular, it should be noted that these reviews are not intended as comprehensive compilations of the existing information on the species reviewed, nor are the analyses of trends and conservation status provided intended to supersede the global assessments produced by IUCN (which are included in each sheet for information). Instead, these reviews are produced with three goals in mind:

1. to examine **at the country level** the status and the known level of action for the species protected by the CMS (at this stage, the Species in Appendix I subject of Concerted Actions – Resolution 7.1)
2. to compile in a single document a **summary of the main sources of information accessible to the CMS** via the CMS Information Management System (CMS IMS) in general (including the expert information systems to which it is interconnected) and at UNEP-WCMC;
3. to provide a draft of the possible primary format and content of the **CMS Rolling Papers**, which once in electronic format on the internet (if they are indeed developed as such) could be used by Councillors and other appointed authorities to share and manage knowledge on the status and conservation actions concerning the species protected by the Convention.

The summary of actions reported for each species and contained in each review refers to the information provided in the National Reports to the CMS submitted by the Parties to the Convention in 2002 (COP7), as at the moment of producing these Reviews, the 2005 Reports had not been produced yet. In addition to the information on actions available through the CMS Reports, the Reviews also make reference to any other recent action reported by other actors identified during the review of literature. Importantly, it should also be noted that these Reviews do not include yet the action reported by Agreements and MoUs of the CMS which, needless to say, represent a fundamental component of the conservation effort orchestrated by totality of the CMS family.

These Reviews are thus only produced as working documents, for discussion at CMS meetings only, and should not be circulated elsewhere without prior permission.

Anyone wishing to use this information elsewhere should contact the Species Programme at UNEP-WCMC for advice on appropriate use of the information and on citation.

Members and observers of the Scientific Council are invited to:

- a) contribute any relevant information they may wish to share which may improve the content of these Reviews;
- b) advise on the usefulness of the exercise in general, and on the convenience of extending the model to other species protected by the CMS;
- c) advise on the convenience of making this information and format available online, within the CMS environment, as a tool for CMS users to share and manage knowledge on the status of ,and conservation actions for CMS species.

Key to general synopsis

IUCN Status:

As reported from the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (www.redlist.org).

IUCN Trend:

The population is either increasing (↑), stable (→) or decreasing (↓). When no information about population trend is provided, there is a blank space in that column.

CMS Listed Range States:

The list of States in the distribution range of the taxon, according to the CMS Range List (2003). All range States were reviewed, including those marked as (Ex), (Ex?) and (?). When the European Union (EU) is listed as a range state by CMS, this is not included in the count but all the individual EU countries that are listed in brackets are counted.

All Range States:

The number of range states including range states reported in the literature reviewed, such as the Species Data Base (UNEP-WCMC), BirdLife International, IUCN/SSC publications, and other reliable publications. If a range state is included, which CMS does not currently list, a reference is provided.

CMS Parties Reporting Action:

This number represents the proportion of CMS Parties in the range that report conservation actions being undertaken for the taxon. This includes any actions reported in National Reports to CMS in 2002.

Range States Reporting Action:

This number represents the fraction of all range States (including those range States not included in the CMS range list but reported in the literature) in which conservation action was identified to be taking place.

Range States in Which Species Occurs in Protected Areas:

The fraction of all range states in which the species occurs in a protected area (P. A.). If a species has been reintroduced to a protected area, then this is still counted.

Key to specific synopses

The species summary sheets provide a concise overview of the information included in the more detailed Reviews. For each species, the summary sheet contains information on status, trends and conservation actions at the national level in each range state. These summary sheets do not intend to provide a comprehensive account of each taxon in question, but instead they are designed to produce a concise overview of the information on population status, trends and on conservation actions, that are readily available through the CMS IMS and in the literature.

Information contained in the summary sheets:

Range States

The range state list included range states registered in the CMS Range List as well as additional range States for which there are reliable references (e.g. BirdLife International, IUCN/SSC publications, etc.). CMS Parties are identified by use of upper-case font.

Status

The status at the national level is not represented using threat categories such as the IUCN Red List classification, since these categories are not standardised across different countries. A species is registered under a generic category of threat in a particular range state if it is included in a National Red List (or equivalent publication). Absence of information, however, should not be interpreted as an indicator that the species is not threatened in that country. Range states in which the species is registered as nationally threatened have a dot (●) in the 'Status' column, and range states for which the species is reported as extinct have an "ex" in the status column (or "ex?" if it is supposed to be extinct but information is lacking).

Trend

The apparent population trend in that range state is included, based on the information reviewed. The population is either increasing in that range state (↑), stable (→) or decreasing (↓). Intermediate trends stages are recorded using the symbols (↗) for stable to increasing, and (↘) for stable to decreasing. Range states for which no information on status was available or where the status is uncertain, are represented by an ? in the 'Trends' column.

CMS Actions

If conservation action(s) in a CMS Party range state were reported to CMS through National Reports in 2002 (note that at the time of producing this reports, 2005 National Reports had not been submitted), this is represented by a ✓ in the 'CMS Actions' column. If no action is reported this is represented with a ✖. Range states that are not CMS Parties, have a blank space in that column section.

Other Actions

If recent conservation actions other than those reported to CMS were reported in the literature for a range State, whether this be a Party or not to CMS, a ✓ is used. If no other conservation action is reported, then the range state has a blank space in this column.

General Synopsis

Name	IUCN Redlist	IUCN Trend	Countries in CMS Range List	All Range States reported in literature	CMS Parties reporting action	Range States reporting action	Range States in which species occur in P.A.
<i>Balaenoptera borealis</i>	EN		27	39	0/20	2/39	0/39
<i>Balaenoptera musculus</i>	EN		125	128	9/47	13/128	2/128
<i>Balaenoptera physalus</i>	EN		38	58	0/19	0/58	0/58
<i>Eubalaena australis</i>	LR/cd		11	17	5/11	8/17	3/17
<i>Lontra felina</i>	EN	?	3	3	2/3	2/3	1/3
<i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i>	VU	↑	127	134	9/52	15/134	3/134
<i>Monachus monachus</i>	CR	?	21	27	4/22	8/27	4/27
<i>Physeter macrocephalus</i>	VU		38	56	0/29	2/56	0/56
<i>Pontoporia blainvillei</i>	DD		3	3	1/2	2/3	0/3

Balaenoptera borealis - synopsis

Country	Reported as nationally threatened	Apparent trend	CMS actions reported (in 2002 National Reports)	Other recent actions reported in the literature
Antarctica		↓		
ARGENTINA	●	?	x	
AUSTRALIA		?	x	
Brazil		?		
Canada		?		✓
CHILE		?	x	
China		?		
Colombia		?		
Cuba		?		
DENMARK		?	x	
ECUADOR		?	x	
FRANCE		?	x	
GERMANY		?	x	
Iceland		?		
INDIA		?	x	
Indonesia		?		
IRELAND		?	x	
Japan		?		
KENYA		?	x	
D.P.R. Korea		?		
Republic of Korea		?		
Malaysia		?		
Mexico		?		
MOROCCO		?	x	
Mozambique		?		
NETHERLANDS		?	x	
NORWAY		?	x	
POLAND		?	x	
PORTUGAL		?	x	
Russian Federation		?		
SOUTH AFRICA		?	x	
SPAIN		?	x	
Suriname		?		
TANZANIA		?	x	
Thailand		?		
UNITED KINGDOM	●	?	x	✓
United States	●	?		
URUGUAY		?	x	
Viet Nam		?		

REVIEW OF CONCERTED ACTION SPECIES

MAMMALIA: BALAENOPTERIDAE

SPECIES: *Balaenoptera borealis* (Lesson, 1828)

SYNONYMS: -

COMMON NAME: Coalfish Whale; Pollack Whale; Rudolphi's Rorqual; Sei Whale (English); Baleinoptère de Rudolphi; Rorqual boréal; Rorqual de Rudolphi; Rorqual sei (French); Ballena boba; Ballena sei; Rorcual boreal; Rorcual de Rudolphi; Rorcual norteno (Spanish)

RANGE STATES: ARGENTINA; AUSTRALIA; Canada; CHILE; China (Taiwan); Cuba; FRANCE (Réunion); Iceland; INDIA; Indonesia; Japan; KENYA; Korea, Democratic People's Republic of; Korea, Republic of; Malaysia; Mexico; Mozambique; NORWAY; POLAND; Russian Federation; SOUTH AFRICA; SPAIN; Suriname; TANZANIA, UNITED REPUBLIC; Thailand; UNITED KINGDOM (Falkland Islands (Malvinas)); United States; URUGUAY; international waters

RED LIST RATING: EN A1abd (Cetacean Specialist Group, 1996)

CONSERVATION STATUS AND ACTIONS:

Although the sei whale, an open ocean species (Jefferson *et al.*, 1994), is found in virtually every ocean and sea in the world, most individuals inhabit temperate and sub-tropical waters, migrating annually to the subarctic and subantarctic for summer feeding. They do undergo seasonal migrations, although they apparently are not as extensive as those of some other larger whales (OBIS-SEAMAP, 2004). The species is therefore less likely to occur in polar waters than other rorquals (Cetacea, 2001; COSEWIC, 2003).

The sei whale was not traditionally a target for whalers. However, from the mid-1960s onwards when stocks in other species began to decline and then became protected, sei whales became the primary catch (Cetacea, 2001). The heaviest period of exploitation was between the 1950s and 1970s. Whaling took place in the North Pacific and North Atlantic Oceans, but most hunting was in the southern hemisphere (OBIS-SEAMAP, 2004). There is good evidence that the stocks of sei whales were depleted before gaining full protection from commercial whaling in the 1970s and 1980s (Reeves *et al.*, 2003).

The extent to which stocks have recovered since then is uncertain because relatively little research on sei whales has been conducted during the past 25 years (Reeves *et al.*, 2003). Although during the period 1970 to 1990, the circumglobal population increased from an estimated 30,000 to 40,000 animals according to UNEP-WCMC (2004). Other sources claim that sei whales have recovered more successfully than other large baleen whales (Jefferson *et al.*, 1994). Watson (1988) quoted a total population size of fewer than 80,000 animals. The highest estimate for the North Atlantic is less than 3,000 while the North Pacific had no more than 20,000 whales. More recently, Cetacea (2001) puts the current total population at 65,000, and OBIS-SEAMAP (2004) estimates it in about 80,000 animals. Some researches have concluded that sei whale populations are rising as a result of decreases in Blue and Fin whale populations, but actual data are scarce, and the dietary overlap between sei whales and these other species is not complete (Shefferley, 1999).

The species' classification by IUCN as Endangered in the mid-1990s (under the 1996 categories and criteria) was based on an estimated decline of around 50% in worldwide total abundance over the last three generations. This assumes a generation time of roughly 20–25 years. Most of this decline would have occurred in the Southern Hemisphere, which had a much larger original population than the North Atlantic or North Pacific. While a change in classification to Vulnerable may be appropriate, there is a distinct lack of reliable survey data that could serve as the basis for reassessment (Reeves *et al.*, 2003).

Although the species has been fully protected by the IWC since 1985, a few were taken in the North Atlantic by Iceland in the last few decades of the 20th century. Sources of mortality other than direct exploitation include probable vessel strikes (OBIS-SEAMAP, 2004), and factors that could potentially limit the persistence and recovery of this species are primarily indirect, and are a reflection of the overall state of the oceans. These include bioaccumulation of toxins, and inter-specific competition for prey items (COSEWIC, 2003). The sei whale's use of relatively remote habitats may reduce the impact of some of the threats to which the species may be exposed.

Antarctica*:

Status: Between 1975 and 1990, the estimated stock of sei whales in the Antarctic dropped from 60,000 to 40,000 animals (UNEP-WCMC, 2004).

CMS actions:

Other actions:

ARGENTINA:

Status: No information available on stock for this country. Stranded individuals have been found on some beaches of Argentina (Redford & Eisenberg, 1992). It is included in the Argentinean Mammals Red Data Book as Vulnerable (Diaz and Ojeda, 2000)

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

AUSTRALIA:

Status: The species may occur in the waters off the southwest coast of Western Australia and in the tropical Indian Ocean Pelagic, shelf and near-shore waters (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Brazil*:

Status: Occurrence reported (UNEP-WCMC, 2004).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Canada:

Status: There are no recent abundance estimates for the sei whale. A current minimum population cannot be estimated because there are no current abundance estimates within the last ten years. There has been no hunting of sei whales in Canada for over 25 years and there is no indication that whaling on this species in Canadian waters will resume in the future (COSEWIC, 2003).

Nova Scotia Stock:

Mitchell and Chapman (1977), based on tag-recapture data, estimated the size of the Nova Scotia (Canada) stock to contain between 1,393 and 2,248 sei whales. Based on census data, they estimated a minimum Nova Scotian population of 870 sei whales. An abundance of 280 sei whales was estimated from an aerial survey program conducted from 1978 to 1982 on the continental shelf and shelf edge waters between Cape Hatteras, North Carolina and Nova Scotia; the estimate is based on data collected

during the spring when the greatest proportion of the population off the northeast USA coast appeared in the study area. This estimate is more than 20 years out of date and thus almost certainly does not reflect the current true population size; in addition, the estimate has a high degree of uncertainty, and it was estimated just after cessation of extensive foreign fishing operations in the region. The Nova Scotia stocks have been listed as endangered under the United States Endangered Species Act (ESA) since 1973 (NOAA, 2003).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions: The Oceans Act appears to be the legislation under which Fisheries and Oceans Canada will work to establish Marine Protected Areas, while the Species at Risk Act includes provisions to protect habitat and develop recovery strategies for endangered species (COSEWIC, 2003).

CHILE:

Status: Stranded individuals have been found in the beaches of Chile (Redford & Eisenberg, 1992).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

China

(Taiwan):

Status: Occurrence reported (UNEP-WCMC, 2004).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Colombia*:

Status: Occurrence reported (UNEP-WCMC, 2004).

CMS actions:

Other actions:

Cuba:

Status: Occurrence reported (UNEP-WCMC, 2004).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

DENMARK*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Nowak, 1981).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

ECUADOR*:

Status: Reported in Galapagos and off the mainland (UNEP-WCMC, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

FRANCE

(Réunion):

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

GERMANY*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Nowak, 1981).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Iceland:

Status: The presence of sei whales in Icelandic waters in summer and autumn months is irregular and their abundance varies (Kjeld *et al.*, 2003). The species continued to be exploited in Iceland until 1986 even though measures to stop whaling of sei whales in other areas had been put in place in the 1970s (New England Fishery Management Council, 2003).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

INDIA:

Status: Occurrence reported (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Indonesia:

Status: Occurrence reported (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

IRELAND*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Berrow *et al.*, 2002).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Japan:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

KENYA:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

D.P.R.Korea:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Republic of Korea:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Malaysia:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Mexico:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

MOROCCO*:

Status: Occurrence reported (UNEP-WCMC, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Mozambique:



Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

NETHERLANDS*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Nowak, 1981).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

NORWAY:

Status: Occurrence reported. The species is proposed as Norwegian Responsibility species (species that Norway has a special international responsibility for maintaining the survival of) (Isaksen *et al.*, 1998).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

POLAND:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

PORTUGAL*:

Status: Occurrence reported in the Azores (Viallelle, 1997) and off the mainland (UNEP-WCMC, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Russian

Federation:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

SOUTH

AFRICA:

Status: Occurrence reported (Oosthuizen, 2001). In winter, they are present off the west and east coasts of South Africa (Fertl, 2002).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

SPAIN:

Status: Scarce presence in Galicia (Northwest). With its Southern distribution limit in Gibraltar, the species has been exceptionally recorded in the Mediterranean (two records, in Ebro's Delta and Columbretes islands), (Purroy & Varela, 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Suriname:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

UNITED

REPUBLIC OF

TANZANIA:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Thailand:

Status: The species has not been reported in this country waters (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

UNITED KINGDOM

(Falkland Islands

(Malvinas)):

Status: Occurrence reported (UNEP-WCMC, 2004; Redford & Eisenberg, 1992).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions: Protected in the UK by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (UNEP-WCMC, 2004).

United States:

Status: **Western North Atlantic Stock**

The total number of sei whales in the U.S. Atlantic EEZ (Exclusive Economic Zone) is unknown. However, two abundance estimates are available for portions of the sei whale habitat: from Nova Scotia during the 1970's, and in the U.S. Atlantic EEZ during the spring of 1978-82 (see **Canada** section) (NOAA, 1998).

There are insufficient data to determine the population trend for this species. The status of this stock relative to optimum sustainable population (OSP) in the U.S. Atlantic EEZ is unknown, but the species is listed as endangered under the ESA. The total level of human-caused mortality and serious injury is unknown, but it is believed to be insignificant and approaching a zero mortality and serious injury rate (NOAA, 1998).

Eastern North Pacific Stock

The International Whaling Commission (IWC) only considers one stock of sei whales in the North Pacific, but some evidence exists for multiple populations. Sei whales are distributed far out to sea in temperate regions of the world and do not appear to be associated with coastal features (NOAA, 2003). Ohsumi and Wada (1974) estimated the pre-whaling abundance of sei whales to be 58,000-62,000 in the North Pacific. Later, Tillman (1977) used a variety of different methods to estimate the abundance of sei whales in the North Pacific and revised this pre-whaling estimate to 42,000. His estimates for the year 1974 ranged from 7,260 to 12,620. All methods depend on using the history of catches and trends in CPUE (Catch per Unit of Effort) or sighting rates; there have been no direct estimates of sei whale abundance in the entire (or eastern) North Pacific based on sighting surveys (NOAA, 2003). Only two confirmed sightings of the species and five possible sightings were made in California, Oregon and Washington waters during extensive ship and aerial surveys in 1991, 1992, 1993, 1996, and 2001 (NOAA, 2003).

There are no data on trends in sei whale abundance in the Eastern North Pacific waters. Although the population is expected to have grown since being given protected status in 1976, the possible effects of continued unauthorized take and incidental ship strikes and gillnet mortality make this uncertain (NOAA, 2003).

Sei whales are formally listed as "Endangered" under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), and consequently the eastern North Pacific stock is automatically considered as a "depleted" and "strategic" stock under the Marine Mammal protection Act (MMPA) (NOAA, 2003).

CMS actions: Not a party to CMS.

Other actions:

URUGUAY:

Status: Stranded individuals have been found on the beaches of Uruguay (Redford &

Eisenberg, 1992).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Viet Nam

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS

Other actions:

REFERENCES:

- Berrow, S. D., Whooley, P. and Ferriss, S. (2002). *Irish Whale and Dolphin Group cetacean sighting review (1991-2001)*. Irish Whale and Dolphin Group, Kilrush, Co. Clare
- Cetacea (2001). Cetacea: Whales, dolphins and porpoises. www.cetacea.org/index.htm
Downloaded on 09/03/2004.
- Cetacean Specialist Group (1996). *Balaenoptera borealis*. In: IUCN 2004. 2004 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. www.redlist.org Downloaded on 18/02/2004.
- COSEWIC (2003) COSEWIC (Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada) *Assessment and status report on the sei whale Balaenoptera borealis in Canada*. Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada. Ottawa. Vii + 27pp. http://www.sararegistry.gc.ca/virtual_sara/files/cosewic/sr_sei_whale_e.pdf
Downloaded on 17/11/2004.
- De Boer, N.M. Baldwin, R. Burton, C.L.K. Eyre, E.L. Jenner, K.C.S. Jenner, M.N.M. Keith, S.G. McCabe, K.A. Parsons, E.C.M. Peddemors, V.M. Rosebaum, H.C. Rudolph, P. Simmonds, M.P. (2003) Cetaceans in the Indian Ocean Sanctuary: A Review. A WDCS Science Report. [http://www.wdcs.org/dan/publishing.nsf/c525f7df6cbf01ef802569d600573108/9c76567b8cc72ff080256d2d00301341/\\$FILE/IOSreview.pdf](http://www.wdcs.org/dan/publishing.nsf/c525f7df6cbf01ef802569d600573108/9c76567b8cc72ff080256d2d00301341/$FILE/IOSreview.pdf) Downloaded on 23/11/2004.
- Diaz, G.B. and R.A. Ojeda, editors, (2000). *Libro Rojo de los Mamíferos amenazados de Argentina*. Sociedad Argentina para el Estudio de los Mamíferos, SAREM. 106 pp.
- Fertl, D. (2002) Cetacean Society International. African Marine Mammals, sei whale, *Balaenoptera borealis*. <http://csiwhalesalive.org/csisei.html> Downloaded on 11/05/2005.
- Isaksen, K., Syvertsen, P. O., Kooij, J. Van Der & Rinden, H. (Eds)(1998). *Threatened mammals in Norway: fact sheets and proposed Red List*. Norsk Zoologisk Forening. Rapport 5. 182 pp. (ISBN 82-7857-004-3). (In Norwegian with English summary).
- Jefferson, T.A., Leatherwood, S. and Webber, M.A. (1994). *Marine mammals of the world. FAO Species Identification Guide*. FAO and UNEP, 320pp.
- Kjeld, M., Vikingsson, G.A., Alfredsson, A., Olafsson, Ö and Arnason, A. (2003) Sex hormone concentrations in the blood of sei whales (*Balaenoptera borealis*) off Iceland. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management* 5(3): pp. 233-240.
- Mizroch, S. A., Rice, D. W. and Breiwick, J. M. (1984). The sei whale, *Balaenoptera borealis*. *Mar. Fish. Rev.*, 46:25-29.
- Mobley, J. R., Smultea, M. Norris, T. and Weller, D. (1996). Fin whale sighting north of Kauai, Hawaii. *Pac. Sci.*, 50: 230-233.
- New England Fishery Management Council (2003) Final Amendment 13 to the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan. Volume II: Description of the Resource and the Affected Environment. http://www.nefmc.org/nemulti/planamen/final_amend13_dec03_section_31.pdf
Downloaded on 11/05/2005.

- NOAA (1998) Stock Assessment Reports (SARs) by Species/stock. Sei whale (*Balaenoptera borealis*): Western North Atlantic Stock.
[http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Sei_Whale_\(Western_N._Atlantic\)/AO98seiwhale_westernN.atlantic.pdf](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Sei_Whale_(Western_N._Atlantic)/AO98seiwhale_westernN.atlantic.pdf) Downloaded on 17/11/2004.
- NOAA (2003) Stock Assessment Reports (SARs) by Species/stock. Sei whale (*Balaenoptera borealis*): Eastern North Pacific Stock.
[http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Sei_Whale_\(ENP\)/PacSar2003%20-%20Sei%20whale%20ENP.pdf](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Sei_Whale_(ENP)/PacSar2003%20-%20Sei%20whale%20ENP.pdf) Downloaded on 17/11/2004.
- NOAA (2003) Stock Assessment Reports (SARs) by Species/stock. Sei whale (*Balaenoptera borealis*): Nova Scotia Stock.
[http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Sei_Whale_\(Nova_Scotia\)/ao03seiwhalenovascotia.pdf](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Sei_Whale_(Nova_Scotia)/ao03seiwhalenovascotia.pdf) Downloaded on 17/11/2004.
- Nowak, E. (1981). Die Säugetiere der Länder der Europäischen Gemeinschaft. Artenkatalog mit Angaben über Vorkommen und gesetzlichen Schutzstatus. Kilda-Verlag, Greven, Germany
- Ohsumi, S. and Wada, S. (1974). Status of whale stocks in the North Pacific, 1972. *Rept. Int. Whal. Commn.*, 25:114-126.
- Oosthuizen, W.H. (2001) South Africa. Progress Report on cetacean research, January 2001 to December 2001, with statistical data for the Calender year 2001.
http://www.iwcoffice.org/documents/sci_com/2002progreports/SC-54-ProgRep%20SouthAfrica.pdf Downloaded on 18/11/2004.
- Perry, S. L., DeMaster, D. P. Silber., G. K. (1999). The Great Whales: History and status of Six species listed as endangered under the U.S. Endangered Species Act of 1973. *Marine Fisheries Review*, 61(1): 1-73.
- Purroy, F.J. and Varela, J.M. (2003) *Guía de los mamíferos de España, Peninsula , Baleares y Canarias*. Lynx Edicions – SEO BirdLife. Barcelona.
- Redford, K. H. and Eisenberg, J. F. (1992). *Mammals of the Neotropics. Vol.2*. Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay. University of Chicago Press.
- Reeves, R.R., Smith, B.D., Crespo, E.A. and di Sciara, G.N. (comps.) (2003). *Dolphins, Whales and Porpoises: 2002-2010 Conservation Action Plan for the World's Cetaceans*. IUCN/SSC Cetacean Specialist Group. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.
- Rice, D. W. (1974). Whales and whale research in the eastern North Pacific. pp. 170-195 In: W. E. Schevill (ed.). *The Whale Problem: A Status Report*. Harvard Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Tillman, M.F. (1977) Estimates of population size for the North Pacific sei whale. *Rept. Int. Whal. Commn.*, Special Issue 1: 98-106.
- UNEP-WCMC (2004). Species Database. www.unep-wcmc.org Downloaded on 17/11/2004.
- Viallelle, S. (1997). *Dolphins and whales from the Azores*. Espaço Talassa, Lajes do Pico, Azores
- Watkins, W.A., Daher, M.A., George, J.E. and Haga, S. (2000). *Distribution of calling blue, fin, and humpback whales in the North Pacific*. Wood Hole Oceanographic Institution Technical Report WHOI-00-12.
- Watson, L. (1988). *Whales of the world. A complete guide to the world's living whales, dolphins and porpoises*. Hutchinson. 302pp.
- Yablokov, A. V. (1994). Validity of whaling data. *Nature*, 367:108.

* Range State not yet included in the CMS range list for this species.

Balaenoptera musculus - synopsis

Country	Reported as nationally threatened	Apparent trend	CMS actions reported (in 2002 National Reports)	Other recent actions reported in the literature
Angola		?		
Antarctica		↓		
Antigua and Barbuda		?		
ARGENTINA	●	?	x	
AUSTRALIA	●	↓	✓	✓
Bahamas		?		
Bahrain		?		
Bangladesh		?		
Barbados		?		
BELGIUM		?	x	
Belize		?		
BENIN		?	✓	
Brazil		?		
Brunei Darussalam		?		
Cambodia		?		
CAMEROON		?	x	
Canada		?		
Cape Verde		?		
CHILE		?	x	✓
China		?		
Colombia		?		
Comoros		?		
CONGO		?	x	
D.R.CONGO		?	x	
Cook Islands		?		
Costa Rica		?		
COTE D'IVOIRE		?	x	
Cuba		?		
CYPRUS		?	x	
DENMARK		?	x	
DJIBOUTI		?	x	
Dominica		?		
Dominican Republic		?		
ECUADOR		?	x	
El Salvador		?		
Equatorial Guinea		?		
Eritrea		?		
Fiji		?		
FINLAND		?	x	
FRANCE		?	x	
Gabon		?		
GAMBIA		?	x	
GERMANY		?	x	
GHANA		?	✓	
GREECE		?	x	
Grenada		?		
Guatemala		?		
GUINEA		?	x	

Balaenoptera musculus - synopsis

Country	Reported as nationally threatened	Apparent trend	CMS actions reported (in 2002 National Reports)	Other recent actions reported in the literature
GUINEA BISSAU		?	x	
Guyana		?		
Haiti		?		
Honduras		?		
Iceland		↑		
INDIA		?	x	
Indonesia		?		
Iran		?		
Iraq		?		
IRELAND		?	✓	
ITALY		?	x	
Jamaica		?		
Japan		?		
JORDAN		?	x	
KENYA		?	x	
Kiribati		?		
D.P.R. Korea		?		
Republic of Korea		?		
Kuwait		?		
Lebanon		?		
Liberia		?		
Madagascar		?		✓
Malaysia		?		
Maldives		?		
Marshall Islands		?		
MAURITANIA		?	x	
MAURITIUS		?	x	
Mexico		?		✓
F.S. Micronesia		?		
MOROCCO		?		
Mozambique		?		
Myanmar		?		
Namibia		?		
Nauru		?		
NETHERLANDS		?	x	
NEW ZEALAND		?	✓	
Nicaragua		?		
NIGERIA		?	x	
Niue		?		
NORWAY		?	x	
Oman		?		
PAKISTAN		?	x	
Palau		?		
Panama		?		
Papua New Guinea		?		
PERU		?	✓	
PHILIPPINES		?	✓	
POLAND		?	x	
PORTUGAL		?	✓	

Balaenoptera musculus - synopsis

Country	Reported as nationally threatened	Apparent trend	CMS actions reported (in 2002 National Reports)	Other recent actions reported in the literature
Russian Federation		↓		
Qatar		?		
Saint Kitts and Nevis		?		
Saint Lucia		?		
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		?		
Samoa		?		
SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE		?	x	
SAUDI ARABIA		?	x	
SENEGAL		?	x	
Seychelles		?		
Sierra Leone		?		
SOMALIA		?	x	
SOUTH AFRICA		?	x	
SPAIN	●	↑	x	
SRI LANKA		?	x	
Sudan		?		
Suriname		?		
SWEDEN?		?	x	
SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC		?	x	
TANZANIA		?	x	
TOGO		?	✓	
Tonga		?		
Trinidad and Tobago		?		
Tuvalu		?		
United Arab Emirates		?		
UNITED KINGDOM	●	?	x	✓
United States	●	↑		
URUGUAY		?	x	
Vanuatu		?		
Venezuela		?		
Viet Nam		?		
Yemen		?		

REVIEW OF CONCERTED ACTION SPECIES

MAMMALIA: BALAENOPTERIDAE

- SPECIES:** *Balaenoptera musculus* (Linnaeus, 1758)
- SYNONYMS:** -
- COMMON NAME:** Blue Whale; Sibbald's Rorqual; Sulphur-bottom Whale (English); Baleine bleue; Baleine d'Ostende; Baleinoptère bleue; Rorqual à ventre cannelé; Rorqual bleu; Rorqual de Sibbold (French); Ballena azul; Rorcual azul (Spanish)
- RANGE STATES:** Angola; Antigua and Barbuda; ARGENTINA; AUSTRALIA (including Heard Island); Bahamas; Bahrain; Bangladesh; Barbados; BELGIUM; Belize; BENIN; Brazil; Brunei Darussalam; Cambodia; CAMEROON; Canada; Cape Verde; CHILE; China (including Hong Kong, Taiwan); Colombia; Comoros; CONGO; CONGO, DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE; Cook Islands; Costa Rica; COTE D'IVOIRE; Cuba; CYPRUS; DENMARK (Faeroe Islands); Denmark (Greenland); DJIBOUTI; Dominica; Dominican Republic; ECUADOR (including Galapagos Islands); El Salvador; Equatorial Guinea; Eritrea; Fiji; FINLAND; FRANCE (including Amsterdam Island, Clipperton Island, Corsica, Crozet Islands, French Guiana, Guadeloupe, Kerguelen, Martinique, New Caledonia, St. Paul Island, St. Pierre-et-Miquelon, Wallis and Futuna Islands); Gabon; GAMBIA; GHANA; Grenada; Guatemala; GUINEA; GUINEA-BISSAU; Guyana; Haiti; Honduras; Iceland; INDIA (including Andaman Islands, Laccadive Islands, Nicobar Islands); Indonesia; Iran (Islamic Republic of); Iraq; IRELAND; Jamaica; Japan (including Bonin Islands); JORDAN; KENYA; Kiribati; Korea, Democratic People's Republic of; Korea, Republic of; Kuwait; LIBERIA; Madagascar; Malaysia; Maldives; Marshall Islands; MAURITANIA; MAURITIUS; Mexico (including Cedros, Guadalupe); Micronesia (Federated States of); MOROCCO; Mozambique; Myanmar; Namibia; Nauru; NETHERLANDS (including Aruba, Bonaire, Curaçao, Saba, Sint Eustatius); NEW ZEALAND (including Antipodes Islands, Auckland Islands, Bounty Islands, Campbell Island, Chatham Islands, Kermadec Islands, Snares Islands, Solander Island, Stewart Island, Three Kings Islands, Tokelau); Nicaragua; NIGERIA; Niue; NORWAY (including Bouvet Island, Jan Mayen Island, Svalbard); Oman; PAKISTAN; Palau; PANAMA; Papua New Guinea; PERU; PHILIPPINES; POLAND; PORTUGAL; Qatar; Russian Federation; Saint Kitts and Nevis; Saint Lucia; Saint Vincent and the Grenadines; Samoa; SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE; SAUDI ARABIA; SENEGAL; Seychelles; Sierra Leone; SOMALIA; SOUTH AFRICA (including Prince Edward Islands); SPAIN; SRI LANKA; Sudan; Suriname; SWEDEN (?); SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC; TANZANIA, UNITED REPUBLIC OF; TOGO; Tonga; Trinidad and Tobago; Tuvalu; United Arab Emirates; UNITED KINGDOM (including Ascension Island, Bermuda, British Indian Ocean Territory, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Cyprus, Falkland Islands (Malvinas), Gibraltar, Montserrat, Pitcairn, St. Helena, South Georgia, South Orkney Islands, South Sandwich Islands, South Shetland Islands, Tristan da

Cunha, Turks and Caicos Islands); United States (including American Samoa, Guam, Hawaiian Islands, United States Virgin Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico); URUGUAY; Vanuatu; Venezuela (including Lesser Antilles); Viet Nam; Yemen; international waters

RED LIST RATING: EN A1abd (Cetacean Specialist Group, 1996)

CONSERVATION STATUS AND ACTIONS:

The blue whale is found throughout every ocean in the world. They migrate to polar waters in summer for feeding and return to warmer seas in winter for breeding, covering thousands of kilometres every year. The subspecies, the pygmy blue whale (*Balaenoptera musculus brevicauda*) is found mainly in the Southern Hemisphere (Cetacea, 2001), in a restricted zone to the north of 54° S and between 0° and 80° E (Nowak, 1991).

Southern Hemisphere blue whales tend to feed between the Antarctic pack ice and the Antarctic convergence zone during the austral summer. In the winter, the whales move northward ahead of the advancing pack ice. Populations generally expend the winter in temperate and subtropical zones, migrate toward the north poles in the spring, feed in high latitudes during the summer, and move back toward the equator in the fall (Nowak, 1991).

Little is known about exact location of breeding grounds, but these whales have been reported as far north as Madagascar and Angola, West Africa; and Brazil, Ecuador and Peru, South America. There are 3 main populations of blue whales: one in the North Pacific, another in the North Atlantic and a third in the southern hemisphere, especially in the cold waters above Antarctica (WDCS, 2004).

Once fast catcher boats and explosive harpoons became available in the latter half of the 1800s, all rorquals were catchable. Being the largest species, blue whales became the primary target. Catches were made primarily on the summer feeding grounds - the North Atlantic, North Pacific and mostly, the Antarctic Ocean (Cetacea, 2001). In 1900, Cetacea (2001) estimated that there were 250,000 blue whales, but in the Antarctic season of 1930-1 alone nearly 30,000 animals were taken and by 1967, when the species received global protection, over 350,000 had been killed in the Southern Hemisphere alone (Cetacea, 2001; Reeves *et al.*, 2003). There has been an estimated decline of at least 50% in worldwide total abundance over the last three generations, assuming a generation time of roughly 20–25 years (Reeves *et al.*, 2003).

Today although most populations of blue whale remain below pre-exploitation levels, stocks in the North Atlantic (e.g. around Iceland and off California) and eastern North Pacific have shown signs of recovery since protection by the International Whaling Commission in 1965 (Clapham *et al.*, 1999; Jefferson *et al.*, 1994; Reeves *et al.*, 2003). According to WDCS (2004), 3,000 blue whales remain in the region. This trend of increase contrasts with the complete absence of blue whales today off southern Japan, and their apparent rarity in the Gulf of Alaska and southern Bering Sea where they were once abundant (Reeves *et al.*, 2003). In the southern hemisphere the story is even less positive, with just 460 animals occurring. The likely global population is therefore fewer than 3,500 whales, a figure considerably lower than previous estimates of between 6,000 and 14,000 (WDCS, 2004).

Like other large whales, they are threatened by environmental change (including noise and chemical pollution). Hunting has been banned since 1996, but blue whale meat still turns up in Japan, labelled as other species of whale (WDCS, 2004). Blue whales require continued protection and close monitoring into the foreseeable future. There does not appear to be any immediate intention to resume commercial whaling for them, nor is there any other well-defined threat from human activities. Their nearly exclusive dependence upon euphausiids,

especially krill (*Euphasia superba*) in the Antarctic, could make blue whales vulnerable to large-scale changes in ocean productivity caused, for example, by climatic change (Reeves *et al.*, 2003).

Angola:

Status: Southern Hemisphere blue whales have been reported as far north as Angola (WDCS, 2004).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Antarctica*:

Status: Southern Hemisphere blue whales tend to feed between the Antarctic pack ice and the Antarctic convergence zone during the austral summer (WDCS, 2004). Between 1975 and 1990, the estimated stock of blue whales in the Antarctic dropped from 44,958 to 660 animals (UNEP-WCMC, 2004). Numbers of living Blue Whales in the Antarctic remain extremely low (estimates are only in the hundreds), and it is uncertain what proportion are “true” blue whales (*B. m. intermedia*) as opposed to “pygmy” blue whales (*B. m. brevicauda*) (Reeves *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Antigua and Barbuda:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

ARGENTINA:

Status: Individuals have been found in the coast of this country (Redford & Eisenberg, 1992). Catalogued as Endangered in the Argentinean Mammals Red Data Book (Díaz & Ojeda, 2000).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

AUSTRALIA:

Status: The population size is estimated to be as low as 1000. There is little or no evidence to suggest that the population size is increasing. The Blue whale has been recorded from all Australian marine areas between 20°S and 70°S. They are generally observed more than 2km off the Australian continent and islands, except off the south-western and south-eastern areas of the continent. Blue whales are known to feed in key localities, including the Rottnest Trench (Western Australia), Portland (Victoria) and Eden (New South Wales). The Blue whale is classified as ‘Endangered’ in Australian waters (Australia National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: Various relevant studies on topics such as migration, surveys, feeding and pollution have been carried out. Monitoring activities include Australian Coast watch and the Australian Cetacean Sighting Database (Environment Australia). The Australian Whale Sanctuary was established in 1980. Future activities involve ongoing research and monitoring programmes, with additional habitat protection if required (Australia National Report, 2002).

Other actions: From October 2002, the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society has been supporting a project led by Margie Morrice and Peter Gill who are studying

the blue whales in the Bonney Coast upwelling region, Southern Australia (WDCS, 2004). The study has focused on establishing links between climate, oceanography, krill and blue whales, and on assessing threats to blue whales in the region (WDCS, 2004).

Bahamas:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Bahrain:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Bangladesh:

Status: Occurrence reported before 1950 (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Barbados:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

BELGIUM:

Status: The Belgium National Report to CMS (2002) does not consider the country as a range state for this species.

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Belize:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

BENIN:

Status:

CMS actions: There have been sea trips to observe only and there is no realistic possibility of assessing the population (Benin National Report, 2002).

Other actions:

Brazil:

Status: Southern Hemisphere blue whales have been reported as far north as Brazil (WDCS, 2004).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Brunei Darussalam:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Cambodia:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

CAMEROON:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Canada:

Status: It occurs in offshore waters off the west coast of Canada and was common there during commercial whaling in the 20th century although current sightings are rare. In the North Atlantic they are best known from Icelandic and eastern Canadian waters. The blue whale is sighted regularly in the Gulf and estuary of the St. Lawrence from April to December, while few have been sighted off Canada's west coast (Sears and Calambokidis, 2002).

There appear to be two populations in the North Atlantic Ocean currently numbering 600-1,500 blue whales. A total of 372 blue whales have been photographically identified over the past 21 years in eastern Canada (up to 105 individuals in a single year). There is insufficient data to determine the current population trend, and there are fewer than 250 mature individuals capable of reproduction (Sears and Calambokidis, 2002).

Today, the biggest threats for blue whales come from ship strikes, disturbance from increasing whale watch activity, entanglement in fishing gear, and pollution. They may also be vulnerable to long-term changes in climate, which could affect the abundance of their prey (zooplankton) (Sears and Calambokidis, 2002).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Cape Verde:

Status: In the winter blue whales have been recorded in the Eastern Atlantic off the Cape Verde islands (WDCS, 2004).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

CHILE:

Status: Currently there are about 8,000 specimens of blue whale, of which probably 5,000 are Pigmy blue whales *Balaenoptera musculus brevicauda* (Chile National Report, 2002). Individuals have been found in the coast of this country (Redford & Eisenberg, 1992).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions: WDCS has recently started funding the blue whale research work of Rodrigo Hucke-Gaete in Chile. The main goals are: (1) Determine and characterize habitat essential to the survival and recovery of blue whales and the extent to which physical and biological processes determine distribution, movements and behaviour, and (2) Identify current and potential conservation threats to blue whales and their habitat and raise public awareness on the most relevant issues (WDCS, 2004).

China:

Status: **Taiwan**

In the winter, some North Pacific blue whales head along the eastern North Pacific, where they breed off Taiwan (WDCS, 2004).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Colombia:

Status:

CMS actions:

Other actions:

Comoros:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

CONGO:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

D.R. CONGO:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Cook Islands:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Costa Rica:

Status: In the winter, some North Pacific blue whales migrate south along the coast of Costa Rica (WDCS, 2004).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

COTE D'IVOIRE:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Cuba:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

CYPRUS:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

DENMARK:

Status: Not reported as a range state for the species in Denmark National Report to CMS (2002).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

DJIBOUTI:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Dominica:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

**Dominican
Republic:**

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

ECUADOR:

Status: Southern Hemisphere blue whales have been reported as far north as Ecuador (WDCS, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

El Salvador:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Equatorial Guinea:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Eritrea:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Fiji:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

FINLAND:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

FRANCE:

Status: Occurrence reported in French Polynesia (UNEP-WCMC, 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Gabon:

Status:

CMS actions:

Other actions:

GAMBIA:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

GERMANY*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Nowak, 1981).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

GHANA:

Status:

CMS actions: CMS funded surveys on exploitation, distribution and natural history of cetaceans in Ghana during 2001 and 2002.

Other actions:

GREECE*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Nowak, 1981).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Grenada:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Guatemala:



Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

GUINEA:

Status: Common on the continental plateau and decreasing or increasing periodically (Guinea National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

GUINEA-BISSAU:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Guyana:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Haiti:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Honduras:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Iceland*:

Status: Blue whales migrate up to the Arctic, to waters around and Iceland (WDCS, 2004). Trends of increase around Iceland have been reported (Reeves *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions:

Other actions:

INDIA:

Status: Occurrence reported (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Indonesia:

Status: Occurrence reported (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

I.R. Iran:

Status: Not reported in this country (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Iraq:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

IRELAND:

Status: Population size unknown, but acoustic detection of blue whales has shown seasonal cycles, increasing from mid-July to December (Ireland National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: Research has been conducted in the Atlantic margin, but no future activities are planned yet for the species (Ireland National Report, 2002)

Other actions:

ITALY*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Nowak, 1981).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Jamaica:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Japan:

Status: In the winter, some North Pacific blue whales head along the eastern North Pacific, where they breed off Japan (WDCS, 2004). There is a complete absence of blue whales today off southern Japan (Reeves *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

JORDAN:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

KENYA:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Kiribati:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

D.P.R. Korea:

Status: In the winter, some North Pacific blue whales head along the eastern North Pacific, where they breed off Taiwan, Japan and Korea (WDCS, 2004).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Republic of Korea:

Status: In the winter, some North Pacific blue whales head along the eastern North Pacific, where they breed off Taiwan, Japan and Korea (WDCS, 2004).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Kuwait:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Lebanon:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

LIBERIA:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Madagascar:

Status: A localised upwelling cell has recently been described inshore of the East

Madagascar Current where it diverges from the coast at the southern tip of Madagascar. This cell seems to be a very persistent phenomenon, being current- rather than wind-driven, and may be the source of filaments of biologically enriched water that are carried further south. Such conditions might create a predictable feeding ground for migrating blue whales of the sub-Antarctic Region, similar to those reported off southern Australia (Best *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions: As part of the International Whaling Commission's SOWER blue whale research programme, two sighting vessels surveyed the Madagascar plateau in December 1996 (Best *et al.*, 2003).

Malaysia:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Maldives:

Status:

There have been reports of blue whales around the Maldives, but very little is known about their movements (WDCS, 2004). Blue whales were reported to strand on Maldivian and other South Asian coasts more frequently during January to April (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Marshall Islands:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

MAURITANIA:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

MAURITIUS:

Status:

Occurrence reported (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Mexico:

Status:

In the winter, some North Pacific blue whales migrate south along the coast of and Baja California (WDCS, 2004). Based on boat and aerial surveys conducted between 1994 and 2002, the distribution of blue whales in the coastal waters on the Peninsula is now well defined. They are found in the Gulf of California between November and June, and are present along the Pacific coast from late winter to late spring. It is also known that blue whales occur in the open waters around the Peninsula but little is known about their relationship with the coastal whales (WDCS, 2004).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions: WDCS is funding biologist and blue whale expert Diane Gendron to research the blue whales living in the warm, azure waters of Baja California, Mexico. Preliminary research, based upon photo-identification and samples of sloughed skin, suggests that habitat use is determined by gender, with females and juveniles being found in coastal waters, and only males venturing into open waters (WDCS, 2004).

F.S. Micronesia:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

MOROCCO:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Mozambique:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Myanmar:

Status: Not reported to occur in Myanmar waters (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Namibia:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Nauru:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

NETHERLANDS:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

NEW ZEALAND:

Status: Occasional coastal New Zealand sightings in spring and early summer during migration south to Antarctic waters. No local population data, but IWC estimates less than 1,000 individuals in the Southern Hemisphere. (New Zealand National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: Aerial survey off the northeastern coast records migrating whales (New Zealand National Report, 2002).

Other actions:

Nicaragua:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

NIGERIA:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Niue:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

NORWAY*:

Status: Blue whales migrate up to the Arctic, to waters around Spitsbergen (WDCS, 2004). No information about the species was provided in the Norwegian National Report to CMS (2002).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Oman:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

PAKISTAN:

Status: It is casually sighted during and after monsoon season (Pakistan National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: None reported. Data collection is planned for the species (Pakistan National Report, 2002).

Other actions:

Palau:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

PANAMA:

Status: In the winter blue whales migrate south, from the waters off New York State, New Jersey, Florida and down to San Cristobel, Panama (WDCS, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Papua New Guinea:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

PERU:

Status: Its abundance and population trend is not known, but they can be seen at any time of the year, particularly during summer and north of Chimbote (09° 04' S) (Peru National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: Research activities have been carried out along the Peruvian coast, by the Instituto del Mar de Peru (IMARPE), as well as studies about biology of dolphins and whales and their relation and interactions with fisheries, carried out by ACOREMA (Peru National Report, 2002).

Other actions:

PHILIPPINES:

Status:

Reported as a range state, but the presence of the species in Philippine waters is still to be confirmed (Philippines National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: Surveys to confirm the occurrence of blue whales are integrated in different cetaceans survey projects such as: Cetacean Research and Conservation project (WWF Philippines), National Stock Assessment program (BFAR), and cetaceans surveys being undertaken by the Siliman University and the University of the Philippines-Marine Science Institute (Philippines National Report, 2002).

Other actions:

POLAND:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

PORTUGAL:

Status:

Unknown. Every year few individuals are sighted in the Azores waters

(Portugal National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: **Azores**

Project MARE. Integrated management of coastal and marine areas in the Azores. LIFE Project, contract LIFE B4-3200/98-509 (Portugal National Report, 2002).

Madeira

Project for the conservation of cetaceans in Madeira archipelago. LIFE Project, contract LIFE 99 NAT/P/6432 (Portugal National Report, 2002).

Other actions:

Russian

Federation:

Status:

In the summer blue whales in the North Pacific tend to feed anywhere between central California, right up to the Gulf of Alaska and the Bering Sea and as far west as the Kamchatka Peninsula (WDCS, 2004).

Thousands of blue whales were killed, but not reported, by Soviet whaling fleets in the 1960s and 1970s. Trends of increase of Blue Whales around Iceland and off California contrast with their apparent rarity in the Gulf of Alaska and southern Bering Sea where they were once abundant (Reeves *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Qatar:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Saint Kitts

and Nevis:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Saint Lucia:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

**Saint Vincent and
the Grenadines:**

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Samoa:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

SAO TOME

AND PRINCIPE:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

SAUDI ARABIA:

Status:

Occurrence reported (WDCS, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:



SENEGAL:

Status: There is no precise information about this species (Senegal National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: Senegal would like to put in place a strategy for the preservation and protection of this species, but lacks knowledge, expertise and the financial means to facilitate good monitoring of this species (Senegal National Report, 2002).

Other actions:

Seychelles:

Status: Occurrence reported (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Sierra Leone:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

SOMALIA:

Status: Occurrence reported (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

SOUTH AFRICA:

Status: One sighting of one blue whale between 1 January and 15 February 2003 (Oosthuizen, 2001).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

SPAIN:

Status: Its presence in open waters of the Atlantic ocean and the Gulf of Cadiz is not rare, but densities are low. Most of the blue whale sightings are recorded in the “Banco de Galicia” area, separated 100 miles or more from Galicia coast (Finisterre), and over 1,000 individuals pass across the North-West Peninsular area. The species does not enter the Mediterranean Sea (Purroy & varella, 2003). There are no population estimates for the species, but it is estimated that in the period 1968-1990 the population has been increasing at a rate of approximately 5% per year. It is listed as “vulnerable” in the Endangered Species National Catalogue (Spain National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

SRI LANKA:

Status: Between February and April Blue Whales are found around Sri Lanka (Cetacea, 2001). Occurrence reported (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Sudan:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Suriname:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

SWEDEN (?):

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

**SYRIAN ARAB
REPUBLIC:**

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

U.R. TANZANIA:

Status: Tanzania National report to CMS does not consider the country as range state for the species (Tanzania National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

TOGO:

Status:

CMS actions: CMS funded surveys on the exploitation, distribution and Natural history of Cetaceans in Togo during 2001 and 2002 (Togo National Report, 2002).

Other actions:

Tonga:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Trinidad and Tobago:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Tuvalu:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

**United Arab
Emirates:**

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

**UNITED
KINGDOM:**

Status:

CMS actions:

Other actions:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions: The blue whale is protected in the UK by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (UNEP-WCMC, 2004). WDCS is promoting the conservation of blue whales, together with other cetaceans (The Big Blue Whale Road Show), using life size inflatables, together with a rolling programme of educational talks (WDCS, 2004).

United States:

United States:

Status:

In the summer blue whales in the North Pacific tend to feed anywhere between central California, right up to the Gulf of Alaska and the Bering Sea and as far west as the Kamchatka Peninsula. In the winter, North Pacific blue whales either migrate south along the coast of Southern California or else head along the eastern North Pacific (WDCS, 2004). The North Pacific whales could

include up to five populations, with two occurring within the US Exclusive Economic Zone (NOAA, 2000).

California/Mexico/Costa Rica population (Eastern North Pacific Stock)

Whales feed in California waters from June to November then migrate south to productive areas off Mexico and as far south as the Costa Rica Dome in winter/spring. An estimate of 1,736 blue whales is available for California, Oregon and Washington, based on ship line-transect surveys in 1996 and 2002, but other authors used photographic mark-recapture and estimated lower population sizes. The best estimate of blue whale abundance is the average of the line-transect and mark-recapture estimates, weighted by the inverse of their variances, or 1,480. Blue whales may have increased in abundance in California coastal waters between 1979/80 and 1991 and between 1991 and 1996. This may be an increase in stock or in the use of California as a feeding area (NOAA, 2003). Trends of increase off California contrast with their apparent rarity in the Gulf of Alaska and southern Bering Sea where they were once abundant (Reeves *et al.*, 2003).

Central Pacific/Gulf of Alaska population

The California population of blue whales is probably separate from the Gulf of Alaska population. Whales feeding along the Aleutian Islands are probably part of a central Pacific stock, which may migrate to offshore waters north of Hawaii in winter. Recently, however, blue whale feeding aggregations have not been found in Alaska despite several surveys. No data are available to estimate population size (NOAA, 2000).

Hawaiian population

Blue whales are extremely rare in Hawaii, and no data are available to estimate population size. The only published sighting record is from 1966, north of the Hawaiian Islands. From ship line-transect surveys, a population of 1,400 blue whales was estimated in 1993 for the eastern tropical Pacific. Acoustic recordings were also made off Oahu and Midway Islands in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s suggesting that the animals were migrating into the area in summer and winter. No estimate of annual human-caused mortality and serious injury is available as there are no reports of recent direct or incidental takes of blue whales in Hawaiian waters (NOAA, 2000). No data are available to provide a minimum population estimate or the current population trend (NOAA, 2000).

Second California and Mexico population

One other stock of North Pacific blue whales (off California and Mexico) is recognized in the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) stock Assessment Reports. No data are available to estimate population size (NOAA, 2000).

In Monterrey bay, California, it has been demonstrated that blue whales consume DA (Domoic acid, a potent web transferred algal toxin that has caused dramatic mortality events involving sea birds and sea lions) contaminated prey. DA contamination of whale feces and fish occurred only during blooms of toxic *Pseudo-nitzschia* (Lefebvre *et al.*, 2002).

Western North Atlantic population

The distribution of the blue whale in the western North Atlantic generally extends from the Arctic to at least mid-latitude waters. Blue whales are most frequently sighted in the waters off eastern Canada, with the majority of recent records from the Gulf of St. Lawrence (NOAA, 2002)

Little is known about the population size of blue whales except for in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Here, 308 individuals have been catalogued, but the data were

deemed to be unusable for abundance estimation. This is considered to be a minimum population estimate for the western North Atlantic Stock. There are insufficient data to determine population trends for this species (NOAA, 2002). The total level of human-caused mortality and serious injury is unknown, but it is believed to be insignificant and approaching a zero mortality and serious injury rate (NOAA, 2002).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

URUGUAY:

Status: Status unknown (Uruguay National Report, 2002). Individuals have been found on the coasts of this country (Redford & Eisenberg, 1992).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Vanuatu:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Venezuela:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Viet Nam:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Yemen:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

REFERENCES:

Australia National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.

Belgium National Report (2002) National report to CMS.

Benin National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.

Best, P.B., Rademeyer, R.A., Burton, C., Ljungblad, D., Sekiguchi, K., Shimada, H., Thiele, D., Reeb, D. and Butterworth, D.S. (2003) The abundance of blue whales on the Madagascar Plateau, December 1996. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management* 5(3): pp. 253-260.

Cetacea (2001). Cetacea: Whales, dolphins and porpoises. www.cetacea.org/index.htm
Downloaded on 09/03/2003.

Chile National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.

Cetacean Specialist Group (1996). *Balaenoptera musculus*. In: IUCN 2004. 2004 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. www.redlist.org. Downloaded on 20 February 2004.

Clapham, P.J., Young, S.B. and Brownell, R.L. Jr. (1999). Baleen whales: conservation issues and the status of the most endangered populations. *Mammal Review*, 29: 35–60.

De Boer, N.M. Baldwin, R. Burton, C.L.K. Eyre, E.L. Jenner, K.C.S. Jenner, M.N.M. Keith, S.G. McCabe, K.A. Parsons, E.C.M. Peddemors, V.M. Rosebaum, H.C. Rudolph, P. Simmonds, M.P. (2003) *Cetaceans in the Indian Ocean Sanctuary: A Review*. A WDCS Science Report.

[http://www.wdcs.org/dan/publishing.nsf/c525f7df6cbf01ef802569d600573108/9c76567b8cc72ff080256d2d00301341/\\$FILE/IOSreview.pdf](http://www.wdcs.org/dan/publishing.nsf/c525f7df6cbf01ef802569d600573108/9c76567b8cc72ff080256d2d00301341/$FILE/IOSreview.pdf) Downloaded on 23/11/2004.

- Diaz, G.B. and R.A. Ojeda, editors, (2000). *Libro Rojo de los Mamíferos amenazados de Argentina*. Sociedad Argentina para el Estudio de los Mamíferos, SAREM. 106 pp.
- Guinea National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- Ireland National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- Jefferson, T.A., Leatherwood, S. and Webber, M.A. (1994). *Marine mammals of the world. FAO Species Identification Guide*. FAO and UNEP, 320pp.
- Lefebvre, K.A. Bargu, S. Kieckhefer, T. and Silver, R.W. (2002) From sanddabs to blue whales: the pervasiveness of Domoic acid. *Toxicon*, 40: 971-977.
- New Zealand National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- NOAA (2000) Stock Assessment report (SARs) by Species/stock. Blue whale (*Balaenoptera musculus*): Hawaiian stock.
[http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Blue_Whale_\(Hawaii\)/PO00bluewhale_hawaii.pdf](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Blue_Whale_(Hawaii)/PO00bluewhale_hawaii.pdf) Downloaded on 19/11/2004.
- NOAA (2002) Stock Assessment report (SARs) by Species/stock. Blue whale (*Balaenoptera musculus*): Western North Atlantic Stock.
[http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Blue_Whale_\(Western_N._Atlantic\)/AO02bluewhale_westernN.atlantic.pdf](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Blue_Whale_(Western_N._Atlantic)/AO02bluewhale_westernN.atlantic.pdf) Dwnloaded on 19/11/2004.
- NOAA (2003) Stock Assessment Reports (SARs) by Species/stock. Blue whale (*Balaenoptera musculus*): Eastern North Pacific Stock.
[http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Blue_Whale_\(EasternN.Pacific\)/PO00bluewhale_easternNpacific.pdf](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Blue_Whale_(EasternN.Pacific)/PO00bluewhale_easternNpacific.pdf) Downloaded on 19/11/2004.
- Nowak, E. (1981). *Die Säugetiere der Länder der Europäischen Gemeinschaft. Artenkatalog mit Angaben über Vorkommen und gesetzlichen Schutzstatus*. Kilda-Verlag, Greven, Germany
- Nowak, R.M. (1991) *Walker's mammals of the world*, Fifth Edition. John Hopkins University Press, Boston.
- Oosthuizen, W.H. (2001) South Africa. Progress Report on cetacean research, January 2001 to December 2001, with statistical data for the Calender year 2001.
http://www.iwcoffice.org/documents/sci_com/2002progreports/SC-54-ProgRep%20SouthAfrica.pdf Downloaded on 18/11/2004.
- Pakistan National Report (2002) National Report to CMS.
- Peru National Report (2002) National Report to CMS.
- Philippines National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- Portugal National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- Purroy, F.J. and Varela, J.M. (2003) *Guía de los mamíferos de España, Peninsula , Baleares y Canarias*. Lynx Edicions – SEO BirdLife. Barcelona.
- Redford, K. H. and Eisenberg, J. F. (1992). *Mammals of the Neotropics. Vol.2. Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay*. University of Chicago Press.
- Reeves, R.R., Smith, B.D., Crespo, E.A. and di Sciara, G.N. (comps.) (2003). *Dolphins, Whales and Porpoises: 2002-2010 Conservation Action Plan for the World's Cetaceans*. IUCN/SSC Cetacean Specialist Group. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.
- Sears, R. and Calambokidis, J. (2002). Update COSEWIC status report on the Blue Whale *Balaenoptera musculus* in Canada, in *COSEWIC assessment and update status report on the Blue Whale Balaenoptera musculus in Canada*. Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada. Ottawa. 1-32 pp.
http://www.sararegistry.gc.ca/virtual_sara/files/cosewic/sr%5Fblue%5Fwhale%5Fe%2Epdf Downloaded on 19/11/2004.
- Senegal National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- Spain National Report (2002) National Report to CMS.
- Togo National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- UNEP-WCMC (2004). Species Database. www.unep-wcmc.org Downloaded on 17/11/2004.
- Uruguay National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.

WDCS (2004) The Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society. *Blue whale*.

<http://www.wdcs.org/dan/publishing.nsf/allweb/803E6F754FC6728380256966005087>

B7 Downloaded on 18/11/2004.

* Range State not yet included in the CMS range list for this species.

Balaenoptera physalus - synthesis

Country	Reported as nationally threatened	Apparent trend	CMS actions reported (in 2002 National Reports)	Other recent actions reported in the literature
Algeria		?		
Angola		?		
Antarctica		?		
ARGENTINA	●	?	×	
AUSTRALIA		?	×	
Bangladesh		?		
BELGIUM		?	×	
Brazil		?		
Canada		?		
China		?		
COTE D'IVOIRE		?	×	
CROATIA		?	×	
CYPRUS		?	×	
DENMARK (Greenland)		↑?	×	
ECUADOR		?	×	
EGYPT		?	×	
FRANCE		?	×	
GERMANY		?	×	
GREECE		?	×	
Iceland		↑		
INDIA		?	×	
Indonesia		?		
IRELAND		?	×	
ISRAEL		?	×	
ITALY		?	×	
Japan		?		
KENYA		?	×	
D.P.R. Korea		?		
Republic of Korea		?		
Madagascar		?		
Malaysia		?		
MAURITIUS		?	×	
Mexico		?		
MONACO		?	×	
MOROCCO		?	×	
Myanmar		?		
Namibia		?		
NETHERLANDS		?	×	
NEW ZEALAND		?	×	
NORWAY		?	×	
PAKISTAN		?	×	
POLAND		?	×	
PORTUGAL		?	×	
Russian Federation		?		
SAUDI ARABIA		?	×	
SOUTH AFRICA		?	×	
SPAIN		?	×	
SRI LANKA		?	×	
Suriname		?		

Balaenoptera physalus - synthesis

Country	Reported as nationally threatened	Apparent trend	CMS actions reported (in 2002 National Reports)	Other recent actions reported in the literature
TANZANIA		?	x	
TUNISIA		?	x	
Turkey		?		
UNITED ARAB EMIRATES		?	x	
UNITED KINGDOM	●	?	x	
United States		↑		
URUGUAY		?	x	
Venezuela	●	?		

REVIEW OF CONCERTED ACTION SPECIES

MAMMALIA: BALAENOPTERIDAE

- SPECIES:** *Balaenoptera physalus* (Linnaeus, 1758)
- SYNONYMS:** -
- COMMON NAME:** Common Rorqual; Fin Whale; Finback; Fin-backed Whale; Finner; Herring Whale; Razorback (English); Baleine à nageoires; Baleine fin; Baleinoptère commun; Rorqual commun (French); Ballena aleta; Ballena boba; Rorcual común (Spanish)
- RANGE STATES:** Angola; ARGENTINA; AUSTRALIA; Bangladesh; Brazil; Canada; China (incl. Hong Kong, Taiwan); DENMARK (Faeroe Isles); Denmark (Greenland); ECUADOR; FRANCE (French Polynesia, French Southern Territories); Iceland; INDIA; Indonesia; ITALY; Japan; KENYA; Korea, Democratic People's Republic of; Korea, Republic of; Madagascar; Mexico; Myanmar; Namibia; NEW ZEALAND; NORWAY (incl. Jan Mayen, Svalbard); PAKISTAN; POLAND; PORTUGAL; Russian Federation; SOUTH AFRICA; SPAIN; SRI LANKA; Suriname; TANZANIA, UNITED REPUBLIC OF; TUNISIA; UNITED ARAB EMIRATES; UNITED KINGDOM (South Georgia, South Sandwich Islands); United States; international waters
- RED LIST RATING:** EN A1abd (Cetacean Specialist Group, 1996)

CONSERVATION STATUS AND ACTIONS:

The fin whale is found throughout every ocean in the world, from the tropics to the Polar Regions, but is rarely seen inshore. It is a pelagic species, seldom found in water less than 200 meters deep. Numerous discrete populations have been identified, most of which are known to be highly migratory. In the spring and early summer, populations generally move into cold temperate and polar waters to feed, and in the autumn they return to warm temperate and tropical regions. The species migrate to polar waters in summer for feeding and return to warmer seas in winter for breeding (Nowak, 1991). It is least common in the tropics and do enter polar waters but not as often as blue or minke whales (WDCS, 2004).

When the stocks of blue whales became severely depleted from commercial whaling, attention turned to the other rorquals, in particular the fin whale. Hunting of this species peaked during the 1950s and 1960s, with catches in excess of 30,000 animals per year (Cetacea, 2001). Between 1904 and 1979 nearly 750,000 were reportedly taken in the Southern Hemisphere alone, which had the largest original population (IWC, 1995).

The current status is poorly known in most areas outside the North Atlantic (including the Mediterranean Sea), where recent studies indicate that there is a series of geographical “stocks” with limited genetic exchange (Bérubé *et al.* 1998), totalling more than 40,000 animals (Reeves *et al.*, 2003). Fin whales are rarely encountered today in those areas of the Southern Hemisphere where they were taken in large numbers (Reeves *et al.*, 2003). According to Cetacea (2001) the estimated current total population is 50,000 to 100,000 animals.

The fin whale suffered an estimated decline of at least 50% worldwide over the last three generations (assumed generation time was 20–25 years). Between 1970 and 1990

circumglobal numbers of fin whale continued to decrease from 124,222 animals to 24,000 (UNEP-WCMC, 2004). Whether the species will recover to original population levels is doubtful (Cetacea, 2001).

Ship-strikes remain a major cause of fin whale mortality (Laist *et al.* 2001). Fin whales are currently hunted only in Greenland, but they would likely also become a principal target in Iceland if whaling were to resume there (Reeves *et al.*, 2003).

Algeria*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Notarbartolo-di-Sciara *et al.*, 2003, UNEP-WCMC, 2004).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Angola:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Antarctica*:

Status: Fin whales occur in the Antarctic (UNEP-WCMC, 2004; WDCCS, 2004). Between late November and March, fin whales feed here (Cetacea, 2001).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

ARGENTINA:

Status: Individuals have been found in the coasts of Argentina (Redford & Eisenberg, 1992). Reported as Vulnerable in the Argentinean Mammals Red Data Book (Díaz & Ojeda, 2000).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

AUSTRALIA:

Status: Recorded to occur off the south-western coast, and likely to be present in the Tropical Indian Ocean Pelagic, shelf and near-shore waters (De Boer *et al.*, 2003). It has been recorded from all states except New South Wales, and Northern Territory.

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Bangladesh:

Status: The species has not been sighted in this country waters (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

BELGIUM*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Nowak, 1981).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Brazil:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Canada:

Status: They are one of the most commonly seen whales in the north, often seen offshore from Eastern Canada (WDCS, 2004). Between June and October fin whales visit the Maritimes and Newfoundland, and St Lawrence at Saguenay River (Cetacea, 2001). Between 1970 and 1985, the numbers of fin whales off Newfoundland decreased from 4,483 to 2,330 animals; a decrease was also seen for the same period off Nova Scotia of 1,070 to 537 animals (UNEP-WCMC, 2004).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

CHILE*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Redford and Eisenberg, 1992).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

China:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

COTE D'IVOIRE*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Amon Kothias and N'Goran, 1991).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

CROATIA*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Notarbartolo-di-Sciara *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

CYPRUS*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Notarbartolo-di-Sciara *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

DENMARK:

Status:

Greenland

Fin whales are currently hunted only in Greenland (Reeves *et al.*, 2003). Between 1970 and 1985, the estimated numbers of fin whales in Greenland increased from 7,043 to 7,174 (UNEP-WCMC, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

ECUADOR:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

EGYPT*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Nowak, 1981).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

FRANCE:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

GERMANY*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Nowak, 1981).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

GREECE*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Notarbartolo-di-Sciara *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Iceland:

Status: They are one of the most commonly seen whales in the north, often seen offshore from Iceland (WDCS, 2004). Between 1970 and 1985, the numbers of fin whale reported off Iceland rose from 3,561 to 6,593 animals (UNEP-WCMC, 2004). Fin Whales would likely become a principal target in Iceland if whaling were to resume there (Reeves *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

INDIA:

Status: Occurrence reported (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Indonesia:

Status: Occurrence reported (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

IRELAND*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Berrow *et al.*, 2002).

CMS actions:

Other actions:

ISRAEL*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Notarbartolo-di-Sciara *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

ITALY:

Status: There is a significant presence of fin whale in the coastal waters of Ischia. In this area, the continental slope results to be incised by submarine canyons, of which the deepest one is that of Cuma. These canyons seem to be the main reason of this concentration of fin whales in such a small area (35 square miles) so close to the island. Sedimentation and hydrodynamics help to create a special habitat characterised by a great local density and diversity of benthic and pelagic fauna exceeding that of other habitats along the continental shelf and slope (Mussi *et al.*, 1999).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Japan:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

KENYA:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

D.P.R. Korea:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Republic of Korea:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Madagascar:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Malaysia*:

Status: Possible occurrence in Sarawak (UNEP-WCMC, 2004).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

MAURITIUS*:

Status: Occurrence reported here (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Mexico:

Status: They are one of the most commonly seen whales in the north, often seen offshore from Baja California. Those in the Gulf of California appear to be resident all year round (WDCS, 2004). Between January and April, fin whales move into the Gulf of California (Cetacea, 2001).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

MONACO*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Notarbartolo-di-Sciara *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

MOROCCO*:

Status: Occurrence reported (UNEP-WCMC, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Myanmar:

Status: Presence not confirmed in this country (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Namibia:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

NETHERLANDS*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Nowak, 1981).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

NEW ZEALAND:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

NORWAY:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

PAKISTAN:

Status: Occurrence reported (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

POLAND:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

PORTUGAL:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Russian Federation:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

SAUDI ARABIA*:

Status: Occurrence reported (de Silva, 1987; De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

SOUTH AFRICA:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

SPAIN:

Status: Spring migration parallel to the Atlantic coast, and with records from the north of Menorca, Gibraltar, Creus cape and Estaca de Bares (Purroy & Varela, 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

SRI LANKA:

Status: Occurrence reported (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Suriname:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

U.R. TANZANIA:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

TUNISIA:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Turkey*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Notarbartolo-di-Sciara *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

UNITED ARAB

EMIRATES:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

UNITED KINGDOM

(South Georgia South

Sandwich Islands):

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions: Protected in the UK by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (UNEP-WCMC, 2004).

United States:

Status: **Mainland**

They are one of the most commonly seen whales in the north, often seen offshore from New England and Baja California. Those in the Gulf of California appear to be resident all year round (WDCS, 2004). Between January and April, fin whales move into the Gulf of California (Cetacea, 2001). Between April and May fin whales can be seen off the coast of New England (Cetacea, 2001).

California/Oregon/Washington stock

The initial pre-whaling population of fin whales in the North Pacific was estimated to be 42,000-45,000. In 1973, the North Pacific population was estimated to have been reduced to 13,620-18,680, of which 8,520-10,970 were estimated to belong to the eastern Pacific stock. Recently 3,279 fin whales were estimated to be off California, Oregon and Washington based on ship surveys in summer/autumn of 1996 and 2001. The minimum population estimate is approximately 2,541 (NOAA, 2003a), and there is some indication that fin whales have increased in abundance in California coastal waters between 1980 and 1981 and 1991 and 1996, but these trends are not significant. Although the population in the North Pacific is expected to have grown since receiving protected status in 1976, the possible effects of continued unauthorized take and incidental ship strikes and gillnet mortality make this uncertain (NOAA, 2003a).

Northeast Pacific stock

In the North Pacific Ocean, fin whales can be found from above the Arctic circle to lower latitudes of approximately 20° N. This is classified as a strategic stock. Reliable estimates of the minimum population size, population trends and status of the stock are currently not available, although surveys in the Bering sea during the summer of 1999 provided an estimated abundance of 4,951 whales, but this estimate can not be used as an estimate of the entire Northeast Pacific Stock because it is based on a survey in only part of the stock's range (NOAA, 2001).

Hawaiian stock

The species is rare in Hawaiian waters. No data are available to provide a minimum population estimate or current population trend (NOAA, 2000).

Western North Atlantic Stock

Fin whales are common in waters of the USA Atlantic Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), principally from Cape Hatteras northward. In this region, fin whales are probably the dominant large cetacean species in all seasons, with the largest standing stock and the largest food requirements. The best estimate of abundance for fin whales is 2,814, and the minimum population estimate for the Western North Atlantic fin whale is 2,362 (NOAA, 2003b)

There are insufficient data to determine population trends for this species, and the total level of human-caused mortality and serious injury is unknown (NOAA, 2003b).

Aside from the threat of illegal whaling or increased legal whaling, potential threats affecting fin whales include collisions with vessels, entanglement in fishing gear, and habitat degradation from chemical and noise pollution. Fin whales are known to have been killed or seriously injured by inshore fishing gear off eastern Canada and the United States (CFMC, 2004).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

URUGUAY*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Redford and Eisenberg, 1992).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Venezuela*:

Status: Occurrence reported. It is included in the Red Data Book of Venezuela as Vulnerable, and its presence offshore the Paraguaná Peninsula is probable, but there are no confirmed records (Rodríguez & Rojas-Suárez, 1999).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

REFERENCES:

- Amon Kothias, J.-B. and N'Goran, N. Y. (1991). Note sur les baleines échouées en estuaires artificiels en Côte d'Ivoire. *Journal Ivoirien d'Océanologie et de Limnologie*, 1(2): 153-155.
- Berrow, S. D., Whooley, P. and Ferriss, S. (2002). *Irish Whale and Dolphin Group cetacean sighting review (1991-2001)*. Irish Whale and Dolphin Group, Kilrush, Co. Clare.
- Bérubé, M., Aguilar, A., Dendanto, D., Larsen, F., Notarbartolo di Sciarra, G., Sears, R., Sigurjónsson, J., Urbán-R, J. and Palsbøll, P.J. (1998). Population genetic structure of North Atlantic, Mediterranean Sea and Sea of Cortez Fin Whales, *Balaenoptera physalus* (Linnaeus 1758): analysis of mitochondrial and nuclear foci. *Molecular Ecology*, 7: 585–599.
- Cetacea (2001). Cetacea: Whales, dolphins and porpoises. www.cetacea.org/index.htm Downloaded on 09/03/2003.
- Cetacean Specialist Group (1996). *Balaenoptera physalus*. In: IUCN (2004). 2004 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. www.redlist.org Downloaded on 17/02/2004.
- CFMC (2004) Caribbean Fishery Management Council. U.S. Virgin Islands Marine Resources and Fisheries Strategic and Comprehensive Action Plan-2005. Appendix 1C. Marine Species Overview, Non-Harvestable Species. <http://www.vifishandwildlife.com/fisheries/FisheriesPlan2/append1c.pdf> Downloaded on 11/05/2005.
- De Boer, N.M. Baldwin, R. Burton, C.L.K. Eyre, E.L. Jenner, K.C.S. Jenner, M.N.M. Keith, S.G. McCabe, K.A. Parsons, E.C.M. Peddemors, V.M. Rosebaum, H.C. Rudolph, P. Simmonds, M.P. (2003) *Cetaceans in the Indian Ocean Sanctuary: A Review*. A WDCS Science Report. [http://www.wdcs.org/dan/publishing.nsf/c525f7df6cbf01ef802569d600573108/9c76567b8cc72ff080256d2d00301341/\\$FILE/IOSreview.pdf](http://www.wdcs.org/dan/publishing.nsf/c525f7df6cbf01ef802569d600573108/9c76567b8cc72ff080256d2d00301341/$FILE/IOSreview.pdf) Downloaded on 23/11/2004.
- de Silva, P. H. D. H. (1987). Cetaceans (whales, dolphins and porpoises) recorded off Sri Lanka, India, from the Arabian Sea and Gulf, Gulf of Aden and from the Red Sea. *Journal of the Bombay Natural History Society*, 84: 505-525.
- Diaz, G.B. and R.A. Ojeda, editors, (2000). *Libro Rojo de los Mamíferos amenazados de Argentina*. Sociedad Argentina para el Estudio de los Mamíferos, SAREM. 106 pp.
- IWC (1995). Report of the scientific committee. *Report of the International Whaling Commission*, 45: 53–221.
- Laist, D.W., Knowlton, A.R., Mead, J.G., Collet, A.S. and Podesta, M. (2001). Collisions between ships and whales. *Marine Mammal Science*, 17, 35–75.
- Mussi, B., Miragliuolo, A., Monzini, E., Diaz Lopez, B. and Battaglia, M. (1999) Fin whale (*Balaenoptera physalus*) feeding ground in the coastal water of Ischia (Archipelago Campano). *European Research on Cetaceans*, 13, pp. 330-335.
- NOAA (2000) Stock Assessment Reports (SARs) by Species/stock. Fin whale (*Balaenoptera physalus*). Hawaiian stock. [http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Fin_Whale_\(Hawaii\)/PO00finwhale_hawaii.pdf](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Fin_Whale_(Hawaii)/PO00finwhale_hawaii.pdf) Downloaded on 23/11/2004.
- NOAA (2001) Stock Assessment Reports (SARs) by Species/stock. Fin whale (*Balaenoptera physalus*). Northeast Pacific Stock.

- [http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Fin_Whale_\(Northeast_Pacific\)/AK01finwhale_NortheastPacific.pdf](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Fin_Whale_(Northeast_Pacific)/AK01finwhale_NortheastPacific.pdf) Downloaded on 23/11/2004.
- NOAA (2003a) Stock Assessment Reports (SARs) by Species/stock. Fin whale (*Balaenoptera physalus*). California/Oregon/Washington stock. [http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Fin_Whale_\(CA-OR-WA\)/po03finwhalecaorwa.pdf](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Fin_Whale_(CA-OR-WA)/po03finwhalecaorwa.pdf) Downloaded on 23/11/2004.
- NOAA (2003b) Stock Assessment Reports (SARs) by Species/stock. Fin whale (*Balaenoptera physalus*). Western North Atlantic Stock. [http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Fin_Whale_\(Western_N._Atlantic\)/ao03finwhalewesternatlantic.pdf](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Fin_Whale_(Western_N._Atlantic)/ao03finwhalewesternatlantic.pdf) Downloaded on 23/11/2004.
- Notarbartolo-di-Sciara, G., Zanardelli, M., Jahoda, M., Panigada, S. and Airoidi, S. (2003). The fin whale *Balaenoptera physalus* (L. 1758) in the Mediterranean Sea. *Mammal Review*, 33(2): 105-150.
- Nowak, E. (1981). Die Säugetiere der Länder der Europäischen Gemeinschaft. Artenkatalog mit Angaben über Vorkommen und gesetzlichen Schutzstatus. German Kilda-Verlag, Greven, Germany.
- Nowak, R.M. (1991) *Walker's mammals of the world*, Fifth Edition. John Hopkins University Press, Boston.
- Purroy, F.J. and Varela, J.M. (2003) *Guía de los mamíferos de España, Península , Baleares y Canarias*. Lynx Edicions – SEO BirdLife. Barcelona.
- Redford, K. H. and Eisenberg, J. F. (1992). *Mammals of the Neotropics. Vol.2. Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay*. University of Chicago Press.
- Reeves, R.R., Smith, B.D., Crespo, E.A. and di Sciara, G.N. (coms.) (2003). *Dolphins, Whales and Porpoises: 2002-2010 Conservation Action Plan for the World's Cetaceans*. IUCN/SSC Cetacean Specialist Group. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.
- Rodríguez, J. P. and Rojas-Suárez, F. (1999). *Libro rojo de la fauna Venezolana*. 2da edición. PROVITA, Caracas (Venezuela).
- UNEP-WCMC (2004). Species Database. www.unep-wcmc.org Downloaded on 24/02/2004.
- WDCS (2004). The Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society www.wdcs.org Downloaded on 22/11/2004.

* Range State not yet included in the CMS range list for this species.

Eubalaena australis - synopsis

Country	Reported as nationally threatened	Apparent trend	CMS actions reported (in 2002 National Reports)	Other recent actions reported in the literature
Antarctica		?		
ARGENTINA	●	?	✓	
AUSTRALIA		↑	✓	
Brazil	●	?		✓
CHILE		?	✓	
Cook Islands		?		
FRANCE		?		
INDIA		?		
Japan		?		
KENYA		?		
NEW ZEALAND		↑	✓	
Niue		?		
PERU		?	✓	
SOUTH AFRICA		?	x	✓
TANZANIA		?	x	
UNITED KINGDOM		?	x	
URUGUAY		?	x	✓

REVIEW OF CONCERTED ACTION SPECIES

MAMMALIA: BALAENIDAE

- SPECIES: *Eubalaena australis* (Desmoulins, 1822)
- SYNONYMS: *Balaena glacialis australis*
- COMMON NAME: Southern Right Whale (English); Baleine australe (French); Ballena franca (Spanish)
- RANGE STATES: ARGENTINA; AUSTRALIA (including Heard Island); Brazil; CHILE (including Easter Island); Cook Islands; FRANCE (Amsterdam Island, Crozet Islands, Kerguelen, St. Paul Island); NEW ZEALAND (including Antipodes Islands, Auckland Islands, Bounty Islands, Campbell Island, Chatham Islands, Kermadec Islands, Snares Islands, Solander Island, Stewart Island, Three Kings Islands, Tokelau); Niue; SOUTH AFRICA (including Prince Edward Islands); UNITED KINGDOM (Falkland Islands (Malvinas), Tristan da Cunha); URUGUAY; international waters (Southern Indian Ocean, Southern Pacific Ocean)
- RED LIST RATING: LR/cd (Cetacean Specialist Group, 1996)

CONSERVATION STATUS AND ACTIONS:

Southern right whales live only in the southern hemisphere and never mix with northern right whales. They are circumpolar mainly between 20° S and 55° S. They mate and calve during the winter in the inshore waters of Chile, Argentina, Brazil, South Africa, Southern Australia and some southern hemisphere islands, then migrate to waters nearer Antarctica to feed during the summer months (WDCS, 2004). Both species of right whales were the first large cetaceans to be commercially hunted by man, possibly as early as the 10th Century. The species were granted protection in 1935 (Cetacea, 2001).

Although not as endangered as the northern species, southern right populations remain small in absolute terms (Jefferson *et al.*, 1994). Cetacea (2001) estimates the current population to be varying between 1,500 and 4,000. IWC (2001) put the figure at about 7,000 animals. Unlike their relatives in the Northern Hemisphere, several populations of Southern Right Whales (*E. australis*) have shown evidence of strong recovery (Bannister 2001, Best *et al.* 2001, Cooke *et al.* 2001).

Continued protection will allow substantial recovery of at least some of these populations according to Best (1993), although other sources are less optimistic. Cetacea (2001) doubts that right whales will ever recover to former numbers.

Current threats include entanglements in fishing gear, vessel collisions and habitat destruction. Despite full protection from the International Whaling Commission there is also probably still some hunting for right whales (Jefferson *et al.*, 1994). A major factor delaying recovery in the species was the illegal and unreported killing of more than 3,300 southern right whales by the Soviet Union between 1951/1952 and 1971/1972 in the Southern hemisphere (Tormosov *et al.* 1998).

Antarctica*:

Status: Southern right whales migrate to waters near Antarctica to feed during the summer months (WDCS, 2004).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

ARGENTINA:

Status: Southern right whales mate and calve during the winter in the inshore waters of Argentina then migrate to waters nearer Antarctica to feed during the summer months (WDCS, 2004). Off the Valdés Peninsula, Chubut province, right whales congregate seasonally to breed (Redford & Eisenberg, 1992). The species was declared natural monument in 1984 (Argentina National Report, 2002) and it is included as Vulnerable in the Argentinean Mammals Red Data Book (Diaz & Ojeda, 2000).

CMS actions: During 1999 and 2000, scientists from the National Patagonia Centre (CENPAT-CONICET) monitored the populations of this species, from the parallel 44 to the outlet of Chubut river. Approximately 1,200 whales visit this area each year, and the population is estimated to be increasing in a 7% basis each year (Argentina National Report, 2002).

Other actions:

AUSTRALIA:

Status: Southern right whales mate and calve during the winter in the inshore waters of southern Australia, then migrate to waters nearer Antarctica to feed during the summer months (WDCS, 2004). The Australian population of southern right whales is thought to number 1,200, although only a proportion of these will visit Australia each year. The species is distributed south of 30°S, principally around the southern coastline from Perth (Western Australia) to Sydney (New South Wales), including Tasmania. Key localities include Point Ann and Point Charles (western Australia), the head of the Great Australian Bight (South Australia) and Warrnambool (Victoria). There has been a steady increase (up to 7%) of Southern right whales observed in Australia (Australia National Report, 2002)

CMS actions: Research, monitoring and habitat protection (through the Australian Whale Sanctuary, established in 1980) have been carried out (Australia National Report, 2002).

Other actions:

Brazil:

Status: Southern right whales mate and calve during the winter in the inshore waters of Brazil then migrate to waters nearer Antarctica to feed during the summer months (WDCS, 2004). Between June and September/October southern right whales can be seen around the southern part of Santa Catarina Island (Cetacea, 2001). Catalogued as Vulnerable in the Brazilian Red Data Book (Fonseca *et al.*, 1994)

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions: The first whale sanctuary (Official Environment Protection Area) was created in September 2000 in the Southern state of Santa Catarina by a decree of Brazil's president, and covers the 130 kilometers stretch of coast that the southern right whale uses for calving and breeding. The Brazilian Right Whale Project is monitoring local southern right whale populations, educating local communities, promoting whale-watching tourism, and establishing guidelines for tourist operators (CSI, 2000).

CHILE:

Status: Southern right whales mate and calve during the winter in the inshore waters of Chile then migrate to waters nearer Antarctica to feed during the summer months (WDCS, 2004). The current population in Chilean waters is unknown (Chile National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: Research and monitoring of the species have been carried out (Chile National Report, 2002).

Other actions:

Cook Islands:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

FRANCE:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

INDIA*:

Status: Occurrence reported (de Silva, 1987).

CMS actions:

Other actions: None reported.

Japan*:

Status: Occurrence reported at Bouvet Island (UNEP-WCMC, 2004).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

KENYA*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Davies and Vanden Berghe, 1994).

CMS actions:

Other actions: None reported.

NEW ZEALAND:

Status: Southern right whales are found seasonally around New Zealand (Cetacea, 2001). There are major breeding areas off New Zealand (Jefferson *et al.*, 1994). The population trend is positive. The maximum single count in major breeding area in Auckland islands (sub Antarctic) is 125, with a population estimate of 200-300 (New Zealand National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: A marine mammal sanctuary and a World Heritage site protect the breeding area around New Zealand's sub-Antarctic islands. Research on the species has been conducted in collaboration with Australia (New Zealand National Report, 2002).

Other actions:

Niue:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

PERU*:

Status: Two individuals were sighted in Peru in November 1987, and a female with one calve were seen in Atico, August 1996. There are no estimations for population and trends (Peru National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: Research and surveys have been conducted along the Peruvian coast, and a study about whales and dolphins biology and their relation with fisheries was carried out (Peru National Report, 2002).

Other actions:

SOUTH AFRICA:

Status: Southern right whales mate and calve during the winter in the inshore waters of South Africa then migrate to waters nearer Antarctica to feed during the summer months (WDCS, 2004). Between 24 July and 20 December 2001, the MRI (Mammal Research Institute, University of Pretoria) Whale Unit maintained a shore-based watch for migrating humpback and right whales from North head, Saldanha Bay, and 217 sightings of 354 southern right whales were made. Over the same period, the Unit's 6 m. inflatable *Balaena* spent 52 days off Saldanha Bay, in which a total of 63 groups of southern right whales were intercepted for photo-identification, biopsy and confirmation of group size (Oosthuizen, 2001).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions: A genetic study of southern right whales was conducted between 1995 and 1997 (Earthwatch Institute, 2004).

U.R. TANZANIA*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Davies and Vanden Berghe, 1994; UNEP-WCMC, 2004). The species is not reported as ranging in this country in the National Report to CMS (2002).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

**UNITED
KINGDOM:**

Status: Occurrence reported in Saint Helena, in the Malvinas (Falkland Islands) (UNEP-WCMC, 2004), in South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands (Bonner, 1987), and in Tristan da Cunha island, where the available evidence therefore suggests that the right whales were able to stage a demonstrable recovery during this century (up to 1960) because, unlike any other putative southern hemisphere stock unit, they were not subjected either to a shore-based fishery in the late 19th century or to a phase of coastal modern whaling in the early 20th century (Best, 1988)

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

URUGUAY:

Status: Individuals have been found in the shores of this country (Redford & Eisenberg, 1992).

CMS actions: No conservation actions have been carried out due to lack of financial resources (Uruguay National Report, 2002).

Other actions: From July 2003, WDCS has been funding research by the FrancaAustral project led by Paula Costa, Paula Franco Fraguas and Mariana Piedra, to obtain the first systematic right whale data in Uruguay (WDCS, 2004).

REFERENCES:

- Argentina National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- Australia National Report (2002) National Report to CMS.
- Bannister, J.L. (2001). Status of Southern Right Whales (*Eubalaena australis*) off Australia. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management*, (Special Issue) 2: 103–110.
- Best, B.P. (1988) Right whales (*Eubalaena australis*) at Tristan da Cunha- A clue to the 'non-recovery' of depleted stocks? *Biological Conservation* 46 (1), pp.23-51.
- Best, P.B. (1993). Increase rates in several depleted stocks of baleen whales. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 50: 169–186.
- Best, P.B., Brandão, A. and Butterworth, D.S. (2001). Demographic parameters of southern right whales off South Africa. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management*, (Special Issue) 2: 161–169.
- Bonner, W. N. (1987). Right whale sightings around South Georgia. *British Antarctic Survey Bulletin*, 76: 99-103.
- Cetacea (2001). Cetacea: Whales, dolphins and porpoises. www.cetacea.org/index.htm Downloaded on 24/11/2004.
- Cetacean Specialist Group (1996). *Eubalaena australis*. In: IUCN (2004). 2004 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. www.redlist.org Downloaded on 17/02/2004.
- Chile National Report (2002) National Report to CMS.
- Cooke, J.C., Rowntree, V.J. and Payne, R. (2001). Estimates of demographic parameters for southern right whales (*Eubalaena australis*) observed off Península Valdés, Argentina. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management*, (Special Issue) 2: 125–132.
- CSI (2000) Cetacean Society International. Whales alive!-Vol. IX N°4, October 2000 <http://csiwhalesalive.org/csi00407.html> Downloaded on 24/11/2004.
- Davies, G. and Vanden Berghe, E. (1994). *Check-list of the mammals of East Africa*. East Africa Natural History Society, Nairobi.
- de Silva, P. H. D. H. (1987). Cetaceans (whales, dolphins and porpoises) recorded off Sri

- Lanka, India, from the Arabian Sea and Gulf, Gulf of Aden and from the Red Sea.
English Journal of the Bombay Natural History Society, 84: 505-525.
- Earthwatch Institute (2004). www.earthwatch.org Downloaded on 24/11/2004.
- Fonseca, G.A.B., da Rylands, A.B., Costa, C.M.R., Machado, R.B. and Leyte, I.L.R. (1994)
Livro Vermelho dos Mamíferos Brasileiros Ameaçados de Extinção. Fundação
Biodiversitas, Belo Horizonte, Brazil.
- IWC (2001). Report of the workshop on the comprehensive assessment of right whales: a
worldwide comparison. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management*, (Special
Issue) 2: 1–60.
- Jefferson, T.A., Leatherwood, S. and Webber, M.A. (1994). *Marine mammals of the world*.
FAO Species Identification Guide. FAO and UNEP, 320pp.
- New Zealand National Report (2002) National Report to CMS.
- Oosthuizen, W.H. (2001) South Africa. Progress Report on cetacean research, January 2001
to December 2001, with statistical data for the Calendar year 2001.
[http://www.iwcoffice.org/
documents/sci_com/2002progreports/SC-54-
ProgRep%20SouthAfrica.pdf](http://www.iwcoffice.org/documents/sci_com/2002progreports/SC-54-
ProgRep%20SouthAfrica.pdf) Downloaded on 18/11/2004.
- Peru National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- Redford, K. H. and Eisenberg, J. F. (1992). *Mammals of the Neotropics. Vol.2*. Chile,
Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay. University of Chicago Press.
- Reeves, R.R., Smith, B.D., Crespo, E.A. and di Sciara, G.N. (comps.) (2003). *Dolphins,
Whales and Porpoises: 2002-2010 Conservation Action Plan for the World's
Cetaceans*. IUCN/SSC Cetacean Specialist Group. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and
Cambridge, UK.
- Tanzania National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- Tormosov, D.D., Mikhailiev, Y.A., Best, P.B., Zemsky, V.A., Sekiguchi, K. and Brownell Jr.,
R.L. (1998). Soviet catches of Southern Right Whales *Eubalaena australis*, 1951–
1971. Biological data and conservation implications. *Biological Conservation* 86:
185–197.
- UNEP-WCMC (2004). Species Database. www.unep-wcmc.org Downloaded on 24/11/2004.
- Uruguay National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- WDCS (2004). The Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society www.wdcs.org Downloaded on
23/11/2004.

* Range State not yet included in the CMS range list for this species.

Lontra felina - synopsis

Country	Reported as nationally threatened	Apparent trend	CMS actions reported (in 2002 National Reports)	Other recent actions reported in the literature
ARGENTINA	●	?	*	
CHILE	●	?	✓	✓
PERU	●	?	✓	

REVIEW OF CONCERTED ACTION SPECIES

MAMMALIA: MUSTELIDAE

SPECIES: *Lontra felina* (Molina, 1782)

SYNONYMS: *Lutra felina*

COMMON NAME: Chingungo; Chungungo; Marine Otter; Sea Cat (English); Chungungo; Loutre de mer (French); Chichimen; Chinchimen; Chungungo; Gato de mar; Gato marino; Huallaca; Nutria de mar; Nutria marina (Spanish)

RANGE STATES: ARGENTINA; CHILE; PERU

RED LIST RATING: EN A3ce (Vogel, 2004).

CONSERVATION STATUS AND ACTIONS:

The marine otter is distributed along the Pacific coast from northern Peru along the Chilean coast to Cape Horn and Isla de Los Estados in Argentina. It inhabits marine areas exposed to heavy seas, strong wind, and a high diversity of rockfishes, molluscs, and crustaceans. It is only rarely found in freshwater habitats. The original range of the marine otter has decreased considerably as a result of excessive hunting, and the species has been nearly exterminated from some regions, becoming patchy in its distribution. The largest populations of marine otter remain along the west coast of Chiloé Island and in southern parts of Chile (IUCN, 2004).

The greatest threats to the marine otter are accelerated habitat destruction, degradation, competition for prey and terrestrial refuges with man (as the diet of the marine otter is composed mostly of invertebrates, including crabs and molluscs also exploited by humans, there is a direct competition with humans), accidental kill in crab pots and poaching throughout the species range. These threats are estimated to potentially lead to a future reduction in population size of around 50% over the next 10 years (IUCN, 2004).

ARGENTINA:

Status: The Marine Otter is on the verge of extinction with three isolated populations, the most important of which is found in the Naheul Huapi National Park (Aued *et al.*, 2003). There are tiny remnant populations down the east coast of Tierra del Fuego and Staten Island (Otter joy, 2004). It is protected (IOSF, 2004). Catalogued as Endangered in the Argentinean Mammals Red Data Book (Diaz & Ojeda, 2000).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

CHILE:

Status: *Lutra felina* is threatened (IOSF, 2004). The largest populations of marine otters remain along the west coast of Chiloé Island and in southern parts of Chile. In this region, however, there is very little information about hunting, habitat conservation, and the status and distribution of otter populations. Poaching may be another important threat south of Chiloé Island since there is very little control of such activities in this area (IUCN, 2004).

Information about population size is poor, due to the difficulties in the species habitat. However, it has been possible to determine density in

terms of animals per kilometre of coast, which varies from one to ten animals/km along the 4,718km of Chilean coast (Chile National Report, 2002). Considering the mean otter density along the Chilean coast, it was estimated that the population could number 7,549 animals, and taking into account burrow densities, it would increase to 12,266 animals (considering one animal per burrow) (Chile National Report, 2002).

It is legally protected (IOSF, 2004).

CMS actions: There is currently no funding or platforms to undertake necessary studies spanning the extensive Chilean littoral but future ecological studies are planned. Research has been conducted in this country (Chile National Report, 2002).

Other actions: In 1994, IOSF funded a project on the 'Status of the Marine Otter on the central coast of Chile, Isla Catchagua' and in 2002 it funded a project on the feeding ecology of the Marine Otter in southern Chile (IOSF, 2004).

PERU:

Status: It can be estimated from local reports that the northern limit of this population might be Puerto de Harmey and the southern limit lies in Morro Sama. Estimations of population size for the Peruvian coast are not accurate; between 200 and 300 animals were estimated by IUCN in 1982, but the current population trend is unknown (Peru National Report, 2002). It is protected in this country (INRENA, 2004) and the species is catalogued as threatened with extinction. The only protected populations reside in Paracas National Reserve (Pulido Capurro, 1991).

CMS actions: A population assessment will be conducted by INRENA (Natural Resources National Institute) and APECO (Peruvian Association for Conservation of Nature), funded by CMS (Peru National Report, 2002).

Other actions:

REFERENCES:

- Aued, M.B, Chehebar, G, Porro, G, Macdonald, D.W, and Cassini, M.H. (2003). Environmental correlates and the distribution of the Southern river otters *Lontra provocax* at different ecological scales. *Oryx*, 37. No 4.
- Chile National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- Diaz, G.B. and R.A. Ojeda, editors, (2000). *Libro Rojo de los Mamíferos amenazados de Argentina*. Sociedad Argentina para el Estudio de los Mamíferos, SAREM. 106 pp.
- INRENA (2004). Instituto Nacional de Recursos Naturales. <http://www.inrena.gob.pe/> Downloaded on 25/11/2004.
- IOSF (International Otter Survival Fund) (2004). The marine otter, *Lontra felina*. <http://www.otter.org/otterframes.html> Downloaded on 25/11/2004.
- IUCN (2004). 2004 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. www.redlist.org. Downloaded on 25/11/2004.
- Otter joy (2004). The marine otter, *Lontra felina*. http://www.otterjoy.com/OTTERINFO/Lontra_felina.html Downloaded on 25/11/2004.
- Peru National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- Pulido Capurro, V. (1991) *El Libro Rojo de la Fauna Silvestre del Peru*. Maijosa, Lima, Peru.
- Vogel, G.M. (2004). *Lontra felina*. In: IUCN (2004). *2004 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species*. www.redlist.org. Downloaded on 25/11/2004.

Megaptera novaeangliae - synopsis

Country	Reported as nationally threatened	Apparent trend	CMS actions reported (in 2002 National Reports)	Other recent actions reported in the literature
Angola		?		
Antarctica		?		
Antigua and Barbuda		?		
ARGENTINA	●	?	✘	
AUSTRALIA		↑	✓	
Bahamas		?		
Bahrain		?		
Bangladesh		?		
Barbados		?		
BELGIUM		?	✘	
Belize		?		
BENIN		?	✓	
Brazil	●	?		✓
Brunei Darussalam		?		
Cambodia		?		
CAMEROON		?	✘	
Canada	●	?		✓
Cape Verde		?		✓
CHILE		↑	✓	✓
China		?		
Colombia		?		✓
Comoros		?		
CONGO		↑	✘	
D.R CONGO		?	✘	
Cook Islands		?		
Costa Rica		?		
COTE D'IVOIRE		?	✘	
Cuba		?		
CYPRUS		?	✘	
DENMARK		?	✘	
DJIBOUTI		?	✘	
Dominica		?		
Dominican Republic		?		
ECUADOR		?	✘	
EGYPT		?	✘	
El Salvador		?		
Equatorial Guinea		?		
Eritrea		?		
Fiji		?		
FINLAND		?	✘	
FRANCE		↑	✘	
Gabon		?		
GAMBIA		?	✘	
GHANA		?	✘	
GREECE		?	✘	
Grenada		?		
Guatemala		?		
GUINEA		?	✘	

Megaptera novaeangliae - synopsis

Country	Reported as nationally threatened	Apparent trend	CMS actions reported (in 2002 National Reports)	Other recent actions reported in the literature
GUINEA-BISSAU		?	x	
Guyana		?		
Haiti		?		
Honduras		?		
Iceland		?		
INDIA		?	x	
Indonesia		?		
Iran		?		
Iraq		?		
IRELAND		?	✓	
ISRAEL		?	x	
ITALY		?	x	
Jamaica		?		
Japan		?		
JORDAN		?	x	
KENYA		?	✓	
Kiribati		?		
D.P.R. Korea		?		
Republic of Korea		?		
Kuwait		?		
Lebanon		?		
Liberia		?		
Madagascar		?		
Malaysia		?		
Maldives		?		
MALTA		?	x	
Marshall Islands		?		
MAURITANIA		?	x	
MAURITIUS		?	x	
Mexico		?		
F.S. Micronesia		?		
MOROCCO		?		
Mozambique		?		
Myanmar		?		
Namibia		?		
Nauru		?		
NETHERLANDS		?	x	
NEW ZEALAND		?	✓	✓
Nicaragua		?		
NIGERIA		?	x	
Niue		?		
NORWAY		?	x	
Oman		?		
PAKISTAN		?	x	
Palau		?		
PANAMA		?	x	
Papua New Guinea		?		
PERU		?	✓	
PHILIPPINES	●	?	✓	✓

Megaptera novaeangliae - synopsis

Country	Reported as nationally threatened	Apparent trend	CMS actions reported (in 2002 National Reports)	Other recent actions reported in the literature
POLAND		?	x	
PORTUGAL		?	x	
Russian Federation		?		
Qatar		?		
Saint Kitts and Nevis		?		
Saint Lucia		?		
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		?		
Samoa		?		
SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE		?	x	
SAUDI ARABIA		?	x	
SENEGAL		?	x	
Seychelles		?		
Sierra Leone		?		
Singapore		?		
Solomon Islands		?		
SOMALIA		?	x	
SOUTH AFRICA		?	x	✓
SPAIN		?	x	
SRI LANKA		?	x	
Sudan		?	x	
Suriname		?		
SWEDEN(?)		?	x	
TANZANIA		?	✓	
Thailand		?		
TOGO		?		
Tonga		↑		
Trinidad and Tobago		?		
TUNISIA		?	x	
Tuvalu		?		
United Arab Emirates		?		
UNITED KINGDOM	●	?	x	
United States	●	↑		✓
URUGUAY		?	x	
Vanuatu		?		
Venezuela	●	?		
Viet Nam		?		
Yemen		?		

REVIEW OF CONCERTED ACTION SPECIES

MAMMALIA: BALAENOPTERIDAE

- SPECIES:** *Megaptera novaeangliae* (Borowski, 1781)
- SYNONYMS:** -
- COMMON NAME:** Bunch; Hump Whale; Humpback Whale; Hunchbacked Whale (English); Baleine à bosse; Baleine à taquet; Jubarte; Mégaptère; Rorqual à bosse; Rorqual du Cap (French); Ballena jorobada; Gubarte; Jorobada; Rorcual jorobado (Spanish)
- RANGE STATES:** Angola; Antigua and Barbuda; ARGENTINA; AUSTRALIA (Including Heard Island); Bahamas; Bahrain; Bangladesh; Barbados; BELGIUM; Belize; BENIN; Brazil; Brunei Darussalam; Cambodia; CAMEROON; Canada; Cape Verde; CHILE; China (including Hong Kong, Taiwan); Colombia; Comoros; CONGO; CONGO, DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE; Cook Islands; Costa Rica; COTE D'IVOIRE; Cuba; CYPRUS; DENMARK; Denmark (Greenland); DJIBOUTI; Dominica; Dominican Republic; ECUADOR (including Galapagos Islands); EGYPT; El Salvador; Equatorial Guinea; Eritrea; Fiji; FRANCE (including Amsterdam Island, Clipperton Island, Corsica, Crozet Islands, French Guiana, Guadeloupe, Kerguelen, Martinique, New Caledonia, St. Paul Island, St. Pierre-et-Miquelon, Wallis and Futuna Islands); Gabon; GAMBIA; GHANA; Grenada; Guatemala; GUINEA; GUINEA-BISSAU; Guyana; Haiti; Honduras; Iceland; INDIA (including Andaman Islands, Laccadive Islands, Nicobar Islands); Indonesia; Iran (Islamic Republic of); Iraq; IRELAND; ISRAEL; Jamaica; Japan (including Bonin Islands); JORDAN; KENYA; Kiribati; Korea, Democratic People's Republic of; Korea, Republic of; Kuwait; LIBERIA; Madagascar; Malaysia; Maldives; MALTA; Marshall Islands; MAURITANIA; MAURITIUS; Mexico (including Cedros, Guadalupe); Micronesia (Federated States of); MOROCCO; Mozambique; Myanmar; Namibia; Nauru; NETHERLANDS (including Aruba, Bonaire, Curaçao, Saba, Sint Eustatius); NEW ZEALAND (including Antipodes Islands, Auckland Islands, Bounty Islands, Campbell Island, Chatham Islands, Kermadec Islands, Snares Islands, Solander Island, Stewart Island, Three Kings Islands, Tokelau); Nicaragua; NIGERIA; Niue; NORWAY (including Bouvet Island, Jan Mayen Island, Svalbard); Oman; PAKISTAN; Palau; PANAMA; Papua New Guinea; PERU; PORTUGAL; Qatar; Saint Kitts and Nevis; Saint Lucia; Saint Vincent and the Grenadines; Samoa; SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE; SAUDI ARABIA; SENEGAL; Seychelles; Sierra Leone; Singapore; Solomon Islands; SOMALIA; SOUTH AFRICA (including Prince Edward Islands); SPAIN; SRI LANKA; Sudan; Suriname; SWEDEN (?); TANZANIA, UNITED REPUBLIC OF; Thailand; TOGO; Tonga; Trinidad and Tobago; TUNISIA; Tuvalu; United Arab Emirates; United Kingdom (Anguilla); UNITED KINGDOM (including Ascension Island, Bermuda, British Indian Ocean Territory, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Cyprus, Falkland Islands (Malvinas), Gibraltar, Montserrat, Pitcairn, St. Helena, South Georgia, South Orkney Islands, South Sandwich Islands, South

Shetland Islands, Tristan da Cunha, Turks and Caicos Islands); United States (including American Samoa, Guam, Hawaiian Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, United States Virgin Islands); URUGUAY; Vanuatu; Venezuela (including Lesser Antilles); Viet Nam; Yemen; international waters

RED LIST RATING: VU A1ad (Cetacean Specialist Group, 1996)

CONSERVATION STATUS AND ACTIONS:

The humpback whale is a widely distributed species, occurring seasonally in all oceans from the Arctic to the Antarctic, with distinct populations located in virtually every sea (Cetacea, 2001). All populations of humpback whale undertake vast migrations between high-latitude summer feeding grounds and tropical breeding grounds (Clapham, 2000). The longest migration is probably made by the Hawaii humpbacks, which travel to the Bering Strait and Alaska's Glacier Bay every year to feed (Cetacea, 2001). Since 1990, the number of humpback whale observations in the Mediterranean Sea has increased and the range of sighting locations has expanded to cover both basins of the Mediterranean Sea (Frantzis *et al.*, 2004). Cetacea (2001) quotes the current global population at 20,000 animals. IUCN (2004) estimates the population is increasing.

Humpbacks were not traditionally a favourite of whalers, but their slow swimming speeds and coastal habits made them easy targets for modern large-scale commercial whaling (Jefferson *et al.*, 1994). Individuals were taken on migrations between their feeding and breeding grounds, as well as on these grounds. Between 1904 and 1939, 102,298 humpbacks were taken in the Southern Hemisphere alone, and the annual worldwide kill was above 2,400 in every season from 1948/49 to 1963/64. From 1964 to 1966 the International Whaling Commission extended protection to all populations, except that a small aboriginal quota continued (Nowak, 1991).

In 1944 humpbacks received international protection from commercial whaling (Jefferson *et al.*, 1994), although they are still threatened by entrapment in fishing nets (Cetacea, 2001). They are also vulnerable to ship collisions and disturbance (even serious injury) from industrial noise. Despite this humpbacks seem able to adapt, or at least tolerate, living in close proximity to a considerable variety and amount of human activities. They are actively hunted today only in a few locations (Reeves *et al.*, 2003). With growing humpback populations, however, pressure to resume commercial whaling in at least a few areas is likely to mount (Reeves *et al.*, 2003).

Although most monitored stocks have demonstrated remarkable resilience and have shown evidence of fast recovery (Clapham *et al.*, 1999) and may have increased to more than 50% of their levels three generations ago (1930s, assuming a 20-year generation time), humpbacks have not yet attained 80% of those levels (IUCN, 2004). Between 1980 and 1995 the number of humpbacks in the central north Pacific rose from an estimated 1,234 to an estimated 3,832 animals (UNEP-WCMC, 2004). Other data seem to contrast with this: between 1970 and 1990, the populations in the combined northern oceans (Arctic Sea, Black sea, Atlantic Ocean, Indian Ocean, Mediterranean, Pacific) declined from an estimated 45,038 to an estimated 25,954 animals (UNEP-WCMC, 2004).

Humpbacks are the subjects of numerous local population studies (e.g., Steiger and Calambokidis 2000, Razafindrakoto *et al.* 2001) as well as basin-scale research programs (Baker *et al.* 1998, Smith *et al.* 1999).

Angola:

Status:



CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Antarctica*:

Status: Between late November and March humpback whales feed here (Cetacea, 2001). Occurrence of the species in Antarctica is also reported by UNEP-WCMC (2004).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS

Other actions:

Antigua and Barbuda:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

ARGENTINA:

Status: Individuals have been stranded on the southern coasts of Argentina (Redford and Eisenberg, 1992). Reported as Vulnerable in the Argentinean Mammals Red Data Book (Diaz & Ojeda, 2000).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

AUSTRALIA:

Status: The humpback whale is known as a coastal species in Australian waters in winter and spring, and occurs in waters south of 15°S. Key locations include sites along the Western Australian, Queensland and New South Wales coasts. Breeding locations are known off the northern Western Australian coast and the central Great Barrier Reef area. The western Australian population is estimated to be 4-6,000, and the eastern Australian population is approximately 5,000, with population increases estimated to be in the order of 10% per annum (Australia National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: Numerous projects including research into the status of the humpback whale based on aerial surveys, estimating seasonal abundance and survival rates, predator-prey relationships, behaviour, migratory movements (Australia National Report, 2002). Monitoring activities are also carried out by Australian Coastwatch and Australian Cetacean Sighting Database (Environment Australia) and the habitat is being protected through the Australian Whale Sanctuary, established in 1980. A Recovery Plan, under federal legislation, is being developed. There will also be ongoing research and monitoring programs, with additional habitat protection if required (Australia National Report, 2002).

Other actions:

Bahamas:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Bahrain:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Bangladesh:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Barbados:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

BELGIUM:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Belize:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

BENIN:

Status: Monitoring of the species has been carried out but no population estimates are available (Benin National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Brazil:

Status: The Brazilian coast is recognised as a southern Hemisphere humpback whale wintering ground (IWC breeding stock 'A'). The relatively high density off northeastern Brazil suggests that the species is reoccupying historical areas of distribution and the presence of newborn individuals indicates that calving and nursing occur in the area (Zerbini *et al.*, 2004). Catalogued as Vulnerable in the Brazilian Red Data Book (Fonseca *et al.*, 1994).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions: Shipboard sighting surveys were conducted in this area to evaluate large whales' distribution and density in 1999 and 2000 (Zerbini *et al.*, 2004).

Brunei

Darussalam:

Status: Not a Party to CMS.

CMS actions:

Other actions:

Cambodia:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

CAMEROON:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Canada:

Status: Between June and October for humpback whales visit the Maritimes and Newfoundland (Cetacea, 2001). Roughly 2,000 humpbacks live in the Northern Pacific today. Designated as threatened by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC) (Fisheries and Oceans Canada, 2004).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions: In co-operation with the Vancouver Aquarium Marine Sciences Centre (VAMSC), Fisheries and Oceans Canada is working with universities and the eco-tourism industry on a range of projects related to the humpback whale. Programs include public education through displays at the Vancouver Aquarium Marine Science Centre, a web site and other media (Fisheries and Oceans Canada, 2004).

Cape Verde:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions: During the winter-spring seasons of 1990, 1991, 1995, 1996, 1999, 2000, 2001 and 2002 a total of 42 individual humpbacks were identified by fluke photographs from the waters of the Cape Verde Islands. These were compared with photographs taken elsewhere in the North Atlantic. One match was made with a whale previously photographed in the Denmark Strait off Iceland, providing the first direct evidence of a link between the humpbacks in tropical waters of the eastern North Atlantic and a high-latitude feeding ground (Jann *et al.*, 2003).

CHILE:

Status:

In recent years there has been an apparent increase in the frequency of sightings of humpback whales off the coast of Chile, especially during summer and autumn in the Patagonian fjords between 49°S and 53°S. Carlos III Island, in the southwestern section of the Straits of Magellan, appears to be a suitable feeding habitat for humpback whales (Gibbons *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: A project on cetacean ecology, involving monitoring is being conducted (Chile National Report, 2002).

Other actions: The relationship between the humpback whales of the Straits of Magellan with animals from Colombia and the Western Antarctic Peninsula is being investigated through analysis of genetic and photo-id evidence (Gibbons *et al.*, 2003).

China:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Colombia:

Status:

The only well-known reproductive area for humpback whales in the eastern tropical Pacific is around the Gorgona Islands in Colombia. Estimates for this population range between 170-450 animals and re-sightings with Antarctic humpbacks have confirmed that these animals migrate from Antarctic waters (Scheidat *et al.*, 2000).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions: WWF is assessing the potential for establishing a new protected area around Bahia Malaga and has joined other NGOs to hold a yearly festival along the Colombia coast to raise awareness about humpbacks and other migratory species in the Pacific (WWF, 2004). The Yubarta Foundation has studied humpbacks in Colombia since 1986, and it was one of the firsts groups to call attention to its presence and the risks faced in Colombian waters (WWF, 2004).

Comoros:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

CONGO:



Status: Intensive hunting in the Asia region has resulted in a large presence of humpback whales in recent years, which have been observed from oilrigs (Congo National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

D.R. CONGO:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Cook Islands:

Status: The Cook islands region appears to represent a breeding ground for humpback whales, presumably from the little-studied Area VI population. The Southern Cook Islands represent a calving ground for humpback whales during the austral winter. The population identity of the humpbacks in the region remains to be established (Hauser *et al.*, 2000).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Costa Rica:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

COTE

D'IVOIRE:

Status: Occurrence reported (UNEP-WCMC, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Cuba:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

CYPRUS:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Denmark

(Greenland):

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

DJIBOUTI:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Dominica:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Dominican

Republic:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

ECUADOR:

Status: Machalilla National Park, on the coast of mainland Ecuador, supports a growing whale watching industry that focuses on Southern Hemisphere humpback whales, which spend the austral winter (June –September) in this area. A preliminary abundance for this breeding population, based on capture-recapture statistics from an ongoing photo-identification study, is 400 animals (Scheidat *et al.*, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

EGYPT:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

El Salvador:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Equatorial

Guinea:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Eritrea:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Fiji:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

FINLAND*:

Status: Occurrence reported (UNEP-WCMC, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

FRANCE:

Status: One humpback whale was found entangled in fishing nets in May 1993 off Cavalaire, and in August of the same year, two humpbacks of similar size were filmed off Toulon (Frantzis *et al.*, 2004).

Reported in French Polynesia (UNEP-WCMC, 2004). Trends for New Caledonia are upward but are still <20% of the pre 20th century abundance. Population in New Caledonia is around 300-500 (New Zealand National Report, 2002). Garrigue and Gill (1994) proposed that the lagoon waters of New Caledonia are not merely points past which humpback whales migrate to a destination further north though it is likely that some do continue as far as Vanuatu, where recent sightings have also been reported, but in fact constitute migratory breeding destinations in themselves. Humpback whales are frequently sighted during the austral winter and spring in waters surrounding New Caledonia, including new born calves, and group behaviour indicative of breeding has been observed.

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Gabon:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

GAMBIA:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

GHANA:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

GREECE*:

Status: An exceptional sighting of a single humpback whale was reported on 17 April 2001 in the Bay of Tolo, which is encompassed by the Argolikos Gulf, Myrtoon Sea, Greece. This was the first time that a humpback whale has been recorded in the eastern Mediterranean basin. One more humpback whale was sighted in Greece on 19 July 2002 in the strait between Lefkada and the Meganisi Islands, Ionian Sea (Frantzis *et al.*, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported

Other actions:

Grenada:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Guatemala:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

GUINEA:

Status: Common on the continental plateau and decreasing or increasing periodically (Guinea National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

GUINEA-BISSAU:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Guyana:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Haiti:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Honduras:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Iceland:

Status: Occurrence reported (UNEP-WCMC, 2004). Humpback whales can be seen in early summer (Cetacea, 2001).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

INDIA:

Status: Occurrence reported (De Boer et al., 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Indonesia:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

I.R. Iran:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Iraq:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

IRELAND:

Status: Population size/trends not known. Acoustic detections indicate that the waters to the west of Ireland may be a migration corridor to summer breeding grounds, either in the West Indies or Cape Verde islands (Ireland National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: Research has been conducted in cetaceans in Ireland's Atlantic margin, and a stranding programme records species stranded, and collect samples for biological, genetic and chemical analysis (Ireland National Report, 2002).

Other actions:

ISRAEL:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

ITALY*:

Status: On 24 January 1998 a single humpback whale was observed inside the shallow Gulf of Oristano (West Sardinia), and on August 2002, another animal was sighted in the west Adriatic Sea, 3.5 km off Senigallia (Frantzis *et al.*, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Jamaica:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Japan:

Status: Between February and April, humpback whales can be seen around Ogasawara, the Kermanshah Islands and Okinawa (Cetacea, 2001).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

JORDAN:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

KENYA:



Status: Not very populous though occasionally observed. Pass along the Kenyan coast between August and October. Last survey in September 2001 recorded one mother and calf (Kenya National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: Rapid baseline survey of large animals with special emphasis on humpback whales in Kenya (Kenya National Report, 2002). Planned activities include: monitoring, training in photo identification, DNA and song analysis (subject to funds being available) (Kenya National Report, 2002).

Other actions:

Kiribati:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

D.P.R. Korea:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Republic of Korea:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Kuwait:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Lebanon:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

LIBERIA:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Madagascar:

Status: Humpback whales can be seen here between July and September (Cetacea, 2001).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Malaysia:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Maldives:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

MALTA:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Marshall Islands:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

MAURITANIA:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

MAURITIUS:

Status: Occurrence reported (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Mexico:

Status: Between January and April, humpback whales move into the Gulf of California (Cetacea, 2001).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

F.S. Micronesia:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

MOROCCO:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Mozambique:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Myanmar:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Namibia:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Nauru:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

NETHERLANDS:

Status: Occurrence reported in the Netherlands Antilles (Eisenberg, 1989).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

NEW ZEALAND:

Status: Humpback whales migrate through NZ waters to breeding grounds in Tonga and New Caledonia (New Zealand National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: Ongoing monitoring and research (New Zealand National Report, 2002).

Other actions: The South Pacific Humpback Whale Project is a consortium of biologists and conservationists from Auckland University, the Department of Conservation, the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme and

Whales Alive (Australia). The project has conducted studies on the breeding population of humpback whales in the Vava'u island group in the kingdom of Tonga, believed to be the major breeding area for humpbacks migrating through New Zealand's waters (Whale Watch, 2002).

Nicaragua:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

NIGERIA:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Niue:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

NORWAY:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Oman:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

PAKISTAN:

Status: Occurrence reported (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Palau:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

PANAMA:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Papua New

Guinea:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

PERU:

Status: It has been sighted in Northern Peru, between May and November, and its population trend is unknown (Peru National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: Research has been conducted on cetaceans along the Peruvian coast (Peru National Report, 2002).

Other actions:

PHILIPPINES*:

Status:

Occurrence reported (Heaney *et al.*, 1998). Population trend not known but recorded only as rare (Philippines National Report, 2002). Humpbacks in the Babuyan Islands area may be threatened by dynamite fishing, natural gas explorations, and Taiwanese fisheries (WWF, 2004; Philippines National Report, 2002). The species is reported as Vulnerable in the

Philippine Red Data Book, and four problems need attention: accidental catching, habitat disturbances, occasional catches during other whaling operations, and any catches by local people for their own use which are not under IWC controls (Wildlife Conservation Society of the Philippines, 1997).

CMS actions: Photo-identification studies are planned to estimate abundance, determine extend of distribution and migratory patterns (Philippines National Report, 2002).

Other actions: WWF is very active in the Babuyan Islands area of the Philippines, one of the few breeding grounds for the humpback whale, and possibly the southernmost recorded in the western North Pacific (WWF, 2004). The Humpback Whale Research and Conservation Project of WWF Philippines aims to determine the minimum abundance, distribution and migratory pattern of the Humpback whales in Babuyan Islands through photo-identification, vocalization recordings and genetic analysis of biopsy samples. Vessel surveys have been conducted form 2000-2002. The Project also aims to increase the awareness of local communities regarding the species, its habitat and conservation through the development of an information, education and communication program. Workshops, meetings and youth assemblies have been conducted in the coastal municipalities of Aparri, Calayan, Claveria and Sta. Ana, Cagayan province (Philippines National Report, 2002).

POLAND*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Skora, 1991).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

PORTUGAL:

Status: The species is extremely rare in the Portuguese EEZ (Portugal National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Russian

Federation*:

Status: Humpbacks travel to the Bering Strait every year to feed (Cetacea, 2001). This occurrence is also reported by Anon. (1980). The large illegal kills by Soviet factory ships in the Southern Hemisphere from the 1950s to the early 1970s would have delayed recovery of southern stocks (Reeves *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Qatar:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

**Saint Kitts
and Nevis:**

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Saint Lucia:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines:

Status: Humpbacks are actively hunted (Reeves *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Samoa:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

SAUDI ARABIA:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

SENEGAL:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Seychelles:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Sierra Leone:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Singapore:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Solomon Islands:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

SOMALIA:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

SOUTH AFRICA:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Between 21 January and 8 April, 2001, the Whale Unit of the Mammal Research Institute (MRI), University of Pretoria, undertook photo-identification surveys on the west coast of South Africa, between Rooi duinpunt, Lamberts Bay and Bok point, where three humpback whales were sighted; between 24 July and 20 December, 2001, MRI also

maintained a shore-based watch for migrating right and humpback whales from North head, Saldanha Bay, and 95 sightings of 233 humpback whales were made (Oosthuizen, 2001).

SPAIN:

Status: Scarce in Atlantic waters and Canary islands, with tow records in the Mediterranean, in the Costa Brava and Balearic islands (Purroy and Varela, 2003). Population estimates are not known.

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

SRI LANKA:

Status: Occurrence reported in this country (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Sudan:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Suriname:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

SWEDEN (?):

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

U.R. TANZANIA:

Status: Population size and trend is not known. The species occurs in Tanzanian coastal waters (Tanzania National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: Research and monitoring of the migration patterns in the Tanzanian territorial waters is being conducted (Tanzania National Report, 2002).

Other actions:

Thailand:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

TOGO :

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Tonga:

Status: Mark/recapture estimates suggest that Tongan population has grown from as few as 15-30 mature animals in the mid 1960s to 700 (+200) now. Trends are upward but are still <20% of the pre 20th century abundance (New Zealand National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Trinidad and

Tobago:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

TUNISIA:

Status: On 2 October 1992, a young humpback whale was found dead, entangled in fishing nets in the Gulf of Gabès (Frantzis *et al.*, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Tuvalu:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

United Arab

Emirates:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

UNITED

KINGDOM:

Status:

Bermuda

Between 1975 and 1985 the number of humpbacks recorded off Bermuda increased from 5 to 23 (UNEP-WCMC, 2004). It appears that humpback whales utilised the Bermuda area from February to May during the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries, while today they occur at Bermuda for only three to four weeks in April. Humpbacks probably used Bermuda as a breeding ground in winter during these previous centuries and it may be an area that will be repopulated during winter if and then the population recovers from over-hunting (Stone *et al.*, 1987).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions: Protected in the UK by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (UNEP-WCMC, 2004).

United States:

Status: The humpback whale is listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act (NOAA, 2001b).

Mainland

Humpbacks travel to the Bering Strait and Alaska's Glacier Bay every year to feed. Between January and April, humpback whales move into the Gulf of California and between August and October the species can be seen off central California. Between April and May humpbacks can be seen off the coast of New England. By June-early September humpbacks can be seen off the coast of southeast Alaska.

Central North Pacific Stock

This stock of humpback whales winters in Hawaiian waters. The central North Pacific Stock of humpback whales consists of feeding aggregations along the northern Pacific rim. Its distribution in summer is continuous from British Columbia to the Russian far East, and humpbacks are present offshore in the Gulf of Alaska. The minimum population estimate for this stock is 3,698, and although data support an increasing population size, it is not possible to assess the rate of increase (NOAA, 2001a).

The estimated minimum mortality rate incidental to commercial fisheries is 4.1 humpback whales per year, based on observer data, self-reported fisheries information, stranding records traceable to a specific fishery and other stranding records indicating mortality or serious injury (NOAA, 2001a).

Western North Pacific Stock

This stock consists of winter/spring populations of Japan that probably migrate to waters west of the Kodiak Archipelago (the Bering Sea and Aleutian islands) in summer/fall. Little is known about the feeding areas located in U.S. waters for this stock, but some unknown fractions of whales from the wintering grounds off Japan spend their summers feeding in areas typically utilized by whales from the Central North Pacific Stock. The minimum population estimate for this stock is 367, but information on trends in abundance is currently not available (NOAA, 2001b).

The estimated annual mortality rate incidental to commercial fisheries is 0.6 whales per year from this stock (NOAA, 2001b).

Eastern North Pacific Stock

This stock has winter/spring populations in coastal Central America and Mexico that migrate to the coast of California to southern British Columbia in summer/fall. The minimum population estimate for humpback whales in the California/Mexico stock (2000/2001 abundance estimated from mark-recapture methods) is approximately 681 (NOAA, 2003a).

The stock appears to have decreased in abundance between 1998 and 1999, but the most recent mark-recapture estimates shows that growth may have resumed (NOAA, 2003a).

Gulf of Maine stock

The decision was recently made to reclassify the Gulf of Maine as a separate feeding stock; this was based upon the strong fidelity by individual whales to this region, and the attendant assumption that, were this subpopulation wiped out, repopulation by immigration from adjacent areas would not occur on any reasonable management timescale (NOAA, 2003b).

The best estimate of abundance for Gulf of Maine humpback whales is 902, and the minimum population estimate for this stock is 647. Current data suggest that the Gulf of Maine humpback whale stock is steadily increasing in size. This is consistent with an estimated average trend of 3.2% in the North Pacific population overall for the period 1979-1993, although there are no other feeding-area-specific population estimates (NOAA, 2003b).

Although habitat degradation, such as chemical and noise pollution, may be adversely affecting the recovery of humpbacks, the major threats appear to be vessel collisions and entanglements with fishing gear (CFMC, 2004).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions: In early 1992, a major research initiative known as the Years of the North Atlantic Humpback (YONAH) was initiated. This project was a large-scale, intensive study of humpback whales throughout almost their entire North Atlantic range, from the West Indies to the Arctic. During two primary years of field work, photographs for individual identification and biopsy samples for genetic analysis were collected from summer feeding areas and from the breeding grounds in the West Indies. Additional samples were collected from certain areas in other years (NOAA, 2003b).

The Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary was established on November 4, 1992, to protect humpback whales and their habitat within the sanctuary; to educate and interpret for the public the relationship of humpback whales and the Hawaiian islands Marine environment; to manage human uses of the sanctuary consistent with the Hawaiian Islands National Marine Sanctuary Act and the National Marine Sanctuary Act; and to identify resources and ecosystems of national significance for possible inclusion in the sanctuary (Hihwnms, 2004).

URUGUAY:



Status: Reported as a range state for the species (Uruguay National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Vanuatu:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Venezuela:

Status: It is reported from the states of Miranda, Sucre and Anzoátegui, from La Tortuga and Las Aves Islands and from Los Testigos archipelago. Catalogues as Vulnerable in the Red Data Book of Venezuela (Rodríguez & Rojas-Suárez, 1999).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Viet Nam:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Yemen:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

REFERENCES:

- Anon. (1980). *A world review of the Cetacea*. Nature Conservancy Council, Peterborough.
- Australia National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- Baker, C.S., Flórez-González, L., Abernethy, B., Rosenbaum, H.C., Slade, R.W., Capella, J. and Bannister, J.L. (1998). Mitochondrial DNA variation and maternal gene flow among Humpback Whales of the Southern Hemisphere. *Marine Mammal Science*, 14: 721–737.
- Benin National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- Cetacea (2001). Cetacea: Whales, dolphins and porpoises. www.cetacea.org/index.htm Downloaded on 25/11/2004.
- Cetacean Specialist Group (1996). *Megaptera novaeangliae*. In: IUCN (2004). 2004 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. www.redlist.org Downloaded on 25/11/2004.
- CFMC (2004) Caribbean Fishery Management Council. U.S. Virgin Islands Marine Resources and Fisheries Strategic and Comprehensive Action Plan-2005. Appendix 1C. Marine Species Overview, Non-Harvestable Species. <http://www.vifishandwildlife.com/fisheries/FisheriesPlan2/append1c.pdf> Downloaded on 11/05/2005.
- Chile National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- Clapham, P.J. (2000). The Humpback Whale: seasonal feeding and breeding in a baleen whale. In: J. Mann, R.C. Connor, P.L. Tyack, and H. Whitehead (eds), *Cetacean Societies: Field Studies of Dolphins and Whales*, pp. 173-196. University of Chicago Press, Chicago. 433pp.
- Clapham, P.J., Young, S.B. and Brownell, R.L. Jr. (1999). Baleen whales: conservation issues and the status of the most endangered populations. *Mammal Review*, 29: 35–60.
- Congo National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- de Boer, N.M. Baldwin, R. Burton, C.L.K. Eyre, E.L. Jenner, K.C.S. Jenner, M.N.M. Keith, S.G. McCabe, K.A. Parsons, E.C.M. Peddemors, V.M. Rosebaum, H.C. Rudolph, P. Simmonds, M.P. (2003) *Cetaceans in the Indian Ocean Sanctuary: A Review*. A WDCS Science Report.

- [http://www.wdcs.org/dan/publishing.nsf/c525f7df6cbf01ef802569d600573108/9c76567b8cc72ff080256d2d00301341/\\$FILE/IOSreview.pdf](http://www.wdcs.org/dan/publishing.nsf/c525f7df6cbf01ef802569d600573108/9c76567b8cc72ff080256d2d00301341/$FILE/IOSreview.pdf) Downloaded on 23/11/2004.
- Diaz, G.B. and R.A. Ojeda, editors, (2000). *Libro Rojo de los Mamíferos amenazados de Argentina*. Sociedad Argentina para el Estudio de los Mamíferos, SAREM. 106 pp.
- Eisenberg, J. F. (1989). *Mammals of the Neotropics. Vol. 1. Panama, Colombia, Venezuela, Guyana, Suriname, French Guiana*. University Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Fisheries and Oceans Canada (2004). Fisheries and Oceans Canada online. <http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/index.htm> Downloaded on 26/11/2004.
- Fonseca, G.A.B., da Rylands, A.B., Costa, C.M.R., Machado, R.B. and Leyte, I.L.R. (1994) *Livro Vermelho dos Mamíferos Brasileiros Ameaçados de Extinção*. Fundação Biodiversitas, Belo Horizonte, Brazil.
- Frantzis, A., Nikolaou, J.M., Bompar, J.M. and Cammedda, A. (2004) Humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) occurrence in the Mediterranean Sea. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management* 6(1), pp. 25-28.
- Garrigue, C. and Gill, P.C. (1994) Observations of humpback whales in new Caledonian waters during 1991-1993. *Biological Conservation* 70(3): pp. 211-218.
- Gibbons, J., Capella, J.J. and Valladares, C. (2003) Rediscovery of a humpback whale, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, feeding ground in the Straits of Magellan, Chile. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management* 5(2), pp. 203.
- Guinea National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- Hauser, N., Peckham, H. and Clapham, P. (2000) Humpback whales in the southern Cook Islands, South Pacific. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management* 2(3): pp. 159-164.
- Heaney, L. R., Balete, D. S., Dolar, L., Alcalá, A. C., Dans, A., Gonzales, P. C. et al. (1998). A synopsis of the mammalian fauna of the Philippine Islands. Series/Edition 2 *Fieldiana Zoology*, 88: 1-61.
- Hihwnms (2004). Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary. <http://www.hihwnms.nos.noaa.gov/Welcome.html> Downloaded on 29/11/2004.
- Ireland National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- IUCN (2004). 2004 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. www.redlist.org Downloaded on 26/11/2004.
- Jann, B., Allen, J., Carrillo, M., Hanquet, S., Katona, S.K., Martin, A.R., Reeves, R.R., Seton, R., Stevick, P.T. and Wenzel, F.W. (2003) Migration of a humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) between the Cape Verde Islands and Iceland. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management* 5(2): 125-129.
- Jefferson, T.A., Leatherwood, S. and Webber, M.A. (1994). *Marine mammals of the world. FAO Species Identification Guide*. FAO and UNEP, 320pp.
- Kenya National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- New Zealand National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- NOAA (2001a) Stock Assessment report (SARs) by Species/stock. Humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*): Central North Pacific Stock. [http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Humpback_Whale_\(Central_N._Pacific\)/AK02humpbackwhale_CentralN.Pacific.PDF](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Humpback_Whale_(Central_N._Pacific)/AK02humpbackwhale_CentralN.Pacific.PDF) Downloaded on 25/11/2004.
- NOAA (2001b) Stock Assessment report (SARs) by Species/stock. Humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*): Western North Pacific Stock. [http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Humpback_Whale_\(Western_N._Pacific\)/AK02humpbackwhale_WesternN.Pacific.PDF](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Humpback_Whale_(Western_N._Pacific)/AK02humpbackwhale_WesternN.Pacific.PDF) Downloaded on 25/11/2004.
- NOAA (2003a) Stock Assessment report (SARs) by Species/stock. Humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*): Eastern North Pacific Stock. [http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Humpback_Whale_\(Eastern%20N.%20Pacific,%20formerly%20CA-OR-WA-Mexico\)/po03humpbackwhaleenp.pdf](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Humpback_Whale_(Eastern%20N.%20Pacific,%20formerly%20CA-OR-WA-Mexico)/po03humpbackwhaleenp.pdf) Downloaded on 25/11/2004.

- NOAA (2003b) Stock Assessment report (SARs) by Species/stock. Humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*): Gulf of Maine stock. [http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Humpback_Whale_\(Gulf_of_Maine\)/ao03humpbackwhalegulfofmaine.pdf](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Humpback_Whale_(Gulf_of_Maine)/ao03humpbackwhalegulfofmaine.pdf) Downloaded on 25/11/2004.
- Nowak, R.M. (1991) *Walker's mammals of the world*, Fifth Edition. John Hopkins University Press, Boston.
- Oosthuizen, W.H. (2001) South Africa. Progress Report on cetacean research, January 2001 to December 2001, with statistical data for the Calendar year 2001. http://www.iwcoffice.org/documents/sci_com/2002progreports/SC-54-ProgRep%20SouthAfrica.pdf Downloaded on 18/11/2004.
- Peru National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- Philippines National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- Portugal National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- Purroy, F.J. and Varela, J.M. (2003) *Guía de los mamíferos de España, Península, Baleares y Canarias*. Lynx Edicions – SEO BirdLife. Barcelona.
- Razafindrakoto, Y., Rosenbaum, H.C. and Helweg, D.A. (2001). First description of Humpback Whale song from Antongil Bay, Madagascar. *Marine Mammal Science*, 17: 180–186.
- Redford, K. H. and Eisenberg, J. F. (1992). *Mammals of the Neotropics. Vol.2*. Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay. University of Chicago Press.
- Reeves, R.R., Smith, B.D., Crespo, E.A. and di Sciara, G.N. (comps.) (2003). *Dolphins, Whales and Porpoises: 2002-2010 Conservation Action Plan for the World's Cetaceans*. IUCN/SSC Cetacean Specialist Group. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.
- Rodríguez, J. P. and Rojas-Suárez, F. (1999). *Libro rojo de la fauna Venezolana*. 2da edición. PROVITA, Caracas (Venezuela).
- Scheidat, M., Castro, C., Denkinger, J., González, J. and adelung, D. (2000) A breeding area for humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*). *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management* 2(3): pp. 165-171.
- Scheidat, M., Castro, C., Gonzalez, J. and Williams, R. (2004) Behavioural responses of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) to whalewatching boats near Isla de la Plata, Machalilla National Park, Ecuador. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management* 6(1): pp. 63-68.
- Skora, K. E. (1991). Notes on Cetacea observed in the Polish Baltic Sea: 1979-1990. *Aquatic Mammals*, 17(2): 67-70.
- Smith, T.D., Allen, J., Clapham, P.J., Hammond, P.S., Katona, S., Larsen, F., Lien, J., Mattila, D., Palsbøll, P.J., Sigurjónsson, J., Stevick, P.T. and Øien, N. (1999). An ocean-basin-wide mark-recapture study of the North Atlantic Humpback Whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*). *Marine Mammal Science*, 15: 1–32.
- Steiger, G.H. and Calambokidis, J. (2000). Reproductive rates of humpback whales off California. *Marine Mammal Science*, 16: 220–239.
- Stone, G.S. Katona, S.K. and Tucker, B. (1987) History, migration and present status of humpback whales in Bermuda. *Biological Conservation*, 42(2): pp. 133-145.
- Tanzania National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- UNEP-WCMC (2004). Species Database. www.unep-wcmc.org Downloaded on 24/02/2004.
- Uruguay National Report (2004). National Report to CMS.
- Whale Watch (2002). South Pacific Humpback Whale Project. <http://www.whalewatch.co.nz/south.htm> Downloaded on 26/11/2004.
- Wildlife Conservation Society of the Philippines (1997) *Philippine Red Data Book: Red List of Threatened Animals*. Wildlife Conservation Society of the Philippines, Makati City, Philippines.
- WWF (2004). Flagship species: the great whales - Our Projects www.panda.org Downloaded on 10/03/2004.

Zerbini, A.N., Andriolo, A., Da Rocha, J.M., Simões-Lopes, P.C., Siciliano, S., Pizzorno, J.L., Waite, J.M., Demaster, D.P. and Vanblaricom, G.R. (2004). Winter distribution and abundance of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) off northeastern Brazil. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management* 6(1), pp. 101-107.

* Range State not yet included in the CMS range list for this species.

Monachus monachus - synopsis

Country	Reported as nationally threatened	Apparent trend	CMS actions reported (in 2002 National Reports)	Other recent actions reported in the literature
ALBANIA		?	x	
Algeria		↓		
BULGARIA	ex		x	
CROATIA	Ex?		x	
CYPRUS		?	x	
EGYPT	ex		x	
FRANCE (Corsica)		?	x	✓
GEORGIA	Ex?		x	
GREECE		?	x	✓
ISRAEL	ex		x	
ITALY		?	x	✓
Lebanon	Ex?			
LYBIAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA		?	x	
MALTA		?	x	
MAURITANIA		↑	✓	
MONACO		?		
MOROCCO		?	✓	✓
PORTUGAL		↑	✓	✓
ROMANIA	ex		x	
Russian Federation	ex			
Serbia and Montenegro	Ex			
SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC	Ex?		x	
SPAIN		↓	✓	
TUNISIA		?	x	
Turkey		↑		✓
UKRAINE	Ex ●		x	
UNITED KINGDOM	ex		x	

REVIEW OF CONCERTED ACTION SPECIES

MAMMALIA: PHOCIDAE

- SPECIES:** *Monachus monachus* (Hermann, 1779)
- SYNONYMS:** -
- COMMON NAME:** Mediterranean Monk Seal (English); Phoque moine; Phoque-moine méditerranéen (French); Foca monje; Foca monje del Mediterráneo (Spanish)
- RANGE STATES:** ALBANIA; Algeria; BULGARIA; CROATIA; CYPRUS (Ex); EGYPT (Ex); FRANCE (Corsica); GREECE; ISRAEL (Ex); ITALY; Lebanon; LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA; MAURITANIA; MONACO (?); MOROCCO; PORTUGAL; Serbia and Montenegro; SPAIN; TUNISIA; Turkey; UNITED KINGDOM (Cyprus) (Ex); international waters (Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea, Atlantic Ocean)
- RED LIST RATING:** CR C2a (Seal Specialist Group, 1996)

CONSERVATION STATUS AND ACTIONS:

The Mediterranean monk seal is the most threatened pinniped species in the world (Anon., 2002). At one time, the Mediterranean monk seal occupied a wide geographical range. Colonies were found throughout the Mediterranean, the Marmara and Black seas. The species also frequented the Atlantic coast of Africa, as far south as Mauritania, Senegal and Gambia, as well as the Atlantic islands of Cape Verde, Madeira, the Canary Islands and the Azores. More recently, however, the species has disappeared from most of its former range, with the most severe contraction and fragmentation occurring during the last 50 years (Anon., 1999a). By 1966 it had been reduced to 20-30 small colonies scattered throughout its original range (Massicot, 2004), and it is considered extinct in the Black Sea (González, 2004).

Nations and island groups where the monk seal has been extirpated during the 20th century include mainland France and Corsica, Spain and the Balearic Islands, Italy, Sicily and the Toscana archipelago, and Egypt, Israel, Lebanon and Tunisia. The species is also thought to be on the brink of extinction in the Marmara and Black Seas and the Adriatic coasts and islands of Croatia. Despite sporadic sightings, the species also appears effectively to be extinct in Sardinia. As a result of this range contraction, the monk seal has been virtually reduced to two populations, one in the eastern Mediterranean and the other in the Northeast Atlantic, off the coast of Northwest Africa (Anon., 1999a).

The global population was estimated at around 5,000 in the 1950s (Burton and Pearson, 1987), around 400-800 in the 1970s (Israels, 1992) and 500 in the early 1980s (Nowak and Paradiso, 1983; Macdonald, 1984). Today, the Mediterranean monk seal population is estimated in 500 animals (Karamanlidis *et al.*, 2004).

Hunting for its skin prior to this century reduced the population considerably. More recently, persecution by fishermen and disturbance of the seals' last remaining refuges (caves with submarine entrances) by skindivers are the greatest threats (Massicot, 2004). The Mediterranean monk seal is threatened by deliberate killings (fishers still consider the species a pest and a competitor for increasingly scarce resources), incidental capture in fishing gear, decreased food availability, destruction of habitat, and pollution. Because the Mediterranean monk seal is sensitive to human disturbance, continued development of once isolated habitat

has had a significant effect on the already fragmented and declining species. It seems likely that its original habitat was sandy beaches, but the popularity of such beaches to humans has now effectively restricted the Monk Seal to small islands, uninhabitable by man because of lack of water, and to cliff-bound rocky coasts (King, 1983). Compounding this is the animal's low reproductive rate. Pups are susceptible to inclement weather in their birth caves, and may be washed away and drowned during storms. Pressure from some quarters to promote *ex-situ* conservation measures - such as captive breeding and translocation - continues, despite serious doubts over the wisdom of such initiatives. Other threats to the species include disease and toxic algae (Anon., 1999a).

Many countries have introduced laws protecting the Mediterranean monk seal in the last 30 years. Thus, in theory the protection of the monk seal has been much improved. But, implementation of these laws usually leaves much to be desired. In reality therefore, little has changed (Israels, 1992).

ALBANIA:

Status: There is almost no information on monk seals in Albanian waters. The few known reports of seals were made during the period 1948-1963 in the region of Butrint and Seman, and may correspond to individuals either from the Ionian Sea in Greece or from the Dalmatian islands in Croatia (Aguilar, 1999).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Algeria:

Status: The species originally inhabited the whole shoreline but it is now fragmented into at least two subpopulations: one in the east and another in the west. Some individuals may still show up in the central segment of the coastline, although reported observations are extremely limited. There are probably none individuals in the east and an undetermined number (probably fewer than 10 animals) in the western population (Aguilar, 1999).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

BULGARIA:

Status: Extinct (Bulgaria National Report, 2002).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

CROATIA:

Status: In the nineties the population appeared to become extinct; the last resident individuals were two seals on the Island of Pag, which were last seen alive in 1991, although some individuals from the Ionian Sea population may occasionally visit the Dalmatian Islands (Aguilar, 1999).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

CYPRUS:

Status: Five individuals have been reported in this country (González, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

EGYPT (Ex):

Status: It appears to have become extinct before the Second World War. No population currently inhabits the region, although one sighting was reported in 1981 (Aguilar, 1999; González, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

FRANCE (Corsica):

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions: As early as 1985, and again in 1994, the French government initiated an experimental captive breeding project, which was abandoned on both occasions due to protests from the international monk seal scientific, and conservation communities (Anon., 1999a).

GEORGIA (Ex?)*:

Status: Considered extinct in this country (González, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

GREECE:

Status: The Greek waters are home to the species' largest population, which is estimated at 200-250 individuals (MOm, 2004; González, 2004). MOm recorded 16 monk seal births during the 2003-2004 breeding season in three main study areas: four in the core zone of the National Marine Park of Alonissos-Northern Sporades, eight in the Kimolos-Polyaigos area and four in the area of n. Karpathos-Saria (Mom, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions: MOm/Hellenic Society for the Study and Protection of the Monk Seal, a non-profit, non-governmental environmental organization was founded in 1988 by a team of marine biologists and environmental researchers. Its aims are to research and study the biology, ecology and behaviour of the species and to conserve it through any legal means (MOm, 2004). The research boat 'IFAW-ODYSSIA' regularly visits monk seals refuges throughout the Greek islands and coastal areas, collecting any possible data on the species, used in the design of conservation measures, and MOM also plays an important role in the organization and operation of the National Marine Park of Alonissos-Northern Sporades (Greece's first National Marine Park), established in 1992 (MOm, 2004).

Every year, with the assistance of its volunteers, the MOM summer information Programs inform and instruct thousands of people throughout the Greek islands and coastal regions. The Seal Treatment and Rehabilitation Centre was established on the island of Alonissos for the purposes of rescuing sick, injured or orphaned animals (MOm, 2004).

ISRAEL (Ex):

Status: Reported as extinct in this country (González, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

ITALY:

Status: Italy and Sardinia remain with no habitat occupied, despite recent sightings (González, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions: A Conservation Group is present in this country, and carried out a project in 1997 on Orak island (turkey) for the monitoring and control of monk seals in

caves (Gruppo Foca Monaca, 2004).

Lebanon:

Status: Although information for the last two decades has been extremely limited, the species appears to have become extinct in the early or mid-seventies (Aguilar, 1999). None individuals have been reported in this country (González, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

LIBYAN ARAB

JAMAHIRIYA:

Status: The current population is estimated in 5-10 individuals (González, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

MALTA*:

Status: Information on the presence of Mediterranean monk seals in Malta is very limited and does not suggest that the species has ever been common in the Islands (Aguilar, 1999). None individuals are reported from this country (González, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

MAURITANIA:

Status: Some of the individuals from the cape Blanco colony are found on the Mauritanian side of the cape. The mass mortality that ravaged Cape Blanco in Spring 1997 also affected the seals in Mauritania (Aguilar, 1997). There are approximately 153 seals in Mauritania, Desertas and Sahara coast, and 25 births have been recorded during the last pupping season (González, 2004).

CMS actions: The CBD-Habitat Foundation launched the Mediterranean Monk Seal Project in 1999, with the aims of start regular marine surveillance in the Seals Reserve of Cabo Blanco (since the start of the surveillance in 2002, the mortality of monk seals in the Reserve, attributable to drowning in fishing gear, was reduced from 4-6 seals/year between 1998-2001 to 0, between 2002-2004), help the local fishing communities and develop a monk seal public awareness campaign in the Cape Blanco Satellite Reserve (González, 2004).

Other actions:

MONACO (?):

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

MOROCCO:

Status: Morocco is one of the four range states for this species in the Atlantic (Morocco National Report, 2002). The Mediterranean population of monk seals is estimated in 5-10 individuals, and between one and five animals are estimated in the Sahara coast (González, 2004), although the Fondo para la Foca del Mediterráneo (FFM) undertook a monk seal survey along the Mediterranean coasts of Morocco in August 2004, and all signs were negative, and a huge alteration of habitat is now underway in the form of a main road, being built to join Saidia and Tanger; at some places, this involves construction over sea cliffs and seaside slopes, with debris being thrown down to the sea, in some cases even burying marine grottoes (Johnson, 2004).

CMS actions: An international strategy for action has been developed, “The Plan for the Care of the Monk Seal”. A committee for the safeguard of the species was established following a meeting on 2 March 2000 regarding the implementation of the Barcelona Convention. The aim of this meeting was to identify the resources needed to safeguard this species on the Moroccan coast. Recommendations designed to reverse the decline of the Monk Seal were put forward (Morocco National Report, 2002).

Other actions: In September 2004, The CBD-Habitat Foundation and the Moroccan NGO Nature Initiative signed a collaboration agreement in order to jointly develop conservation actions for the monk seal and other threatened species in the region of the South of Morocco, in the former Spanish Sahara. One of the first actions performed has been to begin the exploration of the coast south of Cap Barbas, in order to determinate the status of monk seals in the area, currently unknown (Johnson, 2004).

Since June 2003, trawlers have been prohibited in the 12 miles offshore between Lagouira and Cap Bojdour, as well as artisanal fishing activities from Lamhiriz to the south (González, 2004).

Exploration of coastal habitats in southern Morocco and feasibility study of the establishment of a biological station in D’Khila (Cap Corveiro) are planned (González, 2004).

PORTUGAL:

Status: In Portugal, the Madeira archipelago is the only place where monk seals can be found (Portugal National Report, 2002). Following a steep decline in the last century, the Mediterranean monk seal in the archipelago of Madeira is now found mainly in the Desertas islands, a group of three uninhabited islands (Deserta Grande, Bugio and Ilhéu Chão) lying c. 20 km southeast of Madeira. Due to protection the monk seal colony, which was estimated to number 6-8 individuals in 1984, has experienced a remarkable recovery and is now believed to number 23 individuals. In addition, this species is now occasionally sighted on the main island of Madeira (Karamanlidis *et al.*, 2004).

The survival of the Monk Seal will depend on the allocation of sufficient habitat for the continued reproduction of the species. Even in areas with pristine habitat, such as the Desertas Islands and the São Lourenço Peninsula, the proportion of potential pupping habitat is low (Karamanlidis *et al.*, 2004).

CMS actions: In the Desertas Islands the monk seal study and monitoring programme, which was initiated in 1989, is maintained. A system to monitor the seals inside the caves is in preparation (Portugal National Report, 2002).

Study of habitat availability for monk seals in the main Madeira island, public awareness campaigns and monk seal monitoring and logging of sightings in Madeira have been performed (González, 2004).

Other actions: In order to protect this species, the Parque Natural da Madeira Service initiated a Monk Seal Conservation and Monitoring Programme in 1988, and in 1990 the Desertas Islands were declared a Nature Reserve (Karamanlidis *et al.*, 2004).

The construction of a new biological station at the Desertas island commenced in October 2004. This measure, supported by the regional Government, aims to improve living conditions for park rangers, whilst also providing an information centre for visitors (Johnson, 2004).

The São Lourenço Peninsula, an area at the easternmost tip of Madeira, which was the last place where monk seals were regularly sighted on Madeira in the past, and the adjacent marine area to a depth of 50 m have been recently included in the Natura 2000 network as a Site of Community Importance

(Karamanlidis *et al.*, 2004).

ROMANIA*:

Status: Considered extinct in the Black sea (González, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Russian Federation*:

Status: Considered extinct (González, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Serbia and Montenegro:

Status: Extinct (González, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

SYRIAN ARAB

REPUBLIC (ex?)*:

Status: Considered extinct (González, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

SPAIN:

Status: One to two individuals reported in the West Mediterranean Coast, and none in the Canary Islands (González, 2004). It was relatively frequent in the Chafarinas islands, where breeding was recorded until 1994, and some records from the Mediterranean coast and the Balearics (Purroy and Varela, 2003).

CMS actions: The Spanish Ministry of Environment and the International Cooperation Agency are funding monk seal conservation projects in Mauritania, and the country is coordinating the Monk Seal Recovery Plan in the Atlantic (González, 2004).

Other actions:

TUNISIA:

Status: It is unclear whether the few reports of isolated sightings or strandings of seals in the last decade are of remnants of the original population or of stray individuals from other areas (Aguilar, 1999).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Turkey:

Status: The population is estimated in 50 individuals in the Mediterranean, and the Black sea population is considered extinct (González, 2004). The status of the Mediterranean Monk Seal was studied during five years in the Foça Pilot Monk Seal Conservation Area, where the population was estimated to consist of nine individuals. Islands off the Foça town provide suitable habitats and enable the survival of the species (Güçlüsoy & Savas, 2003). As a result of intensive research, Turkey is expected to increase its population estimates for the species (González, 2004).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions: There is a Turkish monk seal conservation and research organisation, SAD-AFAG, the Underwater Research Society – Mediterranean Seal Research

Group. (SAD-AFAG, 2004).

UKRAINE (ex?)*:

Status: Considered extinct (González, 2004). It is reported as extinct in the Red Data Book of Ukraine (Shcherbak, 1994).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

UNITED KINGDOM

(Cyprus) (Ex):

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Western Sahara*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Sarro and Oliveras, 1968; Valverde, 1957). In the summer of 1997, two thirds of the largest surviving population of Mediterranean monk seals were wiped out within the space of two months on the Côte des Phoques in the Western Sahara.

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

REFERENCES:

- Aguilar, A. (1999) *Status of Mediterranean monk seals populations*. UNEP and RAC-SPA, Tunisia.
- Anon. (1999a). Marine Mammal Fact Sheet Series: Mediterranean Monk Seal. Monachus.org <http://www.monachus.org/profiles/mediseal.htm>
- Anon. (2002). CMS Information System – *Monachus monachus*. Information from 2002 National Report, European Community.
- Bannikov, A. G. and Sokolov, V. I. (1984). *Krasnaya Kniga SSSR*. 2nd edition. Lesnaya Promiishlyennost, Moscow.
- Bulgaria National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- Burton and Pearson. (1987). *Rare Mammals of the World*. Stephen Greene Press, Lexington, MA, USA.
- González, L.M. Aguilar, A. Lopez-Jurado, L.F. and Grau, E. (1997). Status and distribution of the Mediterranean monk seal on the Cabo Blanco Peninsula (Western Sahara-Mauritania). *Biological Conservation* 80(3): pp.225-234.
- González, L.M. (2004). Mediterranean Monk Seal (*Monachus monachus*): up-date of the status and conservation progress. Twelfth Meeting of the CMS Scientific Council, Glasgow, Scotland, U.K., 31 March-3 April 2004.
- Gruppo Foca Monaca (2004). Gruppo Foca Monaca web page. www.focamonaca.it Downloaded on 30/11/2004.
- Güçlüsoy, H & Savas, Y. 2003. Status of the Mediterranean Monk Seal *Monachus monachus*, in the Foça Pilot Monk Seal Conservation Area, Turkey. *Zoology in the Middle East* 28:5-16.
- Israels, L.D.E. (1992). Thirty years of Mediterranean monk seal protection, a review. *Neth. Comm. Intl. Nature Prot.*, 28.
- Johnson, W.M. (ed) (2004). The Monachus guardian 7(2). <http://www.monachus-guardian.org/library/mguard14.pdf> Downloaded on 30/11/2004.
- Karamanlidis, A.A. Pires, R. Carina Silva, N. and Costa Neves, E. (2004). The availability of resting and pupping habitat for the Critically Endangered Mediterranean monk seal *Monachus monachus* in the archipelago of Madeira. *Oryx*, 38: p 80.
- Kumerloeve, H. (1975). Die saugetiere (Mammalia) Syriens und des Libanon. *Veröffentlichungen der Zoologischen Staatssammlung München*, 18: 159-225.
- Macdonald, D. (1984). *The Encyclopedia of Mammals*. Facts On File Publications,

- New York, NY, USA.
- Massicot, P. (2004). Animal Info - Mediterranean Monk Seal.
<http://www.animalinfo.org/species/carnivor/monamona.htm> Downloaded on 29/11/2004.
- MOm (2004). Hellenic Society for the Study and Protection of the Monk Seal.
http://www.mom.gr/eng_version/eng_version.htm Downloaded on 30/11/2004.
- Morocco National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- Nowak, R.M. and Paradiso, J.L. (1983). *Walker's Mammals of the World, vols. 1 and 2. 4th edition*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, USA.
- Panou, A. Jacobs, J. and Panos, D. (1993) The endangered Mediterranean monk seal in the Ionian Sea, Greece. *Biological Conservation* 64(2): pp.129-140.
- Portugal National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- Purroy, F.J. and Varela, J.M. (2003) *Guía de los mamíferos de España, Peninsula , Baleares y Canarias*. Lynx Edicions – SEO BirdLife. Barcelona.
- SAD-AFAG (2004). Underwater Research Society – Mediterranean Seal Research Group.
www.afag.org Downloaded on 30/11/2004.
- Sarro, A. and Oliveras, J. R. P. (1968). Expedicion a las islas del Banco de Arguin (Mauritiana). *Ardeola*, 12: 121-141.
- Shcherbak, M.M. (1994) *Chervona knuga Ukrainu: tavarinniy svit (Red Data Book of Ukraine: Animal Kingdom)*. Ukraine Entsiklopediya, Kiev, Ukraine.
- Seal Specialist Group (1996). *Monachus monachus*. In: IUCN (2004). 2004 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. www.redlist.org Downloaded on 29/11/2004.
- Tunisia National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.
- UNEP-WCMC (2004). Species Database. www.unep-wcmc.org Downloaded on 24/02/2004.
- Valverde, J. A. (1957). *Aves del Sahara Español*. Instituto de Estudios Africanos, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas, Madrid.
- WCMC/WWF (1997). *Species Under Threat*. World Conservation Monitoring Centre/World Wide Fund for Nature.

* Range State not yet included in the CMS range list for this species.

Physeter macrocephalus – synthesis

Country	Reported as nationally threatened	Apparent trend	CMS actions reported (in 2002 National Reports)	Other recent actions reported in the literature
ARGENTINA	●	?	x	
AUSTRALIA		?	x	
BELGIUM		?	x	
Brazil		?		
Canada		?		
Cape Verde		?		
CHILE		?	x	
China		?		
Colombia		?		
Costa Rica		?		
COTE D'IVOIRE		?	x	
DENMARK		?	x	
Djibouti		?		
ECUADOR		↓	x	
Eritrea		?		
FRANCE		?	x	
GERMANY		?	x	
GREECE		?	x	
Iceland		?		
INDIA		?	x	
Indonesia		?		
IRELAND		?	x	
ITALY		?	x	
Japan		?		√ ¹
KENYA		?	x	
D.P.R. Korea		?		
Korea, Republic of		?		
Liberia		?		
Malaysia		?		
Maldives		?		
MAURITIUS		?	x	
Mexico		?		
MOROCCO		?	x	
Mozambique		?		
Myanmar		?		
NETHERLANDS		?	x	
NEW ZEALAND		?	x	
NORWAY		?	x	
Oman		?		
PANAMA		?	x	
PHILIPPINES	●	?	x	
PORTUGAL		?	x	
Seychelles		?		
Solomon Islands		?		
SOMALIA		?	x	
SOUTH AFRICA		?	x	
SPAIN		?	x	
SRI LANKA		?	x	
Suriname		?		

Country	Reported as nationally threatened	Apparent trend	CMS actions reported (in 2002 National Reports)	Other recent actions reported in the literature
TANZANIA		?	x	
Thailand		?		
United Arab Emirates		?		
UNITED KINGDOM		?	x	
United States	●	?		✓
URUGUAY		?	x	
Venezuela	●	?		

1. In 2000 Japan initiated a 'scientific research hunt' for sperm whales in the North Pacific.

REVIEW OF CONCERTED ACTION SPECIES

MAMMALIA: PHYSETERIDAE

- SPECIES: *Physeter macrocephalus*
- SYNONYMS: *Physeter catodon*
- COMMON NAME: Cachelot; Pot whale; Sperm Whale; Spermacet whale (English); Cachalot (French); Ballena esperma; Cachalote (Spanish)
- RANGE STATES: ARGENTINA; AUSTRALIA; BELGIUM; Brazil; Canada; CHILE; China; Colombia; Costa Rica; DENMARK (incl. Greenland); Eritrea; FRANCE (French Polynesia); INDIA; Indonesia; IRELAND; Japan; KENYA; Korea, Democratic People's Republic of; Korea, Republic of; LIBERIA; Mexico; Mozambique; Myanmar; NETHERLANDS; NEW ZEALAND; NORWAY; PANAMA; PORTUGAL; SOUTH AFRICA; SPAIN; SRI LANKA; Suriname; TANZANIA, UNITED REPUBLIC OF; Thailand; UNITED KINGDOM (incl. Falkland Islands (Malvinas), St. Helena); United States; URUGUAY; Venezuela; international waters
- RED LIST RATING: VU A1bd (Cetacean Specialist Group, 1996)

CONSERVATION STATUS AND ACTIONS:

Sperm Whales are cosmopolitan, occurring primarily in deep waters where they prey on squid (Reeves *et al.*, 2003). This species can be found in all oceans of the world, and, although well known in the Mediterranean, rarely enters semi-enclosed or shallow seas. In summer they migrate to higher latitudes in both hemispheres but return to lower latitudes in winter, though some populations are resident all year round (Cetacea, 2001).

The sperm whale is generally found in waters conducive to the production of squid (at least 1,000 meters deep and with cold-water upwellings). The best areas are off the coasts of South America and Africa, in the North Atlantic and Arabian Sea, between Australia and New Zealand, in the western North Pacific, and all along the Equator. Most animals stay between 40° N and 40° S, but during the summer the bachelor males of medium size move to between 40° and 50°, and at least some of the older males venture beyond 50° into or near arctic and Antarctic waters (Nowak, 1991). However, discovery tag data from the days of commercial whaling revealed a great deal of east-west movement between Alaska waters and the western North Pacific (Japan and the Bonin Islands), with little evidence of north-south movement in the eastern North Pacific (Ferrero *et al.*, 2000).

The global population size has been estimated at around 2 million individuals (Cetacea, 2001). However, according to Obley (2004), although the worldwide population may have once been about 2 million, it is now around 500,000, although exact estimates are difficult because of the deep diving nature of these whales. Recently, however, sperm whale numbers seem to be increasing (Obley, 2004). As a species, the Sperm whale is not immediately threatened, but some regional populations require close evaluation and monitoring. For example, in the Mediterranean Sea, deaths from ship strikes and entanglement occur relatively frequently, and in the eastern tropical Pacific the most recent phase of whaling was particularly intensive and current birth rates are low (Whitehead *et al.*, 1997). For the purposes of management, the International Whaling Commission (IWC) defines four stocks: the North Pacific, the North Atlantic, the Northern Indian Ocean, and Southern Hemisphere.

However, review of the current knowledge of sperm whales indicates no clear picture of the worldwide stock structure of sperm whales (CFMC, 2004).

The total number of sperm whales in the Atlantic is not known, but according to the September 2000 stock report by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, estimates are about 3,500 (Obley, 2004). It is estimated that there are 102,112 individuals in the western North Pacific (Kato and Miyashita, 1998) and 39,200 individuals in the eastern temperate North Pacific (Barlow and Taylor, 1998). Between 1970 and 1980 the number of sperm whales in the Bering Sea decreased from an estimated 9,100 to 6,600 animals (UNEP-WCMC, 2004).

Recent summer/fall surveys in the eastern tropical Pacific show that although sperm whales are widely distributed in the tropics, their relative abundance tapers off markedly westward towards the middle of the tropical Pacific (near the IWC stock boundary at 150° W) and tapers off northward towards the tip of Baja California (NOAA, 2003a).

Sperm whales have a long history of commercial exploitation and continuing economic value (mainly as meat in Japan) (Reeves *et al.*, 2003). The IWC's moratorium has protected sperm whales from deliberate hunting since the 1980s, except at Lamalera in Indonesia (Rudolph *et al.*, 1997), and the Lesser Antilles, where the St. Vincent and St. Lucia whalers take them occasionally (Price, 1985; Reeves, 1988).

Sperm whales die fairly often from entanglement in fishing gear, especially pelagic driftnets, including "ghost nets" (Notarbartolo di Sciara, 1990; Haase and Félix, 1994, Barlow *et al.*, 1994, Félix *et al.*, 1997), and as a result of vessel collisions (Cagnolaro and Notarbartolo di Sciara, 1992, André *et al.*, 1994, Laist *et al.*, 2001); however, due to their more offshore distribution and benthic feeding habitats, sperm whales seem less subject to entanglement in fishing gear than some cetacean species (CFMC, 2004). There is also concern about the residual effects of whaling. The selective removal of large males may have reduced pregnancy rates, and the loss of adult females within matricentric pods may have made these groups less well equipped to survive (Whitehead and Weilgart, 2000).

ARGENTINA:

Status: Individuals have been found off the coast of this country (Redford & Eisenberg, 1992). Catalogued as Least Concern in the Argentinean Mammals Red Data Book (Diaz & Ojeda, 2000).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

AUSTRALIA:

Status: In September 2003, nine huge sperm whales –all badly slashed- became stranded near a reef on western's Australia rugged southern coast (ECBC, 2004). The species is considered insufficiently known in the action Plan for Australian Cetaceans (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

BELGIUM:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Brazil:

Status: The species has been recorded for southern (26-34°S) and southeastern Brazil (21-26°S) (Aguiar dos Santos & Haimovici, 2001).

<i>CMS actions:</i>	Not a Party to CMS.
<i>Other actions:</i>	
Canada:	
<i>Status:</i>	
<i>CMS actions:</i>	Not a Party to CMS.
<i>Other actions:</i>	
Cape Verde*:	
<i>Status:</i>	Occurrence reported (Hazevoet and Wenzel, 2000).
<i>CMS actions:</i>	Not a Party to CMS.
<i>Other actions:</i>	
CHILE:	
<i>Status:</i>	Individuals have been found off the coasts of Chile (Redford & Eisenberg, 1992).
<i>CMS actions:</i>	None reported.
<i>Other actions:</i>	
China:	
<i>Status:</i>	
<i>CMS actions:</i>	Not a Party to CMS.
<i>Other actions:</i>	
Colombia:	
<i>Status:</i>	
<i>CMS actions:</i>	Not a Party to CMS.
<i>Other actions:</i>	
Costa Rica:	
<i>Status:</i>	
<i>CMS actions:</i>	Not a Party to CMS.
<i>Other actions:</i>	
COTE D'IVOIRE*:	
<i>Status:</i>	Occurrence reported (Amon Kothias and N'Goran, 1991).
<i>CMS actions:</i>	None reported.
<i>Other actions:</i>	
DENMARK:	
<i>Status:</i>	A total of 29 sperm whales (two groups of 13 and 16 individuals) stranded in Denmark coasts between 1994 and 1998 (Anon., 1998).
<i>CMS actions:</i>	None reported.
<i>Other actions:</i>	
DJIBOUTI*:	
<i>Status:</i>	Occurrence reported (UNEP-WCMC, 2004).
<i>CMS actions:</i>	None reported.
<i>Other actions:</i>	
ECUADOR*:	
<i>Status:</i>	Occurrence reported in Galapagos and the mainland (UNEP-WCMC, 2004). In the Galapagos Islands, the population decreased at a rate of about 20% per year between 1985 and 1995. The decline seems to be due principally to migration into waters off the Central and South American mainland and to the low recruitment rate. Both of them are probably related to heavy whaling in Peruvian waters, which ended in 1981. Whales of the Galapagos are moving east to fill productive but depopulated waters near the coast, and the virtual elimination of large breeding males (in their late

twenties and older) from the region has lowered pregnancy rates (Whitehead *et al.*, 1997).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Eritrea:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

FRANCE

(French Polynesia):

Status: Occurrence reported in New Caledonia (Garrigue and Greaves, 2001).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

GERMANY*:

Status:

Occurrence reported (Boye and Plaisier, 1989). Seven sperm whales stranded in different coastal sites between 1994 and 1998 (Anon., 1998).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

GREECE*:

Status:

Occurrence reported (Nowak, 1981).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Iceland*:

Status:

Occurrence reported around this country (Sea Watch Foundation, 2004).

CMS actions:

Other actions:

INDIA:

Status:

Occurrence reported (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Indonesia:

Status:

At Lamalera, a few to a few tens are taken each year with hand harpoons (612 landed from 1959 to 1994) (Rudolph *et al.*, 1997).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

IRELAND:

Status:

Sperm whales are occasionally observed in Irish waters off the Continental Shelf (Irish Whale and Dolphin Group, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

ITALY*:

Status:

Occurrence reported (di Natale and Mangano, 1983).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Japan:

Status:

Japan killed five out of a quota of 10 sperm whales it set itself in 2000 in the North West Pacific and another 10 in 2001(WDCS, 2004). The IWC

prohibited commercial hunting of sperm whales in 1981, although the Japanese continued to harvest sperm whales in the North Pacific until 1988 (CFMC, 2004).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions: In 2000, Japan initiated a “scientific research” hunt for sperm whales in the North Pacific (Reeves *et al.*, 2003).

KENYA:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

D.P.R. Korea:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Korea, Republic

of:

Status: Not a Party to CMS.

CMS actions:

Other actions:

REPUBLIC OF

LIBERIA:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported

Other actions:

Malaysia*:

Status: Occurrence reported Peninsular Malaysia (Harrison, 1966) and Sarawak (Beasley and Jefferson, 1997).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Maldives*:

Status:

Occurrence reported (UNEP-WCMC, 2004; De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions:

Other actions: Not a Party to CMS.

MAURITIUS*:

Status:

Reported as abundant in this country waters (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions:

None reported.

Other actions:

Mexico:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

MOROCCO*:

Status:

Occurrence reported (UNEP-WCMC, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Mozambique:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

Myanmar:



Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

NETHERLANDS:

Status: Five sperm whales (a group of four and one individual) stranded in the Ameland island in 1994 and 1997 (Anon., 1998).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

NEW ZEALAND:

Status: Sperm whales are now common whale-watching attractions in the waters around New Zealand (Cetacea, 2001).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

NORWAY:

Status: Reported off Western Norway (Andenes) (Sea Watch Foundation, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Oman*:

Status: Occurrence reported (de Silva, 1987; De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

PANAMA:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

PHILIPPINES*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Heaney *et al.*, 1998). It has been sighted in the following areas: off Cebu City harbor, Tubbataha Reef, Sulu Sea, Bohol, Camiguin, and Balicasag Island. Reported as Insufficiently Known in the Philippine Red Data Book (Wildlife Conservation Society of the Philippines, 1997).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

PORTUGAL:

Status: Mainly seen around the western coast of Portugal and the Azores (Sea Watch foundation, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Seychelles*:

Status: Occurrence reported (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions:

Other actions:

Solomon Islands*:

Status: Occurrence reported (Shimada and Pastene, 1995).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

SOMALIA*:

Status: Reported to occur in Somalian waters (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions:

Other actions:

SOUTH AFRICA:

Status: Occurrence reported (Oosthuizen, 2001).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

SPAIN:

Status: Reported as abundant in Atlantic and Mediterranean waters, especially in the south of the Balearics and near Galicia (Purroy and Varela, 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

SRI LANKA:

Status: Occurrence reported (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Suriname:

Status:

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

TANZANIA:

Status:

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Thailand:

Status: Occurrence reported (De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

United Arab

Emirates*:

Status: Occurrence reported (UNEP-WCMC, 2004; De Boer *et al.*, 2003).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

UNITED KINGDOM:

Status: Occurrence reported in Grenada (Romero *et al.*, 2002). In Scotland, it has been recorded in every month except February and March. 86% of sperm whale sightings involved single animals and it is probable that animals sighted at these latitudes are sub-adult or mature males, which account for the majority of sightings and strandings in British and Irish waters. All sperm whale sightings were distributed to or over the 1000m isobath to the north and west of Scotland, and this is likely to be related to the distribution of their prey, particularly cephalopod populations that occur in intermediate and deep waters (Weir *et al.*, 2001).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

United States:

Status:

It is possible that the sperm whale passes through waters just off South

Carolina's coast. During winter in the Atlantic, sperm whales concentrate near Cape Hatteras, North Carolina, heading northward in spring. The sperm whale has been listed as federally endangered and protected in the U.S. since 1970 (Obley, 2004). Sperm whales of the eastern North Pacific have been divided into three separate stocks as dictated by the U.S. waters in which they are found: Alaska (North Pacific stock), California/Oregon/Washington and Hawaii. The number of sperm whales of the North Pacific occurring within Alaska waters is unknown (Ferrero *et al.*, 2000).

North Pacific Stock (Alaska)

In the North Pacific, sperm whales are distributed widely, with the northernmost boundary extending from Cape Navarin (62°N) to the Pribilof Islands. A current estimate of abundance for this stock is currently unavailable, as well as reliable information on trends in abundance. On the basis of total abundance, current distribution, and regulatory measures that are currently in place, it is unlikely that this stock is in danger of extinction or threatened with becoming endangered in the foreseeable future. The estimated annual rate of human-caused mortality and serious injury seems minimal for this stock (NOAA, 1998).

Hawaiian Stock

The Hawaiian islands marked the centre of a major nineteenth century whaling ground for sperm whales. The minimum population estimate is 43 whales, although this includes only areas within about 25 nmi of the main Hawaiian Islands and does not include a large proportion of animals that were diving and therefore unavailable to be seen. The total fishery mortality and serious injury for sperm whales is zero and therefore can be considered to be insignificant (NOAA, 2000).

California/Oregon/Washington Stock

Sperm whales are found year-round in California waters, but they reach peak abundance from April through mid-June and from August through mid-November. They are seen in every season except winter (Dec.-Feb.) in Washington and Oregon. The minimum population estimate is approximately 885 whales; Sperm whale abundance appears to have been rather variable off California between 1979/1980 and 1996, but does not show any obvious trends. Although the population in the eastern-North Pacific is expected to have grown since large-scale pelagic whaling stopped in 1980, the possible effects of large unreported catches are unknown and the ongoing incidental ship strikes and gillnet mortality make this uncertain (NOAA, 2003a).

North Atlantic Stock

The sperm whales that occur in the eastern US Atlantic EEZ zone likely represent only a fraction of the total stock. The nature of linkages of the USA habitat with those to the south, north, and offshore is unknown. The IWC recognises one stock for the North Atlantic. In the US EEZ waters, the sperm whales are concentrated east and northeast of Cape Hatteras in winter. In Spring, the centre of distribution shifts northward to east of Delaware and Virginia, and is widespread throughout the central portion of the mid-Atlantic bight and the southern portion of Georges Bank. In summer, the distribution is similar but also includes the area east and north of Georges Bank and into the Northeast Channel region, as well as the continental shelf south of New England. In the fall, sperm whale occurrence south of New England on the continental shelf is at its highest level (NOAA, 2002).

The minimum population estimate for the western North Atlantic sperm whale is 3,505, and the population trend is unknown. Total fishery-related

mortality and serious injury for this stock can be considered to be insignificant and approaching a zero mortality and serious injury rate (NOAA, 2002).

Northern Gulf of Mexico Stock

Recent research supports distinct stock status for the Gulf of Mexico, and the sperm whale population is provisionally being considered a separate stock for management purposes. The minimum population estimate for the northern Gulf of Mexico is 1,114 sperm whales, but there are insufficient data to determine the population trends for the species. The total fishery-related mortality and serious injury for this stock is unknown, but can be considered to be insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate (NOAA, 2003b).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions: Ship line transect surveys have been conducted in 1991 and 1993 (Barlow, 1997).

A satellite-tagged sperm whale was tracked for 131 days in 2001, and remained in the Gulf of Mexico the entire time (NOAA, 2003b), and surveys to investigate stock structure and abundance of sperm whales in the northeastern temperate Pacific were carried out in 1997 (NOAA, 2000).

URUGUAY:

Status: Individuals have been found off the coast of Uruguay (Redford & Eisenberg, 1992).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

Venezuela:

Status: Catalogued as Insufficiently Known in the Red Data Book of Venezuela, it has been reported from Anzoategui, Sucre, Nueva Esparta and Los testigos archipelago (Rodriguez and Rojas-Suarez, 1999).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions:

REFERENCES:

Aguiar dos Santos, R. and Haimovici, M. (2001) Cephalopods in the diet of marine mammals stranded or incidentally caught along southeastern and southern Brazil. *Fisheries Research*, 52: 99-112.

Amon Kothias, J.-B. and N'Goran, N. Y. (1991). Note sur les baleines échouées en estuaires artificiels en Côte d'Ivoire. *Journal Ivoirien d'Océanologie et de Limnologie*, 1(2): 153-155.

Anon. (1998) *Sperm Whales strandings in the North Sea*. Common Wadden Sea Secretariat. <http://www.waddensea-secretariat.org/news/publications/Wsnl/WSNL98-1/98-1-12Whales.html> Downloaded on 2/12/2004.

André, M., Ramos, A.G. and Lopez-Jurado, L.F. (1994). Sperm Whale acoustic survey off the Canary Islands, in an area of heavy maritime traffic: preliminary results. *European Research on Cetaceans*, 8: 65.

Barlow, J. (1995). The abundance of cetaceans in California waters. Part I: Ship surveys in summer and fall of 1991. *Fish. Bull.*, 93:1-14.

Barlow, J. (1997). *Preliminary estimates of cetacean abundance off California, Oregon and Washington based on a 1996 ship survey and comparisons of passing and closing modes*. Administrative Report LJ-97-11, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, P.O. Box 271, La Jolla, CA 92038. 25p.

- Barlow, J., Baird, R.W., Heyning, J.E., Wynne, K., Manville II, A.M., Lowry, L.F., Hanan, D., Sease, J. and Burkanov, V.N. (1994). A review of cetacean and pinniped mortality in coastal fisheries along the west coast of the USA and Canada and the east coast of the Russian Federation. *Report of the International Whaling Commission* (Special Issue), 1: 405–425.
- Barlow, J. and Taylor, B.L. (1998). *Preliminary abundance of sperm whales in the northeastern temperate Pacific estimated from a combined visual and acoustic survey*. Unpubl. Report submitted to Int. Whal. Comm. (SC/50/CAWS/20). 19 pp.
- Beasley, I. and Jefferson, T. A. (1997). Marine mammals of Borneo: a preliminary checklist. *Sarawak Museum Journal*, 51(72): 193-210.
- Boye, P. and Plaisier, F. (1989). Die Säugetiere der Nordseeinsel Langeoog. *Drosera*, 1-2: 69-78.
- Cagnolaro, L. and Notarbartolo di Sciara, G. (1992). Attività di ricerca sui cetacei e loro status di conservazione in Italia. *Bollettino del Museo Istituto di Biologia della Università Genova*, 56–57: 53–85.
- Cetacea (2001). Cetacea: Whales, dolphins and porpoises. www.cetacea.org/index.htm Downloaded on 30/11/2003.
- Cetacean Specialist Group (1996). *Physeter macrocephalus*. In: IUCN (2004). 2004 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. www.redlist.org Downloaded on 30/11/2004.
- CFMC (2004) Caribbean Fishery Management Council. U.S. Virgin Islands Marine Resources and Fisheries Strategic and Comprehensive Action Plan-2005. Appendix 1C. Marine Species Overview, Non-Harvestable Species. <http://www.vifishandwildlife.com/fisheries/FisheriesPlan2/append1c.pdf> Downloaded on 11/05/2005.
- Craig, P. (ed.) (2002). *Natural History guide to American Samoa*. National Park of American Samoa and Dept. Marine and Wildlife Resources, Pago Pago.
- de Boer, N.M. Baldwin, R. Burton, C.L.K. Eyre, E.L. Jenner, K.C.S. Jenner, M.N.M. Keith, S.G. McCabe, K.A. Parsons, E.C.M. Peddemors, V.M. Rosebaum, H.C. Rudolph, P. Simmonds, M.P. (2003) *Cetaceans in the Indian Ocean Sanctuary: A Review*. A WDCS Science Report. [http://www.wdcs.org/dan/publishing.nsf/c525f7df6cbf01ef802569d600573108/9c76567b8cc72ff080256d2d00301341/\\$FILE/IOSreview.pdf](http://www.wdcs.org/dan/publishing.nsf/c525f7df6cbf01ef802569d600573108/9c76567b8cc72ff080256d2d00301341/$FILE/IOSreview.pdf) Downloaded on 23/11/2004.
- de Silva, P. H. D. H. (1987). Cetaceans (whales, dolphins and porpoises) recorded off Sri Lanka, India, from the Arabian Sea and Gulf, Gulf of Aden and from the Red Sea. *English Journal of the Bombay Natural History Society*, 84: 505-525.
- Diaz, G.B. and R.A. Ojeda, editors, (2000). *Libro Rojo de los Mamíferos amenazados de Argentina*. Sociedad Argentina para el Estudio de los Mamíferos, SAREM. 106 pp.
- di Natale, A. and Mangano, A. (1983). Biological and distribution new data on the sperm whale, *Physeter macrocephalus* L. in the central Mediterranean Sea. *Rapports P.-v. Reun. Commn int. Explor. scient. Mer. Mediterr.*, 28(5):183-184.
- Dohl, T. P., Guess, R. C., Duman, M.L. and Helm, R.C. (1983). *Cetaceans of central and northern California, 1980-83: Status, abundance, and distribution*. Final Report to the Minerals Management Service, Contract No. 14-12-0001-29090. 284p.
- ECBC (2004). European Cetacean Bycatch Campaign. <http://www.eurocbc.org/page2.html> Downloaded on 1/12/2004.
- Félix, F., Haase, B., Davis, J.W., Chiluiza, D. and Amador, P. (1997). A note on recent strandings and bycatches of Sperm Whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) and humpback whales (Megaptera novaeangliae) in Ecuador. *Report of the International Whaling Commission*, 47: 917–919.
- Ferrero, R.C., DeMaster, D.P., Hill, P.S., Muto, M.M. and Lopez, A.L. (2000). Alaska Marine Mammals Stock Assessments 2000. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Alaska Fisheries Science Center, US.
- Forney, K. A., Barlow, J. and Carretta, J.V. (1995). The abundance of cetaceans in California waters. Part II: Aerial surveys in winter and spring of 1991 and 1992. *Fish. Bull.*,

93:15-26.

- Garrigue, C. and Greaves, J. (2001). Cetacea records for the New Caledonian area (Southwest Pacific Ocean). *Micronesica*, 34: 27-33.
- Gosho, M.E., Rice, D.W. and Breiwick, J.M. (1984). The sperm whale, *Physeter macrocephalus*. *Mar. Fish. Rev.*, 46(4):54 -64.
- Green, G. A., J. J. Brueggeman, R. A. Grotefendt, C. E. Bowlby, M. L. Bonnell, K. C. Balcomb, III. (1992). Cetacean distribution and abundance off Oregon and Washington, 1989-1990. Ch. 1 In: J. J. Brueggeman (ed.). Oregon and Washington Marine Mammal and Seabird Surveys. Minerals Management Service Contract Report 14-12-0001-30426.
- Haase, B. and Félix, F. (1994). A note on the incidental mortality of Sperm Whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) in Ecuador. *Report of the International Whaling Commission* (Special Issue), 15: 481–483.
- Harrison, J. (1966). *An introduction to the mammals of Singapore and Malaya*. English Singapore Branch, Malayan Nature Society, Singapore ISBN 900848 67 7.
- Hazevoet, C. J. and Wenzel, F. W. (2000). Whales and dolphins (Mammalia, Cetacea) of the Cape Verde Islands, with special reference to the Humpback Whale *Megaptera novaeangliae* (Borowski, 1781). *English Contributions to Zoology*, 69(3): 197-211.
- Heaney, L. R., Balete, D. S., Dolar, L., Alcalá, A. C., Dans, A., Gonzales, P. C. et al. (1998). A synopsis of the mammalian fauna of the Philippine Islands. Series/Edition 2. *Fieldiana Zoology*, 88: 1-61.
- Irish Whale and Dolphin Group (2004). Species profiles: Sperm whale. http://www.iwdg.ie/species_profiles.asp?speciesID=2111 Downloaded on 2/12/2004.
- Kato, H., and Miyashita, T. (1998). *Current status of North Pacific sperm whales and its preliminary abundance estimates*. Unpubl. report submitted to Int. Whal. Comm. 6 pp.
- Laist, D.W., Knowlton, A.R., Mead, J.G., Collet, A.S. and Podesta, M. (2001). Collisions between ships and whales. *Marine Mammal Science*, 17, 35–75.
- Mignucci Giannoni, A. A. (1989). A stranded sperm whale, *Physeter catodon*, at Cayo Santiago, Puerto Rico. *Journal of the Veterinary Faculty of the University of Tehran*, 24 (3-4): 213-215.
- NOAA (1998) Stock Assessment report (SARs) by Species/stock: Sperm whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*): North Pacific Stock. [http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Sperm_Whale_\(North_Pacific\)/AK98spermwhale_N.pacific.pdf](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Sperm_Whale_(North_Pacific)/AK98spermwhale_N.pacific.pdf) Downloaded on 1/12/2004.
- NOAA (2000) Stock Assessment report (SARs) by Species/stock: Sperm whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*): Hawaiian stock. [http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Sperm_Whale_\(Hawaii\)/PO00spermwhale_hawaii.pdf](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Sperm_Whale_(Hawaii)/PO00spermwhale_hawaii.pdf) Downloaded on 1/12/2004.
- NOAA (2002) Stock Assessment report (SARs) by Species/stock: Sperm whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*): North Atlantic stock. [http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Sperm_Whale_\(N._Atlantic\)/AO02spermwhale_N.atlantic.pdf](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Sperm_Whale_(N._Atlantic)/AO02spermwhale_N.atlantic.pdf) Downloaded on 1/12/2004.
- NOAA (2003a) Stock Assessment report (SARs) by Species/stock: Sperm whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*): California-Oregon-Washington stock. [http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Sperm_Whale_\(CA-OR-WA\)/po03spermwhalecaorwa.pdf](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Sperm_Whale_(CA-OR-WA)/po03spermwhalecaorwa.pdf) Downloaded on 1/12/2004.
- NOAA (2003b) Stock Assessment report (SARs) by Species/stock: Sperm whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Stock. [http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Sperm_Whale_\(N._Gulf_of_Mexico\)/ao03spermwhalengulfofmexico.pdf](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot_res/PR2/Stock_Assessment_Program/Cetaceans/Sperm_Whale_(N._Gulf_of_Mexico)/ao03spermwhalengulfofmexico.pdf) Downloaded on 1/12/2004.
- Notarbartolo di Sciara, G. (1990). A note on the cetacean incidental catch in the Italian

- driftnet swordfish fishery, 1986–1988. *Report of the International Whaling Commission*, 40: 459–460.
- Nowak, E. (1981). Die Säugetiere der Länder der Europäischen Gemeinschaft. Artenkatalog mit Angaben über Vorkommen und gesetzlichen Schutzstatus. German Kilda-Verlag, Greven, Germany
- Nowak, R.M. (1991) *Walker's mammals of the world*, Fifth Edition. John Hopkins University Press, Boston.
- Obley, S. (2004). The South Carolina Wildlife Federation.
<http://www.scwf.org/articles/index.php?view=209> Downloaded on 09/03/2004.
- Omura, H. (1955). Whales in the northern part of the North Pacific. *Nor. Hvalfangst-Tidende*, 44(6): 323-345.
- Oosthuizen, W.H. (2001) South Africa. Progress Report on cetacean research, January 2001 to December 2001, with statistical data for the Calendar year 2001.
http://www.iwcoffice.org/documents/sci_com/2002progreports/SC-54-ProgRep%20SouthAfrica.pdf Downloaded on 18/11/2004.
- Price, W.S. (1985). Whaling in the Caribbean: historical perspective and update. *Report of the International Whaling Commission*, 35: 413–420.
- Reeves, R.R. (1988). Exploitation of cetaceans in St. Lucia, Lesser Antilles, January 1987. *Report of the International Whaling Commission*, 38: 445–447.
- Reeves, R.R., Smith, B.D., Crespo, E.A. and di Sciara, G.N. (comps.) (2003). *Dolphins, whales and Porpoises: 2002-2010 Conservation Action Plan for the World's Cetaceans*. IUCN/SSC Cetacean Specialist Group. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.
- Rice, D.W. (1989). Sperm whale, *Physeter macrocephalus*. Pp.177-233, In S.H.Ridgway and R.Harrison (eds.), *Handbook of Marine Mammals*. vol 4. River Dolphins and the Larger Toothed Whales. Academic Press, New York.
- Rodríguez, J. P. and Rojas-Suárez, F. (1999). *Libro rojo de la fauna Venezolana. 2da edición*. PROVITA, Caracas (Venezuela).
- Romero, A., Hayford, K. T., Romero, A. and Romero, J. (2002). The marine mammals of Grenada, W.I., and their conservation status. *Mammalia*, 66(4): 479-494.
- Rudolph, P., Smeenk, C. and Leatherwood, S. (1997). Preliminary checklist of Cetacea in the Indonesian archipelago and adjacent waters. *Zoologische Verhandelingen, Leiden* 312: 48pp.
- Sea Watch foundation (2004). Sperm whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*).
<http://www.seawatchfoundation.org.uk/species-sperm.htm> Downloaded on 1/12/2004.
- Shimada, H. and Pastene, A. A. (1995). Report of a sighting survey off the Solomon Islands with comments on Bryde's Whale distribution. *Reports of the International Whaling Commission*, 45: 413-417.
- UNEP-WCMC (2004). Species Database. www.unep-wcmc.org Downloaded on 1/12/2004.
- WDCS (2004) The Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society www.wdcs.org Downloaded on 10/03/2004.
- Weir, C.R. Pollock, C. Cronin, C. and Taylor, S. (2001). Cetaceans of the Atlantic Frontier, north and west of Scotland. *Continental Shelf Research*, 21: pp. 1047-1071.
- Whitehead, H. and Weilgart, L. (2000). The Sperm Whale: social females and roving males. In: J. Mann, R.C. Connor, P.L. Tyack, and H. Whitehead (eds) *Cetacean Societies: Field Studies of Dolphins and Whales*, pp. 154–172. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Whitehead, H., Christal, J. and Dufault, S. (1997). Past and distant whaling and the rapid decline of Sperm Whales off the Galápagos Islands. *Conservation Biology*, 11(6): 1387–1396.
- Wildlife Conservation Society of the Philippines (1997) *Philippine Red Data Book: Red List of Threatened Animals*. Wildlife Conservation Society of the Philippines, Makati City, Philippines.

-- DRAFT, NOT FOR FURTHER CIRCULATION --

Pontoporia blainvillei - synopsis

Country	Reported as nationally threatened	Apparent trend	CMS actions reported (in 2002 National Reports)	Other recent actions reported in the literature
ARGENTINA	●	?	✓	✓
Brazil	●	?		✓
URUGUAY		?	✘	

REVIEW OF CONCERTED ACTION SPECIES

MAMMALIA: PLATANISTIDAE

- SPECIES:** *Pontoporia blainvillei* (Gervais and d'Orbigny, 1844)
- SYNONYMS:** -
- COMMON NAME:** Franciscana; La Plata River Dolphin (English); Dauphin de la Plata (French); Delfín de la Plata; Tonina (Spanish)
- RANGE STATES:** ARGENTINA; Brazil; URUGUAY; international waters (Southwest Atlantic Ocean)
- RED LIST RATING:** DD (Cetacean Specialist Group, 1996)

CONSERVATION STATUS AND ACTIONS:

Pontoporia blainvillei is a small cetacean endemic to coastal waters of eastern South America and is found mainly in marine waters and only occasionally in estuaries (Praderi, 1986). It ranges from Itaúnas (Espírito Santo, Brazil, 18°25'S) (Moreira and Siciliano, 1991) to Golfo San Matías (northern Patagonia, Argentina, 41°10'S) (Crespo *et al.*, 1998). Based on the distribution of sightings and catches, it seems to inhabit a narrow strip of coastal waters between the surf line and the 30m isobath. It is ecologically tied to areas that receive large volumes of nutrient-rich continental runoff and are influenced by subtropical shelf waters (Reeves *et al.*, 2003). It does not appear to undergo large seasonal migrations and little is known about daily movements (Bordino *et al.* 1999; Bordino 2002a). This is the only member of the river dolphin that lives in the sea and prefers shallow coastal waters.

The franciscana is not distributed continuously throughout its range although the reasons for these gaps are unclear, but because the species prefers shallow, turbid waters (Pinedo *et al.*, 1989; Brownell, 1989), water transparency and depth may be among the factors responsible (Siciliano *et al.*, 2002).

Two franciscana populations are recognized based on differences in skull morphology and genetic and parasite markers: a smaller northern form occurring between Rio de Janeiro and Santa Catarina; and a larger southern form in Rio Grande do Sul, Uruguay, and Argentina (Pinedo, 1991, Secchi *et al.*, 1998). Recent aerial surveys indicate that there may be about 42,000 franciscanas in the waters of Rio Grande do Sul and Uruguay (95% confidence interval: 33,047–53,542) between the shore and the 30m isobath – an area of about 64,000km² (Secchi *et al.*, 2001). There is a lack of information to allow assessment of the status of the franciscana from most regions in its range (Secchi and Wang, 2002).

Pontoporia blainvillei is a particular conservation concern because of its restricted distribution and vulnerability to incidental capture in fishing gear. Large numbers are killed in gillnets. Although the largest documented catches in the 1970s were in Uruguay, catches in recent decades have also been high in southern Brazil and Argentina (Praderi *et al.*, 1989; Pérez Macri and Crespo, 1989; Monzón and Corcuera, 1991; Secchi *et al.*, 1997; Secchi, 1999). Available evidence suggests that mortality rates are excessive and unsustainable (Crespo, 1998; Secchi *et al.*, 2002; Secchi and Wang, 2002). About 1,500-2000 franciscana dolphins are killed annually in the nets of fishermen seeking to catch sharks (de Guia, 2000). Pollution and habitat degradation (heavy coastal traffic, tourism) are other important causes of mortality for this species (Fundación Cethus, 2004).

ARGENTINA:

Status: In total, 338 sightings were recorded between 1993 and 1999 at Bahía Anegada. It is estimated that at least 500 dolphins are accidentally caught every year during fishing operations along the Argentinean coast (Bordino, 2002b). In Argentina, franciscana sightings near the coastline are frequent during spring and summer. In winter, groups usually move away from the coast (Di Benedetto & Ramos, 2001). The species is catalogued as Vulnerable in the Argentinean Mammals Red Data Book (Ojeda & Diaz, 2000).

CMS actions: Research has been conducted by Dr. P. Bordino (Aquamarina-CECIM, in collaboration with the Wildlife Trust), focused on ecology and behaviour (Bahía Blanca and Bahía Anegada areas), bycatch estimation (Bahía Samborombon, Cabo San Antonio, Bahía Blanca and Bahía Anegada), abundance estimations, use of acoustic alarms for reduction of by-catch (Cabo San Antonio and Bahía Blanca), telemetry use evaluation (Bahía Samborombon and Bahía Blanca) and genetic studies. Dr. L. Cappozzo (Natural Sciences Museum of Argentina) has been working on bycatch estimation (Argentina National Report, 2002).

Other actions: Research into the effects of acoustic deterrents for reducing bycatch in this species has been conducted, as has work on population health and genetic and on the general ecology of the Plata Dolphin (Bordino, 2002b). A project is planned to discover knowledge required for timely conservation action, and especially to investigate the impact of human activities on the survival chances of the species. It includes a study of the natural habitat and ecology of this species as well as a Conservation Campaign based on the findings (Bordino, 2002b). Since 1992, the Cethus Foundation has developed a research effort related to this species in the Bay of San Blas (Buenos Aires Province), where behavioral studies and seasonal distribution of the franciscana have been studied, and in 2001, this Foundation signed an agreement with CEAMSE (Coordinación Ecológica Area Metropolitana Sociedad del Estado) with the aim of implementing an awareness and research campaign for the species (Fundación Cethus, 2004).

Brazil:

Status: The conservation status of one franciscana stock inhabiting waters off Rio Grande do Sul State (southern Brazil and Uruguay), was assessed and based on the available information the stock was classified as Endangered under IUCN sub-criteria 1d and 2d of criterion A (EN A1d+2d) (Secchi and Wang, 2002). Crespo (2000) states that the population estimated for Rio Grande do Sul State between the coast and the 30 m isobath was about 4,000-5,000 individuals (the author considers this estimate to be in the lower range of the population size). Spring stranding rates in Rio Grande do Sul were generally high during 1979-81, declined to relatively low levels during 1982-85, increased again until 1987 and subsequently declined, with perhaps some increase again in the most recent years. While clearly recognising the limitations of attempting to infer changes in abundances from stranding data, one of the most likely explanations for declining stranding rates in the face of substantially increasing fishing effort would be a decline in franciscana abundance. The stranding rate trends in conjunction with the effort trends are a matter of concern, and the available information, while limited, suggests that an impact on the southern Brazil population may have occurred (Culik, 2003).

Recent widespread deforestation and agricultural cultivation are present in many of the basins draining into the Rio de la Plata system, particularly in southeastern Brazil (Culik, 2003).

Included as Insufficiently Known in the Brazilian Red Data Book (Fonseca *et al.*, 1994).

CMS actions: Not a Party to CMS.

Other actions: Three research groups have been collecting information about marine mammal stranding events, including the franciscana, along portions of São Paulo State coast (Santos *et al.*, 2002).

Guardians of the Sea in Action was a joint operation by Sea Shepherd Conservation Society (SSCC) and its Brazilian affiliate, Institute Sea Shepherd Brazil (ISSB) conducted in 2004, in which the protection of the Franciscanas was one of the main objectives (Sea Shepherd Conservation Society, 2004).

URUGUAY:

Status: Information about population size, trends and distribution is not available in the Uruguay National Report (2002). Apparently mortality would have fallen to 20-30 specimens per year, given that shark-fishing activities with big nets have decreased (Uruguay National Report, 2002). However, according to Praderi (1986), franciscanas are relatively common in the Uruguayan part of the La Plata River estuary. The conservation status of one franciscana stock inhabiting waters off Rio Grande do Sul State (southern Brazil and Uruguay), was assessed and based on the available information the stock was classified as Endangered under IUCN sub-criterias 1d and 2d of criterion A (EN A1d+2d) (Secchi and Wang, 2002).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions:

REFERENCES:

Argentina National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.

Bordino, P. (2002a). Movement patterns of Franciscana dolphins (*Pontoporia blainvillei*) in Bahía Anegada, Buenos Aires, Argentina. *Latin American Journal of Aquatic Mammals*, 1 (special issue 1): 71-76.

Bordino, P. (2002b). *Ecology, Behaviour and Conservation of the La Plata dolphin in Argentina*. Preliminary Report. Aqua Marino. Centro de Estudios en Ciencias Marinas.

Bordino, P., Thompson, G. and Iñiguez, M. (1999). Ecology and behaviour of the Franciscana (*Pontoporia blainvillei*) in Bahía Anegada, Argentina. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management*, 1: 213-222.

Brownell, R.L. Jr. (1989). Franciscana *Pontoporia blainvillei* (Gervais and d'Orbigny, 1844). In: S. Ridgway and R. Harrison. (eds) *Handbook of Marine Mammals*. Vol 5 The First Book of Dolphins, pp. 45-67. Academic Press, London.

Cetacean Specialist Group (1996). *Pontoporia blainvillei*. In: IUCN (2004). 2004 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. www.redlist.org Downloaded on 3/12/2004.

Crespo, E.A. (ed.) (1998). *Informe del tercer taller para la coordinación de la investigación y la conservación de la Franciscana (Pontoporia blainvillei) en el Atlántico Sudoccidental*. Buenos Aires, 26–28 November 1997. Report to the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), UNEP Secretariat, Bonn, Germany. 23pp.

Crespo, E.A., Harris, G. and González, R. (1998). Group size and distributional range of the Franciscana, *Pontoporia blainvillei*. *Marine Mammal Science*, 14: 845-849.

- Crespo EA (2000) Overview and recommendations. *In: Report of the third workshop for coordinated research and conservation of the franciscana dolphin (Pontoporia blainvillei) in the southwestern Atlantic*. UNEP/CMS Secretariat, Bonn, Germany. pp.1-11
- Culik, B. (2003) *Pontoporia blainvillei*. Review of small cetaceans: Distribution, behaviour, Migration and threats. Compiled for the Convention of Migratory Species. http://www.cms.int/reports/small_cetaceans/data/P_blainvillei/p_blainvillei.htm Downloaded on 9/12/2004.
- Diaz, G.B. and R.A. Ojeda, editors, (2000). *Libro Rojo de los Mamíferos amenazados de Argentina*. Sociedad Argentina para el Estudio de los Mamíferos, SAREM. 106 pp.
- de Guia, N. (2000). Animal Diversity Web - *Pontoporia blainvillei*. http://animaldiversity.ummz.umich.edu/site/accounts/information/Pontoporia_blainvillei.html. Downloaded on 08/03/2004.
- Di Benedetto, A.P.M. and Ramos, R.M.A. (2002) Biology and conservation of the franciscana (*Pontoporia blainvillei*) in the north of Rio de Janeiro State, Brazil. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management* 3(2), pp185-192.
- Fonseca, G.A.B., da Rylands, A.B., Costa, C.M.R., Machado, R.B. and Leyte, I.L.R. (1994) *Livro Vermelho dos Mamíferos Brasileiros Ameaçados de Extinção*. Fundação Biodiversitas, Belo Horizonte, Brazil.
- Fundacion Cethus (2004). *Franciscana dolphin*. http://www.cethus.org/camp_franciscanaEN.htm Downloaded on 3/12/2004
- Monzón, F. and Corcuera, J. (1991). Franciscana *Pontoporia blainvillei* (Gervais and d'Orbigny, 1844). In: H.L. Capozzo and M. Junín (eds) *Estado de Conservación de los Mamíferos Marinos del Atlántico Sudoccidental*, pp. 16–22. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Informes y estudios del Programa de Mares Regionales del PNUMA No. 138.
- Moreira, L.M. de P., and Siciliano, S. (1991). Northward range extension for *Pontoporia blainvillei*. Ninth Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 5–9 December, Chicago, Illinois. [Abstract]
- Pinedo, M.C. (1991). *Development and variation of the Franciscana Pontoporia blainvillei*. Doctoral Thesis, University of California, Santa Cruz. 406pp.
- Pinedo, M.C., Praderi, R. and Brownell, R.L. Jr. (1989). Review of the biology and status of the Franciscana *Pontoporia blainvillei*. In: W.F. Perrin, R.L. Brownell Jr., K. Zhou and J. Liu (eds) *Biology and Conservation of the River Dolphins*, pp. 45-61. IUCN SSC 3, Occasional Papers, Gland.
- Praderi, R. (1986). Comentarios sobre la distribución de *Pontoporia blainvillei* en aguas del Rio de La Plata. In: H.P. Castello (ed.) *Actas I Reunión de Trabajo de Especialistas en Mamíferos Acuáticos de América del Sur, Buenos Aires*, pp. 206-214.
- Praderi, R., Pinedo, M.C. and Crespo, E.A. (1989). Conservation and management of *Pontoporia blainvillei* in Uruguay, Brazil and Argentina. In: W.F. Perrin, R.L. Brownell Jr., Zhou Kaiya, and Liu Jiankang (eds) *Biology and Conservation of the River Dolphins*, pp. 52–56. IUCN/SSC Occasional Paper No. 3, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.
- Pérez Macri, G. and Crespo, E.A. (1989). Survey of the Franciscana dolphin (*Pontoporia blainvillei*) along the Argentine coast with a preliminary evaluation of incidental mortality in coastal fisheries. In: W.F. Perrin, R.L. Brownell Jr., Zhou Kaiya, and Liu Jiankang (eds) *Biology and Conservation of the River Dolphins*, pp. 57–63. IUCN/SSC Occasional Paper No. 3, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.
- Reeves, R.R., Smith, B.D., Crespo, E.A. and di Sciara, G.N. (comps.) (2003). *Dolphins, Whales and Porpoises: 2002-2010 Conservation Action Plan for the World's Cetaceans*. IUCN/SSC Cetacean Specialist Group. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.
- Santos, M. C. O., Vicente, A.F.C., Zampiroli, E., Alvarenga, F.S. and Souza, S.P. (2002). Records of Franciscana (*Pontoporia blainvillei*) from the coastal waters of Sao Paulo State, southeast Brazil. *Lajam Special Issue* 1, 1(1): 169-174.

- Sea Shepherd Conservation Society (2004). Sea Brazil 2004 – Guardians of the Sea in Action. <http://www.seashepherd.org/brazil/brazil.html> Downloaded on 3/12/2004.
- Secchi, E.R. (1999). Taxa de crescimento potencial intrínseco de um estoque de franciscanas, *Pontoporia blainvillei* (Gervais and D'Orbigny, 1844) (Cetacea, Pontoporiidae) sob o impacto da pesca costeira de emalhe. MSc. Thesis, Fundação Universidade Federal do Rio Grande, Rio Grande. 152pp.
- Secchi, E.R. and Wang, J.Y. (2002). Assessment of the conservation status of a Franciscana (*Pontoporia blainvillei*) stock in the Franciscana Management Area III following the IUCN Red List process. *Latin American Journal of Aquatic Mammals* (Special Issue), 1: 183-190.
- Secchi, E.R., Ott, P.H. and Danilewicz, D. (2002). Report of the fourth workshop for the coordinated research and conservation of the Franciscana dolphin (*Pontoporia blainvillei*) in the western South Atlantic. *Latin American Journal of Aquatic Mammals* (Special Issue), 1: 11-20.
- Secchi, E.R., Ott, P.H., Crespo, E.A., Kinas, P.G., Pedraza, S.N. and Bordino, P. (2001). A first estimate of Franciscana (*Pontoporia blainvillei*) abundance off southern Brazil. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management*, 3: 95-100.
- Secchi, E.R., Wang, J.Y., Murray, B., Roccha-Campos, C.C. and White, B.N. (1998). Populational differences between franciscanas, *Pontoporia blainvillei*, from two geographical locations as indicated by sequences of mtDNA control region. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, 76: 1622-1627.
- Secchi, E.R., Zerbini, A.N., Bassoi, M., Dalla Rosa, L., Moller, L.M. and Roccha-Campos, C.C. (1997). Mortality of franciscanas, *Pontoporia blainvillei*, in coastal gillnetting in southern Brazil: 1994-1995. *Reports of the International Whaling Commission*, 47: 653-658.
- Siciliano, S., Di Benedetto, A.P. and Ramos, R.M.A. (2002). A toninha, *Pontoporia blainvillei* (Gervais and d'Orbigny, 1844) (Mammalia, Cetacea, Pontoporiidae), nos estados do Rio de Janeiro e Espírito Santo, costa sudeste do Brasil: caracterizações dos habitats e fatores de isolamento das populações. *Boletim do Museu Nacional, Zoologia*, 476: 1-15.
- Uruguay National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.

* Range State not yet included in the CMS range list for this species.