



**CONVENTION ON
MIGRATORY
SPECIES**

Distr: General

UNEP/CMS/PIC-1/5/Add.1
20 March 2007

Original: English

FIRST MEETING OF THE SIGNATORIES TO THE
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR THE
CONSERVATION OF CETACEANS AND THEIR
HABITATS IN THE PACIFIC ISLANDS REGION

Apia, Samoa, 6 March 2007

Agenda Item 7.1, 7.2, 8.4

**REPORT OF THE
TECHNICAL MEETING ON CETACEANS IN THE PACIFIC ISLANDS REGION
(1-4 AUGUST 2006)**



TECHNICAL MEETING ON CETACEANS IN THE PACIFIC ISLANDS REGION

SPREP Headquarters, Apia, Samoa,

1-4 August 2006



LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

| | |
|---------------|---|
| CBD | Convention on Biological Diversity |
| CI | Conservation International |
| CITES | Convention on the International Trade of Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna |
| CMS | Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Wild Animals |
| COP | Conference of Parties |
| CROP | Council of Regional Organizations in the Pacific |
| DEH | Department of Environment and Heritage, Australia |
| EEZ | Exclusive Economic Zone |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations |
| FFA | Forum Fisheries Agency |
| GEF | Global Environment Fund |
| HI | Hawaii |
| ICRW | International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling |
| IFAW | International Fund for Animal Welfare |
| IGO | Inter-Governmental Organization |
| IWC | International Whaling Commission |
| JARPA | Japanese Whale Research Program under Special Permit in the Antarctic |
| MoC | Memorandum of Cooperation |
| MoU | Memorandum of Understanding |
| MPAs | Marine Protected Areas |
| MSPF | regional Marine Species Programme Framework |
| NBSAP | National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan |
| NCSA | National Capacity Self Assessment |
| NEA | National Environment Agency |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organization |
| NOAA | National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (USA) |
| NSW | New South Whales |
| NZ | New Zealand |
| PICTs | Pacific Island Countries and Territories |
| PIF | Pacific Islands Forum |
| PIR | Pacific Islands Region |
| PNG | Papua New Guinea |
| REA | Regional Environment Agreements? |
| RFMOs | Regional Fisheries Management Organizations |
| SAT | Samoan Tala |
| SMMPL | Some Marine Mammals Protection Legislation |
| SOPAC | Pacific Islands Applied Geoscience Commission |
| SPC | Secretariat of the Pacific Community |
| SPLASH | Structure of Populations, Levels of Abundance, and Status of Humpbacks Project |
| SPREP | Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme |
| SPTO | South Pacific Tourism Organization |
| SPWRC | South Pacific Whale Research Consortium |
| SPWS | South Pacific Whale Sanctuary |
| SWOT | Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats |
| TNC | The Nature Conservancy |
| UNCLOS | United Nations Convention on Law of the Sea |
| UNEP | United Nations Environment Programme |
| USA | United States of America |
| USP | University of the South Pacific |
| WCPFC | Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission |
| WDAP | Whales and Dolphins Action Plan |
| WDCS | Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society |
| WSSD | World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) |
| WWF | World Wildlife Fund for Nature |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|------------|
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS | I |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | ii |
| LIST OF TABLES AND ANNEXES | iii |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 1 |
| INTRODUCTION | 6 |
| SECTION 1: STATUS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REGIONAL WHALE & DOLPHIN ACTION PLAN (WDAP) 2003-2007 | 7 |
| 1.1 WDAP 2003-2007 | 7 |
| 1.2 IMPLEMENTATION..... | 7 |
| 1.3 STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, GAPS, LESSONS LEARNT..... | 8 |
| SECTION 2: STATUS, CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT OF CETACEANS..... | 9 |
| 2.1 CETACEAN POPULATION TRENDS..... | 9 |
| 2.1.1 <i>Cetacean Species Distribution</i> | 9 |
| 2.1.2 <i>Stock Populations and Trends of Large Cetaceans</i> | 10 |
| 2.1.3 <i>Status of small cetaceans</i> | 11 |
| 2.2 THREATS TO CETACEANS IN THE REGION..... | 11 |
| 2.3 FISHERIES INTERACTION WITH CETACEANS..... | 12 |
| 2.4 CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE OF CETACEANS..... | 13 |
| 2.5 CETACEAN CONSERVATION STRATEGIES..... | 13 |
| 2.5.1 <i>South Pacific Whale Sanctuary (SPWS)</i> | 13 |
| 2.5.2 <i>National legislation, policies and sanctuaries</i> | 14 |
| 2.5.3 <i>Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries</i> | 14 |
| 2.5.4 <i>Relevant conservation conventions for cetaceans</i> | 15 |
| 2.6 CETACEAN AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES | 17 |
| 2.6.1 <i>Whale and Dolphin Watching</i> | 17 |
| 2.6.2 <i>Managing impacts of tourism</i> | 18 |
| 2.6.3 <i>Certification/training programme for whale watching operators and guides</i> | 19 |
| 2.7 INFORMATION/AWARENESS MATERIAL | 20 |
| SECTION 3: TOWARDS A REVISED ACTION PLAN | 20 |
| 3.1 WDAP IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES..... | 20 |
| 3.2 KEY COMPONENTS FOR THE REVISED ACTION PLAN..... | 22 |
| 3.2.1 <i>Linkages to CMS Cetacean MoU</i> | 22 |
| 3.2.2 <i>Proposed Format</i> | 22 |
| 3.2.3 <i>Collaborative Linkages</i> | 22 |
| 3.3 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 23 |

LIST OF TABLES AND ANNEXES

TABLE 1: Cetacean species recorded in Pacific Islands Countries and Territories

Annexes

- **Annex 1:** Status of the implementation of the WDAP 2003-2007;
- **Annex 2:** The results of the session analyzing Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) for the Whale and Dolphin Action Plan 2003-2007 including its implementation;
- **Annex 3:** Agreed actions for the Technical meeting under the current WDAP;
- **Annex 4:** Country listing for Cetaceans within the Pacific Islands;
- **Annex 5:** Potential and known cetacean threats/impacts, with recommendations;
- **Annex 6:** Summary of existing national marine mammal protection measures including sanctuary, regional/international conventions/agreements;
- **Annex 7:** Findings of the cetacean watching industry study for individual countries and territories;
- **Annex 8:** A brief review of cetacean-based tourism impact studies;
- **Annex 9:** List of information and awareness material on cetaceans produced by various agencies, including listing of recent papers on cetaceans by SPWRC;
- **Annex 10:** WADP Implementation Issues
- **Annex 11:** Information on issues and implementation/tools/mechanisms under the subheadings in MoU for the conservation of cetaceans and their habitats in the Pacific Islands region;
- **Annex 12:** A sample National Biodiversity Strategy an Action Plan (NBSAP) format;
- **Annex 13:** Technical Meeting advice on actions for the new WDAP;
- **Annex 14:** List of Participants

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The current regional Marine Species Programme Framework (MSPF) 2003-2007 was endorsed by SPREP members in 2003 and subsequently commended by Forum Leaders in the same year. The MSPF 2003-2007 consists of Action Plans for three groups of marine animals of special interest, whales and dolphins, sea turtles and dugongs.

At the 17th SPREP meeting, members agreed to the review process of the MSPF and its Action Plans and directed SPREP Secretariat to submit a revised MSPF at their next meeting. The approach to the review of the MSPF and Action Plans was to ensure that SPREP Members had updated technical information to inform their deliberation and development of a revised MSPF and Action Plans. SPREP held a technical meeting on Cetaceans on 1-4 August 2006 in Apia, Samoa. The objectives of the meeting were:

- 1). To assess the status of the implementation of the regional WDAP 2003-2007
- 2). To review collected and available information on cetaceans in the Pacific Islands region
- 3). To develop components of a draft revised Whale and Dolphin Action Plan.

The meeting was attended by experts from the region and afar. It provided a forum for information sharing and robust exchanges on key issues and priorities as well as recommended actions with the view to provide relevant advice to SPREP members for the development of the revised Action Plan on Cetaceans. The outcomes of the meeting are summarised below.

Assessment of the implementation of the WDAP 2003-2007

The meeting agreed that the WDAP provided a focus for action at the regional and national level. Whilst significant progress has been achieved in the 3.5 years of the WDAP implementation it has been notably limited by lack of human and financial resources. In the same time it is encouraging to note the following achievements:

- The SPREP/CMS partnership in developing a regional agreement for marine mammal conservation in the region has progressed well with a *CMS MoU on Cetaceans and their habitats in the Pacific Islands Region* signed by 9 SPREP members in 2006
- The SPREP/IFAW MOU has for the first time formally cemented an IGO NGO partnership for marine species conservation in the region.
- Significant new partnerships and programmes by NGOs in the region e.g. IFAW, WWF South Pacific, WDACS which have grown in the region post 2003 and are making a significant contribution to the WDAP's implementation at regional and country level.
- The role the South Pacific Whale Research Consortium (SPWRC) and its members are playing in developing research, providing information and in many cases building significant capacity and long-term research programmes for marine mammals in the region.
- Incorporation by NGOs and Governments of marine mammal issues into ecological assessments eg Solomon Islands TNC REA, NEA/CI Phoenix Islands Conservation Project.

Update on knowledge of cetaceans populations, conservation and management

Cetaceans Population status

Records on cetacean occurrence based on existing and largely limited data and information indicate that a total of 33 species (41 if New Zealand and Australia are also included) are found in the region, with sperm whales being the most widely distributed across the region and PNG and Solomon Islands having the greatest number of species.

A modeling exercise undertaken by Auckland University to estimate population abundance of Humpback whales in Oceania, based on mark-recapture from photo ID, generated and estimate of 3800, with Tonga having the largest population (2,311), followed by French Polynesia (1057) and New Caledonia (472). It should be noted that this work is still an unpublished work in progress, but the meeting agreed that the estimates are probably in the right ballpark. Population estimates for other species are poorly known and mostly based on ad hoc information.

On-going work on movements and genetic analysis of whales and small cetaceans is being conducted adding to the picture. Initiatives such as the Comprehensive assessment of Southern

Hemisphere Humpback Whales (CASH) and the Structure of Populations, Levels of Abundance, and Status of Humpbacks (SPLASH, NOAA) will over time improve knowledge.

Fisheries and cetaceans interaction

Studies of whale entanglements in fishing gear and more generally marine debris, undertaken by NOAA - Hawaii show surprisingly a high rate of encounter. Possible responses include the design of safe fishing gear, establishing rescue networks and closing fisheries in certain areas.

The only published report¹ on depredation in the region estimated that depredation by whales accounts for 0.8% of catch in the region. A report on long line fisheries interactions and cetaceans in Samoa, showed that dolphins occasionally take long line baits and toothed whales take hooked catch. Preliminary results, from catch logs and interviews indicate that 3-6% per sets are affected, representing an estimated loss of income of SAT 3000 per affected set, according to the fishermen interviewed.

An FAO project on ecosystem based management of fisheries in PNG indicated that depredation by cetaceans in particular the Bismarck and Solomon Seas industry of 10% loss of yield in one season and acknowledge the need for further research in this area, including the review and adaptation of log sheet forms and observer protocols to assess the extent of species interaction with tuna fisheries.

Legislation and policy

A review of current national legislation, policies and sanctuaries, undertaken by IFAW, showed that most Pacific Islands countries and territories have in place some form of protection measures. 10 countries and territories have in place national marine mammal protection legislation and 7 have some form of marine mammal protection. All countries are members of FAO, and signatories to UNCLOS, CBD (except US Territories), 12 to CITES (Us and French Territories, Fiji, Palau, PNG, Samoa, Tokelau and Vanuatu) and 3 to the CMS (French Territories, Samoa, Cook Islands).

The review highlighted the need for implementation of current measures, additional legislation to implement CITES/CBD, but also points to the need to consider other instruments such as marine managed areas. Progress on a proposal by Australia and New Zealand to the International Whaling Commission (IWC) for a South Pacific Whale sanctuary endorsed in 2001 by the SPREP members was presented by DEH.

A review of opportunities to progress cetacean conservation under international instruments (eg CBD, CITES, Ramsar, World Heritage, CMS) by WDCS, showed that of the 5 UN biodiversity conventions, the CMS is a most appropriate instrument, given its focus on implementation for migratory species and their habitat conservation. The CBD target to reduce biodiversity loss by 2012, and the CBD indicators for species, ecosystems and habitats were noted as important tools to focus action and measure progress. The streamlining of reporting across conventions was presented as a welcome development to reduce the burden of national reporting.

The potential benefits of the *CMS MoU on Cetaceans and their Habitats in the Pacific Islands Region* was presented as increased international profile, technical information, capacity building and networking opportunities as well as a mechanism for leveraging of resources and streamlining of reporting to conventions. It was proposed that CMS MoU provisions and the CBD indicators and reporting timelines to conventions be incorporated into the revised Action Plan, and that broader partnerships with expertise on ecosystem based approaches be developed.

Cultural significance

Case studies on cultural significance of cetaceans in Tuvalu and Vanuatu presented by IFAW, showed the importance of marine mammals as food source, in ceremonies and a totems. However, traditional associations seem to have been lost in recent times.

¹ Lawson et al 2001. SPC. 14th Standing Committee on Tuna and Billfish Working Paper (6)

Cetacean based tourism

A review of the status of marine mammal tourism activities in the Pacific Islands region, commissioned by IFAW in collaboration with SPREP, SPWRC and the SPTO, showed that the industry is experiencing strong annual growth in particular in French Polynesia and Guam, with well established industries in New Caledonia and Tonga since 1998 and new ventures in PNG, Samoa, Cooks and Solomon Islands.

The review showed that the size of an industry depends on the reliability of sightings and accessibility of cetaceans combined with a sound tourism base. The study indicates that between 1998 and 2005, the number of whales watchers has increased by 100% (estimated at 110 000 in 14 countries in 2005), which represents an estimated direct economic value of \$US 7.5 million and \$US 21 million in total value of the industry. Those figures demonstrate the economic benefits and opportunities associated with cetacean conservation.

With an increase in growth comes clear responsibility to protect cetaceans and have in place appropriate regulations, plans, guidelines and awareness programmes. Cetacean based tourism impacts studies conducted in New Zealand and elsewhere show the need for establishing and disseminating best practices and code of conducts for industry.

A review of impacts of tourism activities undertaken by the Massey University (NZ) showed that there is little known about the impacts of tourism activities such as noise from boats, interaction with swimmers, and that caution should prevail when promoting cetacean based tourism as a sustainable activity. Certification and training programmes for whale watching operations and guides are an important tool to minimize stress on the animals and to develop interpretation activities to promote the conservation of cetaceans. A good example is the Whales Alive Training and Certification Program for whale watching guides.

Toward developing a revised whale and dolphin action plan

The meeting mapped out key issues to be considered in developing the revised plan, including implementation issues and identification of priority areas, based on the review of the existing plan, updated information and new developments such as the CMS MoU on Cetaceans. These discussions were used to develop detailed technical advice for consideration by SPREP member countries and territories.

The meeting highlighted a number of key issues to improve the development and implementation of a revised action plan including:

- Improve knowledge of the status of cetacean populations and their habitats, as well as impacts from human activities to guide decision making (national and regional level);
- Develop strategic priorities and timeframes for regional and national action;
- Foster integration of cetacean conservation in regional and national policies (eg NBSAPs, Fisheries plans and National Sustainable Development Strategies);
- Demonstrate economic benefits of cetacean conservation through economic opportunities (eg tourism) but also from positive impacts of conservation measures (eg habitat protection, mitigation techniques) to generate political support and investment for cetacean conservation;
- Build in country capacity (technical, financial, institutional) to implement and monitor agreed actions and address existing and emerging threats such as climate change and increased direct take;
- Develop monitoring and reporting systems to evaluate the effectiveness of regional and national implementation, and
- Initiate dialogue and collaboration with the fisheries, tourism and transport sectors at the regional and national levels in relation to information, awareness raising and management actions to address impacts.

The meeting highlighted key opportunities to progress cetaceans conservation and enhance the effectiveness of a revised action plan including:

- the CMS MoU on Cetaceans by increasing technical capacity for implementation through partnerships and by leveraging political and financial support in international fora;
- linking cetacean conservation to international and regional initiatives as platforms for integrated policy responses (eg CBD and the CBD Island Biodiversity Programme of Work, the Micronesia Challenge) and information exchange and mitigation strategies with RFMOs (eg the newly established Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission) and
- demonstrated benefits from cetacean conservation reflected in the growth of whale and dolphin tourism in the region.

An overview of key recommendations towards the development of the revised Action Plan for cetaceans include:

Proposed format

The Plan should include a clear vision, priority areas/themes with time bound actions at the national, regional and international levels, identification of implementing organisations, inclusion of a monitoring and evaluation framework and a communication strategy.

Proposed themes/areas for consideration

The meeting proposed the following:

1. Threats to cetaceans;
2. Ecosystem/habitat protection, including migratory corridors
3. Research and monitoring, including responses to strandings and entanglements
4. Education and awareness;
5. Information management
6. Capacity building;
7. Sustainable and responsible cetacean-based tourism
8. Regional and international collaboration and cooperation
9. Legislation and policy;
10. Coordination and implementation of the revised action plan

Under the above categories, the meeting proposed a number of actions for consideration. A summary is presented below. Specific actions are detailed in Annex 13.

Theme 1: Threats to cetaceans

Recommended actions:

- Review key fisheries interaction data to develop strategies and plans for mitigation
- Assess the impact of directed takes on PIR cetacean populations
- Develop advice and regulation to minimise the threat of ship strikes in identified critical habitat areas
- Consider shipping routes and develop ambient noise budgets for the PIR
- Develop information on the impact of climate change to cetaceans in the region

Theme 2: Ecosystem/habitat protection, including migratory corridors

Recommended actions:

- Identify critical habitat, oceanographic conditions and migratory pathways in the PIR
- Assess effectiveness of sanctuaries and area based tools to protect cetacean habitats at regional and national levels

Theme 3: Research and monitoring, including responses to strandings and entanglements

Recommended actions:

- Increase research training and develop PIR wide guidelines for data collection
- Conduct key species inventory/baseline surveys

Theme 4: Education and awareness

Recommended actions:

- Develop communications strategies, training programmes and protocols for key issues

- within the WDAP
- Increase information transfers about cetaceans species in the PIR

Theme 5: Information management

Recommended actions:

- Compile key technical (scientific and legislative) information to support the WDAP
- Develop systems for maximising use of existing data and data analysis

Theme 6: Capacity building

Recommended actions:

- Identify training needs at the national level
- Increase training in appropriate research methods and protocols
- Encourage regional and international opportunities for training

Theme 7: Sustainable and responsible cetacean-based tourism

Recommended actions:

- Assess effectiveness of existing guidelines, regulations and licensing schemes.
- Foster training and certification programmes and best practice impact management.
- Engage industry in monitoring and educational activities.
- Foster sharing of lessons learnt and undertake regular review of industry.

Theme 8: Regional and international collaboration and cooperation

Recommended actions:

- Foster interagency collaboration at national level and engagement with private sector.
- Foster NGO partnerships at the national, regional and international levels.
- Foster greater engagement of US and French Territories in the development and implementation of the action plan.

Theme 9: Legislation and policy

Recommended actions:

- Develop industry based (eg tourism/fisheries/transport) guidelines, regulations and actions to reduce threats to cetaceans.
- Integrate international requirements into regional and national systems

Theme 10: Coordination and implementation

Recommended actions:

- Develop an implementation and reporting framework (including standard reporting template, indicators etc).
- Develop and maintain a database of achievements against agreed actions.
- Develop a communication strategy for the life of the plan.
- Undertake economic evaluation of the effectiveness of the plan to promote the value of cetaceans conservation with policy makers and the community.
- Develop a resource strategy to implement the Action Plan in partnership with the CMS secretariat, NGOs and seek partnership with the private sector.
- Facilitate the development of national implementation plans for cetacean conservation.

INTRODUCTION

The current regional Marine Species Programme Framework (MSPF) 2003-2007 was endorsed by SPREP members in 2003 and subsequently commended by Forum Leaders in the same year. The MSPF 2003-2007 consists of Actions Plans for three groups of marine animals of special interest, whales and dolphins, sea turtles and dugongs. The Action Plans encompass priority actions to enable the peoples of the Pacific Islands region to take a primary role in achieving the following vision: *A Pacific Ocean where populations of whales & dolphins, dugongs and marine turtles have recovered to healthy levels of abundance, have recovered their former distribution and continue to meet and sustain the cultural aspirations of Pacific peoples.*

At the 17th SPREP meeting, members agreed to the review process of the MSPF and its Action Plans and directed SPEP Secretariat to submit a revised MSPF at its next meeting. Nine SPREP members signed the *CMS MoU for the Conservation of Cetaceans and their Habitats in the Pacific Islands* at the meeting.

The approach to the review of the MSPF was to ensure that SPREP Members had updated technical information to inform their deliberation and development of a revised MSPF and Action Plans. To that effect, SPREP held a technical meeting on cetaceans on 1-4 August 2006.

The objectives of the meeting were:

- 1). To assess the status of the implementation of the regional WDAP 2003-2007
- 2). To review collected and available information on cetaceans in the Pacific Islands region
- 3). To develop components of a draft revised Whale and Dolphin Action Plan.

Expected outcomes of the meeting were:

- A Summary of the status of the implementation and likely implementation to end 2007 of the regional WDAP 2003-2007.
- Updated technical information on cetaceans in the Pacific Islands region.
- Agreed process, actions and timetable for completing the review and producing a revised Action Plan for submission to and sign off at the 2007 SPREP meeting.
- Agreed preparation and information needs for a wider regional meeting of countries/territories to discuss/finalize the WDAP review.
- List of components of draft revised action plan.

The meeting brought together experts in cetacean conservation from regional and international agencies including NOAA (US), the CMS Scientific Council, the Department of the Environment and Heritage (Australia), the Department of Conservation (New Zealand) the Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment and Meteorology (Samoa), IFAW, WDCS and WWF. A list of participants is attached as Annex 14.

The meeting was organized and facilitated by SPREP. Significant support was provided to the SPREP team by participants, in particular Ms Sue Miller-Taei (IFAW) and Dr Margi Prideaux (WDCS), prior to and during the meeting.

The meeting was organized around three main sessions addressing the key objectives of the meeting and included a combination of presentations and discussion sessions with daily reviews of the day's outcomes. A technical report was prepared by SPREP and a timetable of actions, lead agency and timelines, leading up to endorsement of the revised Action Plan at the 18th SPREP, was developed.

SECTION 1: STATUS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REGIONAL WHALE & DOLPHIN ACTION PLAN (WDAP) 2003-2007

1.1 WDAP 2003-2007

The current regional Marine Species Programme Framework (MSPF) 2003-2007 was endorsed by SPREP members in 2003 and subsequently commended by Forum Leaders in the same year. The MSPF was preceded by the regional Marine Mammal Conservation Programme 1993-2003. The MSPF 2003-2007 consists of Action Plans for three groups of marine animals of special interest, whales and dolphins, sea turtles and dugongs. The Action Plans encompass priority actions to enable the peoples of the Pacific Islands region to take a primary role in achieving the following vision:

“A Pacific Ocean where populations of whales & dolphins, dugongs and marine turtles have recovered to healthy levels of abundance, have recovered their former distribution and continue to meet and sustain the cultural aspirations of Pacific peoples”.

The Whale and Dolphin Action Plan (WDAP) 2003-2007 vision recognizes that whales and dolphins are part of Pacific Island peoples’ cultural and natural heritage and as such SPREP members’ role is to cooperate to:

- foster their recovery from past over-exploitation;
- improve protection and conservation of these species and their habitats, particularly the establishment of sanctuaries through national, regional and international action;
- ensure that Pacific Island people continue to benefit from their long-term survival;
- increase knowledge, awareness and understanding of these species and the role they play in Pacific marine ecosystems.

The goal of the WDAP 2003-2007 is *“to conserve whales and dolphins and their cultural values for the people of the Pacific” and implementation is the collective responsibility of SPREP member states, SPREP, partner non-governmental and intergovernmental organizations, and private sector”.*

The actions for the WDAP are organised under the themes listed below. All of the recommended actions are listed in the matrix on the WDAP Implementation.

- (i) Cultural Significance (incl. whaling heritage)
- (ii) Whale and Dolphin watching tourism
- (iii) Whale Sanctuaries
- (iv) Strandings
- (v) Fisheries Interactions
- (vi) Other Threats
 - Whaling / directed take of small cetaceans
 - Pollution
 - Vessel Collisions
 - Noise Harassment
 - Habitat Degradation
 - Climate Change
 - Population Status and Trends and Research Priorities

1.2 IMPLEMENTATION

Ms Sue Miller-Taei presented the paper summarising the status of the implementation of the WDAP 2003-2007, which is appended as **Annex 1**. An opportunity was also provided for participants to update this information specifically activities involving their agencies/organizations. The result is presented in a matrix form (attached to the paper) where work done/planned in each SPREP member country/territory is listed against these actions.

The overall summary of the implementation of the WDAP is presented below.

Whilst significant progress has been achieved in the 3.5 years of the WDAP implementation, it has been notably limited by lack of human and financial resources.

Nevertheless, it is heartening to note that significant new partnerships and programmes by NGOs in the region eg IFAW, WWF South Pacific, WDACS have developed in the region post 2003 and are making a significant contribution to the WDAP's implementation at regional and national levels. Another important partnership is between SPREP and CMS Secretariats, now formalized under a Memorandum of Cooperation and the development of a regional agreement for cetacean conservation, which has progressed well. The SPREP/IFAW MoU has for the first time formally cemented an IGO - NGO partnership for marine species conservation in the region. The growing role the South Pacific Whale Research Consortium (SPWRC) and its members are playing in developing research, providing information and in many cases building significant capacity and long term research programmes for cetaceans in the region is also acknowledged. The incorporation by NGOs and Governments of marine mammal issues into ecological assessments e.g. Solomon Islands TNC REA, NEA/CI Phoenix Islands Conservation Project is also a significant undertaking.

However, in the same time, new issues of concern have arisen e.g. the plan by Japan to expand its 'scientific whaling' programme to include more minke whales, plus fin and humpback whales, the latter being the foundation of whale watching tourism in the region. A dolphin capture trade for tourism began in the Solomon Islands leading to an international outcry at this practice. Although export is now banned there is still a captive dolphin tourism in the Solomon Islands and in Palau.

1.3 STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, GAPS, LESSONS LEARNT

The results of a group session on Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) analysis of the Whale and Dolphin Action Plan 2003-2007 and its implementation are presented in bullet point format in **Annex 2**.

One of the strengths of the WDAP is that it is a regionally agreed document. It was endorsed by SPREP members in 2003 and was subsequently commended by Forum Leaders in August of the same year. In addition, the WDAP promotes partnership engagement (e.g. with NGO) and is a rallying/focus point for activity and investment. These characteristics have contributed to the substantial amount of work achieved. The WDAP has been a key driver for the development of the MoU for the Conservation of Cetaceans and their Habitats in the Pacific Islands region under the auspices of CMS.

While substantial work has been achieved overall, national implementation has been patchy. This is due to various factors such as the lack of resources, lack of capacity in some countries, and the Action Plan not linking properly to national policies and planning. Other contributing factors include the lack of communication in-country, no ongoing coordination mechanism at SPREP (the position of marine species officer was vacant for some time), as well as the lack of a monitoring, evaluation and reporting framework.

On the structure and content of the WDAP itself, it was felt that it lacks clear priorities/timelines, is too focused on IWC issues, and is not "implementation friendly". While the Action Plan includes objectives and identified threats, these are not followed adequately by actions. In some cases, the actions are not specific enough and capacity sharing is not included.

In terms of opportunities, avenues exist such as the high profile of eco-tourism in the region with increased accessibility of areas. The CMS MoU for the conservation of cetaceans in the region is another opportunity to leverage funding and resources.

Efforts should be directed to enhancing collaborative opportunities and progress conservation initiatives on the ground and promote lessons learnt. Greater emphasis could be given for in-country models as examples.

There needs to be greater awareness of cetacean issues in the region as well as greater international coordination of conservation activities. Given the status of cetacean work in some countries, reinvigorating them would be necessary, with more frequent reporting and celebrating of achievements. The UN will declare 2007 as the Year of the Dolphin, and this presents an opportunity for awareness raising and participation. Opportunities for cetacean conservation can be improved by linking to other issues with momentum such as conservation of biodiversity on the high seas and climate change. Finally, the Australian Centre for Applied Marine Mammal Science and USP present opportunities for information and collaboration.

One of the main threats identified for the effective implementation of the Action Plan is the divergence of political views on cetacean conservation. This could be directly linked to limited public awareness on issues concerning cetaceans and the adverse promotion of fisheries interaction with cetaceans, which are threats in themselves. While there is an increase in conservation measures in some countries, inadequate national management mechanisms to protect cetaceans pose a threat. The proposal to expand lethal research on cetaceans from the region is a real threat, particularly for populations of whale species that are very low in numbers and have not recovered from previous whaling. The lack of long-term data sets and limited capacity in the region also contribute to the issue. Lack of adequate funding, in particular access to sustained funds, has been a hindrance for cetacean work and conservation in the region. This also includes the limited funds available to both SPREP and CMS Secretariat, including the lack of long-term commitment to the Marine Species Officer position at SPREP who is responsible for the development and implementation of the Action Plan.

Annex 3 lists agreed remaining actions for the technical meeting to address under the current WDAP.

SECTION 2: STATUS, CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT OF CETACEANS

2.1 CETACEAN POPULATION TRENDS

2.1.1 Cetacean Species Distribution

Dr Cara Miller of WDACS presented a paper on the current reported occurrence and distribution of cetacean species in the Pacific Islands region, the area covered under the MoU for the Conservation of Cetaceans and their Habitat in the Pacific Islands region under the auspices of CMS, but excluding Australia, New Zealand and Hawaii. The information was obtained from a variety of sources including peer-reviewed journals, field reports, museum stranding records, whaling ship reports, internal records, personal unpublished sightings, anecdotal reports and newspaper reports and each source weighted for accuracy in one of three classes, depending on reliability of report and location (within EEZ or possibly in international waters). This work updates the report by Reeves *et al* (1999). The results are summarised in Table 1 and the report summary is appended at **Annex 4**.

In summary:

- A total of 33 (41 including Australia and New Zealand) cetacean species have been reported to occur in the Pacific Islands region (22 countries and territories).
- Sperm whales are the most widely distributed cetacean species, reported in 21 countries and territories included in the study;
- PNG and Solomon Islands have the most number of cetacean species (21) reported, while Pitcairn Islands and Wallis and Futuna have the least (1 species each).

It was noted that existing information clearly indicated incomplete data due mainly to the absence of proper inventory work. For example, only 5 cetacean species have been reported to occur in Tuvalu waters, which is perhaps implausible, given the higher number of species reported in EEZs of adjacent countries, indicating the potential for more species to be present. In addition, the assistance of a cetacean scientist is necessary for accurate identification, due to problems encountered in this area involving a few species.

2.1.2 Stock Populations and Trends of Large Cetaceans

(i) South Pacific

Mr David Paton of DEH briefly reviewed drastic declines in large whales commercially hunted in 19th and 20th Century as summarised below:

Sperm whales: There were two massive commercial hunts (18th/19th and 20th Century). Current population abundance is very uncertain. There were no sightings in two recent surveys of Phoenix Islands, where there were high catches in sail whaling days.

Blue whales: There are two sub-species, blue and pygmy blue, that migrate between tropical breeding and polar feeding grounds. Sightings were reported in Solomon Islands and New Caledonia in recent years.

Sei and Fin whales: Little is known about abundance or trends in the region.

Bryde's and Minke: Widely distributed in various forms, but little is known about abundance or trends in the region.

Humpback: Humpback whales are widely distributed and were heavily exploited in the 20th Century. Over 3,000 Discovery tags were deployed in the region (including Australia), in over-wintering grounds as well as migratory corridors and feeding grounds. Total takes in Areas IV, V and VI were approximately 80,000 (refer to Figure 1 for the areas used). Recent work by the South Pacific Whale Research Consortium (SPWRC) has shown that there are three genetically distinct populations of humpback whales in Eastern Australia, and east Polynesia and two distinct populations in central and west Polynesia.

Recoveries of tags suggest N-S migrations, except for Polynesian whales, with two animals marked in Tonga that were retrieved near Antarctic Peninsula, indicating that Polynesian whales may show greater longitudinal changes in N-S migrations. This has particular implications for impacts of JARPA II on Polynesian humpbacks. There is no evidence of animals moving further north than 12 degrees latitude. Further analysis and validation of the Soviet Discovery marking scheme will assist in developing crude abundance estimate.

SPWRC has also done a great deal of photo-i.d. work on interchange in Oceania, showing a small but significant degree of interchange, both within and between seasons. For both American Samoa and Cook Islands, no resights between years has been observed.

New Zealand whale scientist Dr Bill Dawbin's logbooks on sightings and marking in Fiji in the late 1950s, around Levuka, showed sightings of a total of 1,648 whales over 3 seasons, with a maximum of 258 in one week. In 1956, he was seeing 0.34 whales per hour; but in the same location in 2001, only 0.01 whales per hour were sighted, thus the Fiji humpback whale population is estimated to be around 2-3% of its initial abundance.

A modelling paper presented at the CASH (Comprehensive Assessment of Southern Hemisphere Humpback Whales) workshop (Hobart, Tasmania, 3 – 7 April 2006) on abundance based on mark-recapture from photo-i.d., gave the following population estimates:

- Tonga humpback population – 2,311;
- New Caledonia humpback population – 472;
- French Polynesia humpback population – 1,057.

Participants agreed however, that the total humpback abundance in the region is probably between 3,000 and 4,000 animals, with Tonga having the biggest population. In comparison, the Eastern Australia humpback abundance has been estimated to be approximately 8,000. This could be because the South Pacific populations have been so depleted and/or because many South Pacific whales have shifted migration routes to Australia.

(ii) North Pacific

Dr David Mattila, from NOAA, presented a short paper on the SPLASH (Structure of Populations, Levels of Abundance, and Status of Humpbacks) Project. The SPLASH Project is an international

cooperative effort to understand the population structure of humpback whales across the North Pacific, and to assess the status, trends and potential human impacts to this population. SPLASH brings together national research programs and independent whale researchers from the United States, Canada, Mexico, Russia and Japan. Partial funding for this project is from the U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service with additional funding from other governmental organizations in the U.S., Canada, and Mexico and from private research foundations. In summary:

- The project may provide good examples for Pacific Islands region;
- 3 primary breeding grounds – Japan, Hawaii, Mexico;
- Limited information on feeding grounds for these whales;
- A Steering committee was established made up of NOAA fisheries & sanctuaries, other government departments and stakeholders;
- Objectives include defining migratory routes, pop structure and dynamics;
- New effort in NW Pacific – Russia, Aleutians;
- Photo ID & biopsy – also using photo's to identify human impacts, entanglement/collision;
- 3765 total ID's for the program in 2005;
- Matches from Russia to Ogasawara, HI to BC, Alaska California. Seven animals between Mexico and HI. Six matches from Mexico to Central America. One between HI and Ogasawara
- 15- 20% of animals display some sort of entanglement in HI. 56% Nth Pacific. 56% Gulf of Maine;
- Some outreach /educational materials available may be useful models for PICTs.

2.1.3 Status of small cetaceans

Mr Marc Oremus of the Auckland University presented a report of his research on spinner and rough-toothed dolphins in French Polynesia using photo-identification and genetic analysis. The key findings show the benefits of focal species studies to improve knowledge of local populations and potential threats, and collaboration with other organisations (in this case the SPWRC) to improve efficiency of such studies in the area. In terms of population structure, the study shows:

- Care must be taken with representation of the timescale of research – connectivity speaks to evolutionary time – populations may be isolated or closed demographically independent units;
- Understanding population structures has a direct relationship to management implementation;
- Be conscious of localised migration and critical habitat needs;
- Collection of data is simple and could be done in-situ by local communities;
- Permitting requirements need to be better facilitated by countries.

2.2 THREATS TO CETACEANS IN THE REGION

Dr David Mattila presented a paper on determining threats of entanglement in fishing gear. The presentations key findings are as follows:-

- (i) Scar analysis, even though it is inherently conservative in its estimate, shows that, in some areas and populations the rates of large whale encounters with gear is very high;
- (ii) Observer programmes have a limited value for great whales because impacts occur in-water;
- (iii) Rescue networks can provide valuable information;
- (iv) Entanglement reports often increase as a result of the establishment of Rescue Networks, and their associated outreach;
- (v) Gear type implicated is basically any “stationary” rope and net in the water column;
- (vi) Feeding and play behaviour are both factors;
- (vii) Possible solutions to the entanglement problem include: (a) Close fisheries in areas, (b) design whale safe fishing gear and (c) develop rescue networks);
- (viii) Reports of ship strikes is increasing in Hawai'i.

Recreational set nets and marine debris (discarded gear, ghosts nets) are significant issues for delphinids.

The results of the session on cetacean threats/impacts, identifying those that are known as well as potential ones with recommendations are listed in **Annex 5**.

2.3 FISHERIES INTERACTION WITH CETACEANS

Mr Pouvave Fainuulelei, Samoa Fisheries Division, provided a presentation on behalf of Mr Simon Walsh, NSW Fisheries, on results of a case study on cetacean/long-line interaction in Samoa.

The research aims to identify species involved, determine both spatial and temporal variations and qualify and quantify the scale of the interactions. The methodology includes interviewing fishermen, analysing catch logs, facilitation of an observer programme and undertaking research surveys.

The two key issues involved are that dolphins occasionally take bait from long-lines while small toothed whales (eg short-finned pilot whales, false killer whales) occasionally take hooked catch. The extent of this issue is global, and includes the South Pacific, Australia, Alaska, South Atlantic, Peru, Chile and Indian Ocean.

The Impacts

Fisheries interaction with cetaceans impacts both on the fisherman (fisheries) as well as on the cetaceans.

The impacts on fisheries include:

- Loss of bait and catch for fishermen and their associated communities and exports;
- Damage to fishing gear
- Greater expenses (bait, fuel, food etc)
- Cetaceans frightening target fish species from area;
- Fish are removed from the system, often without incorporation into fishery models because they are not recorded as catch.

Impacts on cetaceans include:

- Injury or mortality through retaliation-shooting, harpooning, use of explosives etc
- Injury or mortality through by-catch - hooking and entanglement
- Disturbance to normal activities
- A learned reliance on artificial food source

Preliminary results

Preliminary results for the different methodologies used are as follows:

Catch logs: approximately 6 per cent of all sets are affected by depredation to some extent. However, the accuracy of the data is dependent on the input by the fishing skippers.

Fisher interviews: a financial loss of SAT 3000 per affected set was estimated from interviews. However, it is noted that while results from fishermen interviews are only anecdotal, they can be useful to identify broad patterns and fisher awareness levels.

Observer program: this is the key to gaining a more reliable and comprehensive set of data on the subject and the Samoan Fisheries and SPC have recently completed training 5 new observers to commence a local programme.

Recommended activities

Based on the need for improved data and effective/continuing research to obtain sufficient data for meaningful analysis, the following actions were recommended for the Samoa cetacean/long-line survey:

- Implement effective observer programme;
- Conduct a cetacean id workshop for fishermen and observers;
- Continue interviews, research trips & catch log data analysis;
- Identify additional funding sources.

2.4 CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE OF CETACEANS

Ms Olive Andrews (IFAW) presented on preliminary research conducted by Ms Erin Watson on cultural value/significance of cetaceans in Vanuatu and Tuvalu. The draft results are summarised below:

Tuvalu: cetaceans are associated with identity, lifestyle and well-being. They are culturally important and marine mammals are no longer hunted and they are only eaten if they are washed ashore. They are viewed as incarnations of humans. There is currently no species list available for Tuvalu and a low level of awareness exists.

Vanuatu: there are diverse cultural values throughout Vanuatu associated with cetaceans, including:

- Migration of humpback whales are used as an environmental cue on some islands
- Ceremonies and ritual surround cetaceans across the region
- Cetaceans have never been traditionally harvested
- A history of relationship with dolphins exists.

2.5 CETACEAN CONSERVATION STRATEGIES

2.5.1 South Pacific Whale Sanctuary (SPWS)

Ms Gill Slocum (DEH) presented a paper on the process and status of the South Pacific Whale Sanctuary proposal to the IWC.

Article V(1)(c) of the ICRW allows for “open and closed waters, including the designation of sanctuary areas”. Two whale sanctuaries have been declared under this Article, (i) Indian Ocean Whale Sanctuary (declared in 1979) and (ii) Southern Ocean Whale Sanctuary (declared in 1994).

Since 2000 Australia and New Zealand have been pursuing the creation of a SPWS under the IWC, but has not achieved $\frac{3}{4}$ majority required. The proposal of a SPWS was endorsed by SPREP members as per Apia Statement and was also endorsed by Pacific Forum Leaders.

It has been argued that the proposed sanctuary:

- would protect the seriously depleted great whale populations in the South Pacific, and facilitate their recovery;
- contains critical breeding grounds and migratory routes for great whales, and therefore would complement the protection for species that feed in the Southern Ocean Sanctuary;
- has strong support from States and Territories in the South Pacific;
- would recognise the decision of the peoples of the South Pacific to profit only from whales in a sustainable, non-extractive way.

Australia and New Zealand sought the establishment of the SPWS by the IWC between 2000 and 2004. Even though a simple majority was achieved each year, the necessary $\frac{3}{4}$ majority could not be reached.

In 2005, Australia and New Zealand made the decision not to put the proposal to a vote at IWC 57, but to have the newly formed Conservation Committee review the merits of the proposal. In doing so the SPWS proposal has not been “dropped” but that a different approach in seeking to gain the necessary support for the proposal has been sought.

The following observations were made in relation to the SPWS, IWC and conservation of cetaceans in the region:

- a) Recently some SPREP member nations who are also IWC members have voted against the sanctuary, despite the 2001 Apia Statement and Pacific Forum Leaders endorsement;
- b) There is a need for other Pacific Island countries as counterbalancing voice to advocate whale conservation in relation to IWC;
- c) Beyond IWC, a strong Pacific country voice is needed to support cetacean conservation across the region;

- d) The CMS MoU allows for implementation of cetacean conservation measures beyond what is achievable through a SPWS;
- e) Nevertheless, symbolism of creating a SPWS would be strong.
- f) It is necessary to be clear on what we mean by “national sanctuary”.

2.5.2 National legislation, policies and sanctuaries

Ms Olive Andrews (IFAW) presented a preliminary review on cetacean legislation, policies and sanctuaries in the Pacific Islands region. The work includes a review of existing national marine mammal protection measures including sanctuaries, relevant regional/international conventions/agreements and country/territory specific recommendations relating to an improvement of marine mammal conservation. Information for each country/territory is summarised in **Annex 6**. A Pacific contact database and a CD of country/territory relevant legislation is available. The review findings are summarised below:

- (a). National sanctuaries: Based on no-take provisions; cetacean conservation principles. Important not to undo significant progress made in declaring sanctuaries, even where follow up management measures have not been implemented
- (b). National legislation / policy: Variety of measures in place or under development under environment and/or fisheries legislation.
- (c). Regional conventions / agreements including: Those involved include, SPREP, PIF, FFA, SPC, SPTO, SOPAC, IWC, CITES, CMS, CBD, UNCLOS, FAO.

Recommendations for consideration in the review of the WDAP include:

- Developing and implementing management measures to underpin existing legislation requires significant capacity building/support.
- Revoking existing national whaling legislation.
- Technical advice/templates needed to support sanctuary management.
- Marine mammal inclusion onto protected species lists.
- Other mechanisms – eg community led protected areas.
- Lack of data on cetaceans should not be a barrier to precautionary protection measures.

Follow-up work needed for this review on cetacean legislation, policies and sanctuaries in the Pacific Islands region, includes the following:

- Undertaking a more thorough legislative review in relation to country capacity to implement CMS MoU and potential legislative barriers, including legislation to implement CITES/CBD, habitat protection legislation, declaration of EEZs etc. The Review should be extended to cover the US, UK, Pitcairn, France, Australia, NZ and potentially the distant water fishing fleets.
- Refer to Countries and Territories and that the table needs to clearly show the status of declared sanctuaries etc, and that the area covered needs to be clarified.

2.5.3 Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries

Mr. Masanami Izumi, Fishery Officer, FAO Sub-Regional Office for the Pacific Islands, Samoa presented a paper on FAO Activities in the Pacific Region, concentrating on Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries.

The World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), South Africa (2002) specifically asked to develop and facilitate the use of diverse approaches and tools, including the ecosystem approach to fisheries, the establishment of marine protected areas... and the integration of marine and coastal areas into key sectors by 2010.

A FAO/Headquarters-based Project “Capacity Building for an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries” involves case studies on Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries, including one on the interactions between fisheries and marine mammals in selected countries in the Pacific (PNG). The first Activity completed is the National Workshop on the Ecosystem Approach to Tuna and Shark

Fisheries Management, conducted in cooperation with the National Fisheries Authority, Port Moresby, 13-16 March 2006. The results of issue identification and prioritisation are:

- *Purse Seine Fishery*: by-catch of turtles and dolphins-released alive with assistance of divers.
- *Tuna Longline Fishery*: depredation by cetaceans, particular in the Bismarck and Solomon Seas-Industry assessment of 10 % loss of yield in a season, with reported loss of 100% of a set in one occasion. The workshop recognizes that more research is needed in this area.

The recommended next activities include the review and adaptation of logsheet forms and observer's protocols to assess the extent of species interactions with tuna fisheries, including the assessment of depredation by longline-caught fish by cetaceans.

2.5.4 Relevant conservation conventions for cetaceans

Dr Margi Prideaux (WDCS) presented a paper on "Seeing CMS in Context", and discussed the functional relationships between CBD, CITES and CMS as summarized below. The five UN conventions that deal with biodiversity include, CMS², CITES³, CBD⁴, World Heritage and RAMSAR⁵. Of these five UN Biodiversity Conventions, three are of primary importance to the conservation and protection of cetaceans in the Pacific Islands Region:

- **CBD** provides the global framework for biodiversity conservation and is a framework convention;
- **CITES** regulates international trade in species included in the convention Appendices, and is an implementing convention;
- **CMS** conserves and manages avian, marine and terrestrial, migratory species as well as their habitats throughout their range, and is an implementing convention.

CBD has established a Global Biodiversity Challenge to ***“achieve by [2012] a significant reduction of the current rate of [marine] biodiversity loss at the global, regional and national levels as a contribution to poverty alleviation and to the benefit of all life on Earth”***.

Parties are being asked to report against specific CBD indicators which includes:

- trends in extent of selected biomes, ecosystems and habitats,
- trends in abundance and distribution of selected species,
- change in status of threatened species,
- coverage of protected areas, and
- connectivity/fragmentation of ecosystems.

Reporting is being facilitated through CITES and CMS

CITES/CBD/CMS

These 3 conventions are working on the harmonization of agendas and delivery against the CBD indicators, recognising the separate roles each plays. They are developing joint work programmes and streamlined reporting processes. Of these three conventions, CMS holds the most comprehensive on-ground benefit for cetacean conservation and habitat protection because CMS:

- has a well established history with cetacean conservation;
- has at least 23 cetacean related resolutions which have been passed since the 1st CMS CoP in 1985;
- has a significant history of field research;
- has 2 existing agreements for cetaceans;
- has further 3 agreements in the pipeline;
- addresses issues such as species status and the urgency of conservation action, necessary habitat protection, the importance of migration, by-catch, climate change, chemical and noise pollution.

² Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals

³ Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora

⁴ Convention on Biological Diversity

⁵ Convention on Wetlands

Technical relationships between CITES and CMS

The technical relationship between the two conventions can be seen in the similarity of their Appendices:

Appendices I: The CMS Appendix I deals with migratory species (or population) for which reliable evidence, including the best scientific evidence available, indicates that the species is endangered (a total 13 species or populations to date). The CITES Appendix I deals with species that are threatened with extinction and where a prohibition of commercial international trade in specimens of these species is necessary (a total 21 species to date).

Appendices II: The CMS Appendix II deals with migratory species which have an unfavourable conservation status or would significantly benefit from international agreements for their conservation (a total 39 species to date). The CITES Appendix II deals with species that are not necessarily now threatened with extinction but that may become so unless trade is closely controlled (all cetacean species are listed and 41 of these occur in the PIR).

However the difference between CMS and CITES appendices remains fundamental to each convention's mandate. CMS is mandated to conserve migratory species and their habitats from threats. CITES is mandated to regulate trade as a threat.

CMS MoU for the Conservation of Cetaceans in the Pacific Islands Region

The CMS MoU for the conservation of cetaceans and their habitats in the Pacific Islands Region expresses the desire of the Pacific Islands region to work together, "to foster cooperation, build capacity and ensure coordinated region-wide actions to achieve and maintain a favourable conservation status for all cetaceans and their habitats occurring in the region, and to safeguard the associated cultural values for Pacific Islands peoples".

The MoU provides the following:

- Mechanism through which to formally conserve all cetaceans and fully protect species listed in CMS Appendix I;
- Mechanism that must be acknowledged by the global community;
- Streamlining of international reporting to CBD and CITES through a CMS approach;
- Increasing international awareness and coordination about the issues and threats to cetaceans in the PIR;
- Providing an effective channel for international funding;
- Networking the PIR with other similar cetacean agreement regions, increasing technical information flow and capacity sharing;
- Enhanced platform for PIR issues in international forums through representation of the CMS Secretariat in Bonn.

Recommendations presented for consideration in the review of the WDAP include :

- (i) *Integration of CMS MoU requirements into the revised WDAP*: The CMS MoU Action Plan requirements are integrated into the structure of the updated SPREP Action Plan to provide continuity of work in the PIR. These requirements are:
 - threat reduction;
 - habitat protection, including migratory corridors;
 - research and monitoring;
 - education and public awareness;
 - information exchange;
 - capacity building;
 - responses to strandings and entanglements;
 - sustainable and responsible cetacean-based tourism; and
 - international cooperation.
- (ii) *Integration of CBD indicators into the revised WDAP*: The CBD indicators are also integrated into the structure of the updated SPREP Action Plan to ensure consistency of reporting. These indicators are:
 - trends in extent of selected biomes, ecosystems and habitats;

- trends in abundance and distribution of selected species;
- change in status of threatened species;
- coverage of protected areas; and
- connectivity/fragmentation of ecosystems

(iii) *Additional partners with expertise in broader ecosystem conservation are sought*

(iii) *CMS reporting requirements and international timelines are integrated into the revised WDAP (to ensure maximum benefit from international efforts for the PIR.)*

(iv) *A review is conducted of CITES and CMS listed species that occur in the PIR to establish current gaps in listings (provide consistency for the PIR.)*

2.6 CETACEAN AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES

2.6.1 Whale and Dolphin Watching

Mr Darren Kindleysides (IFAW) presented findings of the recent study on the review of Pacific whale watching. The purpose was to review the status of marine mammal tourism activities in the Pacific Islands region, assess the economic value and growth of whale and dolphin watching tourism in specific Pacific Islands countries and territories and undertake a preliminary assessment of the potential for further whale and dolphin watching tourism in the Pacific Islands region, including identifying development needs. The findings are summarised below and in [Table 2](#).

- The industry is experiencing strong annual growth (compare annual regional tourism growth of 7.3%, and industry growth in Australia (15%) and NZ (11%);
- Strongest annual growth in **French Polynesia & Guam**. Guam accounts for approximately 75% of the region's industry;
- **New Caledonia** and **Tonga**, well established industries in 1998, continued to experience sustained growth;
- Countries with newly identified whale watching industries include **Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Cooks & Solomon Islands**;
- Average ticket price **USD \$76**;
- Industry composition: Full-time, dedicated whale watching; Seasonal, dedicated whale watching; Opportunistic whale watching; Land-based whale watching;
- Size of whale watching industry proportional to the accessibility and reliability of cetacean sightings combined with a large enough base of tourists in country;
- 8 countries/territories with no cetacean watching industry;
- Limitations to development of an industry - inconsistency of cetacean sightings, lack of information of cetaceans, low numbers of tourists, accessibility difficulties, lack of infrastructure

Table 2: Growth of whale and dolphin watching in the Pacific Islands Region

| Pacific Region Findings | Numbers of Whale Watchers | Countries with whale watch operations | Average annual growth in whale watchers (1998 – 2005) | Estimated Direct Value of whale watching industry | Estimated Total Value of the industry |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1998 | 10,308 | 9 | | | USD 1,185,000 |
| 2005 | 110,746 | 14 | 45% | USD 7,525,500 | USD 21,012,000 |

Findings for individual countries/territories are appended as [Annex 7](#).

The following points were recommended for consideration on cetacean watching for the WDAP review:

- With the growth in the industry in the region comes increased responsibility to protect whales;
- Industry needs to be sustainable;
- Recent studies show that in some circumstances whale and dolphin watching can cause impacts upon the individuals and populations being watched;
- But, these studies are limited and there is a lack of information on impacts, especially whales;

- IWC membership in region is increasing. Whale watching does provides an economic argument in support of cetacean conservation initiatives.

The following recommendations were made for consideration in the WDAP review:

- Assessment of effectiveness of existing guidelines, regulations, licensing schemes;
- Capacity building to address implementation and enforcement challenges;
- Region-wide guidelines;
- National guidelines / regulations (production of a template);
- Licensing to manage the number of marine mammal watching vessels;
- Local plans of management in areas of high use or where there are sensitive/endangered populations of marine mammals;
- Improve understanding of cetacean populations - greater certainty to access to viewing opportunities;
- Review the sustainability of specific operations in areas where marine mammal populations may be experiencing significant pressure (eg New Caledonia, French Polynesia);
- Further study to assess impacts of specific activities, eg swim-with.

2.6.2 Managing impacts of tourism

Mr Mark Orams, Massey University at Albany, presented a paper on “Opportunities and threats arising from the growth of cetacean-based tourism in the South Pacific”. He summarized the worldwide growth of cetacean-based tourism which has grown from only 12 countries involved in 1983 to 295 communities in over 65 countries in 1995, 500 communities in 100 countries in 1998, to an industry that is today in excess of 10 million cetacean tourists generating revenues in excess of US\$1 billion. The growth shows that in New Zealand alone, cetacean-based tourism has been spectacular with the number of cetacean tourists doubling since 1998 to 425,000 in 2005 (estimated to be worth NZ\$120m annually). In Australia, there were over 2 million cetacean tourists at over 50 sites in 2003 generating around Aus\$340 million. For the South Pacific islands, the following were noted in terms of cetacean based tourism:

- An estimated 45% growth in whale watcher numbers since 1998
- Almost 110,000 cetacean tourists across 14 nations during 2005
- With exception of Tonga, French Polynesia, Guam and New Caledonia, operations can be described as fledgling.

Opportunities exist for the Pacific Islands as there is considerable demand for high quality cetacean tour experiences. The climate and opportunities available in South Pacific are world class, with a extremely positive image for most potential countries of origin for tourists. The growth potential and economic benefits of cetacean-based tourism have proved an effective argument against the killing of whales.

While the potential and opportunities exist in the Pacific Islands, there is growing concern on the impacts of poorly managed tourism activity based on marine animals. There is a growing concern that the cumulative effect of this activity may threaten the recovery and survival of these endangered species (Forestell and Kaufman 1990, 401). In addition there is little knowledge on the effects of humans interacting with marine mammals in the wild and issues including the impacts of noise produced by vessels, boat handling practices, numbers and proximity of boats and humans, effects of swimmers in the water etc (Constantine, 1999).

Cetacean- based tourism impact studies

Impact studies have shown that there is a growing body of empirical evidence showing that cetacean-based tourism may not always be benign and, potentially, not sustainable. In addition, there is a growing demand from tourists for cetacean-based tour operators to behave ethically and, at a minimum, to minimise impacts. Studies have also shown that cetacean-based tourists are highly discretionary, therefore reputation is critical, and questions are being raised about the ethics and claims of the industry as being a viable and sustainable alternative to whaling. Summaries of cetacean-based tourism impact studies conducted in New Zealand are provided in

Annex 8.

An important issue concerning the industry is stress to the animals, which can be categorized as (i) acute stress, (ii) chronic stress and (iii) psychological/social stress (Sapolsky, 1994). The potential impacts on the animals include, reduced immunity, increased disease, increased mortality, reduced reproductive rates and impaired development.

Other important issues also affecting the industry include the fact that the tourism industry is “fickle” in the region and that infrastructure for tourism is generally poor. Current operations have a growing reputation as being “high impact” and a degree of cynicism exists regarding South Pacific Island nations ability to carefully manage the industry. Given the extra travel time and high cost involved in visiting South Pacific Island nations for cetacean – based tours, there is a high risk of industry collapse (for any number of reasons). This points to the fact that if the industry is to reach its potential (or perhaps even survive) longer term, it is imperative that it “steps up” to best practice.

Conclusion

Recent studies have shown that the growth of cetacean-based tourism has continued over the past decade. It is also a fact that considerable potential exists for further growth in Pacific Island nations and that research into the impacts of tourism on marine mammals has advanced in the past decade. However, questions are now being posed regarding the long-term sustainability of cetacean-based tourism in the region. Issues such as stress and its potential long-term impacts are receiving greater attention and the management of the industry (and its related reputation) will be critical for the long-term future of cetacean-based tourism in the region. Support for research into impacts, and management responses from results of that research are an essential tool in that management process.

Discussion points relevant to Action 4 of the WDAP

Three areas, with priority activities, are considered of high importance for consideration for the WDAP:

- *Research*: priority be given to impact assessments for “swim with” whales in Vava’u; vessel-whales in New Caledonia and dolphin tourism in Guam.
- *Management*: priority for the development of regulation guide for member countries and territories;
- *Training*: priority for training and certification of both operators and guides.

2.6.3 Certification/training programme for whale watching operators and guides

Ms Olive Andrews (IFAW) presented the Whales Alive Whale Training and Certification Program for whale Watching Guides. The program aims to set skill levels of whale watching guides and standards for the quality of information being presented on board whale watching vessels . The main focus of the program is to produce training materials necessary to meet the identified skill requirements of guides for the delivery of a successful whale watch operation, so as to ultimately minimise potential impacts of tourism on whales and maximise the educational value of the experience to tourists. The program consists of:

- *1-Day classroom sessions*. These sessions cover the following topics:
 - Status of whales
 - Management and conservation of cetaceans
 - Natural history and biology of common species
 - Whale research-genetics, acoustics, photo id
 - Whale Watching
 - Whale watching guides and best practise
 - Whale watching – land based, vessel base, swim with programmes
 - Successful delivery of a whale watch program
 - Guiding for a whale watch-whales Alive Marine Guiding
 - Developing an on board interpretive program-Whales Alive Step 5 Program
- *½ day On the Water Sessions*. These cover the following topics:
 - Application of the guidelines

- o Approach distances and angles in practise (BOB)
- o Minimising negative vessel impacts on whales
- o Locating and watching whales effectively
- o Understanding and evaluating whale behaviour in response to vessels
- o Delivering the components of a successful whale watch – application of 5 step program

2.7 INFORMATION/AWARENESS MATERIAL

Annex 9 documents an update of information and awareness material on cetaceans produced by various agencies. A listing of a collection of recent papers on cetaceans by SPWRC is also listed in the Annex.

SECTION 3: TOWARDS A REVISED ACTION PLAN

3.1 WDAP IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

The mind mapping exercise carried out by the meeting identified the following implementation issues with regard to the implementation of the WDAP. The areas with itemized issues are attached as **Annex 10**.

(i) Communication

The main issues under communication include the need for the WDAP to be in both English and French and linking it to NBSAPs as well as to the work of other relevant IGOs in the region such as FFA, SPC, and Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission.

(ii) Coordination

For improved coordination, it was recognised that there is need for the technical meeting participants to stay in touch to coordinate approaches as well as strategies. SPREP plays the key role in this area, with the support of CMS and partner organizations.

(iii) Monitoring, evaluation and reporting

A main concern is overloading SPREP in this area and its role should be refined so that its major role is editorial and coordination. In order to evaluate progress, regular / annual reporting against the action plan by members and partners, using a simple template, would be required. This can be applied to CBD / CMS.

(iv) Information management

It is necessary to find a way of summarising information to monitor advancements of WDAP and strategy for dissemination. Development of a reporting template database of publications etc. allowing for PICTS to comment and make additions is desirable, and working groups or individuals to update the database. Creation of a List server, linked to other networks, is a useful tool. It is also recommended that the SPREP website host PICT content database including legislative information and relevant materials with partner organisation to assist in updating.

(v) Ownership and commitment “political will” – sectoral

In-country NGO's can potentially play the role of facilitation in the implementation of WDAP. Demonstrating benefits as well as using cultural values to underpin management strategies are important aspects.

(vi) Partnerships

A vital component in the implementation of the action plan is building partnerships. These include collaborating with institutions, NGOs, Universities, Private sector and in-country partnerships. CMS integration with both CBD and SIDS would be desirable.

(vii) In country linkages

In-country linkages between Government and NGOs are necessary and the WDAP reporting and monitoring should include all relevant agencies and protocol.

(viii) Capacity

Limited capacity is the region's and in-country's biggest limitation to cetacean conservation. Linking to the USP Faculty of Islands and Oceans and other training mechanisms are critical. There is a need for more country-based programmes to implement the WDAP with regional workshops needing in-country follow up. Participants/professional exchange would be of benefit to the efforts in the region.

(ix) Investment value/demonstrating benefits

In order to profile the regional commitment to the WDAP, it is important to place a monetary value on existing work by various partners and collaborators. Cost benefit analysis and economic evaluation are valuable tools to promote the conservation value of marine mammals and potential benefits specific interventions e.g. of depredation mitigation.

(x) Priority setting/Specificity

While SPREP members prioritize issues and options, the technical group needs to provide options using scientific prioritizing and ranking input.

(xi) Linkages

The WDAP needs to link to NBSAPs, regional mechanisms and agreements including the Pacific Islands Regional Oceans Policy (PIROP) and the Western Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) ecosystem and by-catch working group as well as sectoral planning processes such as tourism and fisheries.

(xii) Lack of data

A fundamental problem exists with the lack of species inventory, key habitats and threats.

(xiii) Gaps and emerging issues

Advances have been made concerning Action 13 of the WDAP related to CMS. However gaps and emerging issues include the need for policy responses concerning JARPA II and the live dolphin export from the region and consideration of national legislation to address those threats. The Micronesia challenge is an opportunity for cetacean conservation to take advantage of the momentum generated by the development of MPA networks in those countries. Given the growth of the whale watching industry, standards are required for its management.

The issue of whales and fisheries need to link to the WCPFC. There is a lack of information and observer coverage concerning by-catch and entanglement and there may be a need for the development of fisheries interaction protocols. Given their importance in conservation efforts, there is a need to extend cultural significance surveys. The trend in Pacific Islands voting in recent IWC meetings on issues involving cetaceans indicates that IWC membership is a real issue impacting adversely on the conservation of cetaceans in the region.

(xiv) Financial resource

Lack of adequate financial resources has been a major drawback in the implementation of the WDAP. There is a range of opportunities e.g. CMS and GEF small grants. However, prioritizing, coordination and presentation are required in order to bring in financial resources. There is industry support due to public concern and effort should be made for private sector involvement. Internships are a good vehicle in attracting financial resources and the USA is a potential source with its growing interest in cetacean work in the region.

(xv) WDAP broader recommendations

The state of knowledge in the PIR on cetacean distribution and threat impact remains low. A process permitting streamlining is highly recommended. It is necessary to ensure that the WDAP highlights the need for a dialogue between conservation managers and the fishing sector (involving industry, government officials, RFMOs, FAO). The fact that the lack of information sometimes disguises the potential of a threat or impact needs to be accommodated, as well as cumulative, disease and sub-lethal impacts. It is necessary to consider strategic relationships with the major industries in the PIR, in particular the tuna sector and associated working groups and scientific surveys

Actions:

Governments and organisations need to provide public consumption documents and lists of electronic materials to SPREP Marine Species Officer.

3.2 KEY COMPONENTS FOR THE REVISED ACTION PLAN

3.2.1 Linkages to CMS Cetacean MoU

It was agreed that it would be difficult for the revised Action Plan to be based on the headings of the CMS MoU for the conservation of cetaceans and their habitats in the Pacific Islands region, e.g. education and public awareness can relate to threat reduction. It was noted though that actions can be cross-referenced in the action plan. It was also noted that a set of issues can be developed and that a set of tools can be developed to address the issues.

The revised action plan needs to have a vision, objectives and a key goal. Part of the objective needs to be that the issues outlined in the MOU are addressed and that there are then other issues that the MOU will also address (e.g. cultural significance).

- Of the MOU subheadings the following are issues/themes:
 - Threats reduction
 - Responses to strandings and entanglements
 - Habitat protection, including migratory corridors
 - Sustainable and responsible cetacean-based tourism
 - Cultural significance (not in the MOU explicitly)
 - Sanctuaries and protected areas (not in the MOU explicitly)

- Of the MOU subheadings the following are implementation /tools/ mechanisms:
 - Information exchange
 - Capacity building
 - Research and monitoring
 - Education and public awareness
 - National, regional and international cooperation
 - Coordination and implementation (not in the MOU explicitly)
 - Investment and resourcing.

Additional information under issues and implementation /tools/ mechanisms are provided in **Annex 11**.

3.2.2 Proposed Format

Dr William Perrin presented two formats used for CMS marine turtles and dugongs. The CMS Action Plan for Aquatic Warbler was also presented. It was agreed that a single species record from a European country was likely to be inappropriate. Some important general points raised in the discussion include the following:

- The new WDAP needs to be done in simple way to facilitate use by countries and territories as well as partners;
- The language (and format) should be conducive to in-country action, and not too scientific;
- It should harmonise with existing national instruments and policies, e.g. NBSAP;
- It should include a monitoring and reporting category for the review process;
- It should have a comparative analysis to other and be comparable to National strategies (i.e., NBSAP structure). For reference a sample NBSAP format is appended as **Annex 12**.

3.2.3 Collaborative Linkages

Dr David Johnston, Cetacean Biologist (Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center, NOAA) presented on Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Centre. NOAA (USA) recently established the Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Centre Cetacean Research Programme to focus work US research in the region. A workshop was held recently to review the science conducted to date and to identify gaps (report due out soon). The work agreed on and now underway includes:

- Collaborative photo-id catalogue;
- Mark recapture study of false killers whales in Hawaiian EEZ;
- Stock structure of spinner dolphins;
- Cruises and small boats, including surveys in America Samoa. It was noted that over the next couple of years, there will be significant ship time available and they are keen to work collaboratively with other countries
- Passive acoustics
 - Discussion: sonobuoys useful and cost effective way of getting preliminary information in the region of cetacean presence and absence.
 - Using acoustics they are able to get an idea of cetacean presence during fishing operations (as can pick up cetaceans and vessel echo sounders).
- Habitat index and using this as a management tool (i.e. resting habitat for spinner dolphins).
- Stable isotope analysis to determine prey consumption.

The initiative presents an opportunity to work in areas outside US waters, dependent on the issue, particularly on larger scale surveys. Linking those initiatives to work in the region is critical. It was noted that the large vessel is currently used as a training vessel in the US and that it would be useful to tap into this and see what other opportunities there are for training of people in the region. Given the limited resources for cetacean work in the region, this initiative presents a great potential for cooperative survey work in the Pacific Islands region.

3.3 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The technical meeting agrees that the Pacific Islands Countries and Territories are stewards of a large part of the world's oceans, containing a rich assemblage of cetacean species. While the status of cetaceans in this region is generally better than in most other parts of the world, there remains a number of critical conservation issues. The technical meeting strongly advised that these issues should be urgently addressed. Detailed advice on recommended actions for the new WDAP is attached as **Annex 13**.

The meeting highlighted a number of key issues to improve the development and implementation of a revised action plan including:

- Improve knowledge of the status of cetacean populations and their habitats, as well as impacts from human activities to guide decision making (national and regional level);
- Develop strategic priorities and timeframes for regional and national action;
- Foster integration of cetacean conservation in regional and national policies (eg NBSAPs, Fisheries plans and National Sustainable Development Strategies);
- Demonstrate economic benefits of cetacean conservation through economic opportunities (eg tourism) but also from positive impacts of conservation measures (eg habitat protection, mitigation techniques) to generate political support and investment for cetacean conservation;
- Build in country capacity (technical, financial, institutional) to implement and monitor agreed actions and address existing and emerging threats such as climate change and increased direct take;
- Develop monitoring and reporting systems to evaluate the effectiveness of regional and national implementation, and
- Initiate dialogue and collaboration with the fisheries, tourism and transport sectors at the regional and national levels in relation to information, awareness raising and management actions to address impacts.

The meeting highlighted key opportunities to progress cetaceans conservation and enhance the effectiveness of a revised action plan including:

- the CMS MoU on Cetaceans by increasing technical capacity for implementation through partnerships and by leveraging political and financial support in international fora;
- linking cetacean conservation to international and regional initiatives as platforms for integrated policy responses (eg CBD and the CBD Island Biodiversity Programme of Work, the

Micronesia Challenge) and information exchange and mitigation strategies with RFMOs (eg the newly established Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission) and

- demonstrated benefits from cetacean conservation reflected in the growth of whale and dolphin tourism in the region.

An overview of key recommendations towards the development of the revised Action Plan for cetaceans include:

Proposed format

The Plan should include a clear vision, priority areas/themes with time bound actions at the national, regional and international levels, identification of implementing organisations, inclusion of a monitoring and evaluation framework and a communication strategy.

Proposed themes/areas for consideration

The meeting proposed the following:

1. Threats to cetaceans;
2. Ecosystem/habitat protection, including migratory corridors
3. Research and monitoring, including responses to strandings and entanglements
4. Education and awareness;
5. Information management
6. Capacity building;
7. Sustainable and responsible cetacean-based tourism
8. Regional and international collaboration and cooperation
9. Legislation and policy;
10. Coordination and implementation of the revised action plan

Under the above categories, the meeting proposed a number of actions for consideration. A summary is presented below. Specific actions are detailed in Annex 13.

Theme 1: Threats to cetaceans

Recommended actions:

- Review key fisheries interaction data to develop strategies and plans for mitigation
- Assess the impact of directed takes on PIR cetacean populations
- Develop advice and regulation to minimise the threat of ship strikes in identified critical habitat areas
- Consider shipping routes and develop ambient noise budgets for the PIR
- Develop information on the impact of climate change to cetaceans in the region

Theme 2: Ecosystem/habitat protection, including migratory corridors

Recommended actions:

- Identify critical habitat, oceanographic conditions and migratory pathways in the PIR
- Assess effectiveness of sanctuaries and area based tools to protect cetacean habitats at regional and national levels

Theme 3: Research and monitoring, including responses to strandings and entanglements

Recommended actions:

- Increase research training and develop PIR wide guidelines for data collection
- Conduct key species inventory/baseline surveys

Theme 4: Education and awareness

Recommended actions:

- Develop communications strategies, training programmes and protocols for key issues within the WDAP
- Increase information transfers about cetaceans species in the PIR

Theme 5: Information management

Recommended actions:

- Compile key technical (scientific and legislative) information to support the WDAP
- Develop systems for maximising use of existing data and data analysis

Theme 6: Capacity building

Recommended actions:

- Identify training needs at the national level
- Increase training in appropriate research methods and protocols
- Encourage regional and international opportunities for training

Theme 7: Sustainable and responsible cetacean-based tourism

Recommended actions:

- Assess effectiveness of existing guidelines, regulations and licensing schemes.
- Foster training and certification programmes and best practice impact management.
- Engage industry in monitoring and educational activities.
- Foster sharing of lessons learnt and undertake regular review of industry.

Theme 8: Regional and international collaboration and cooperation

Recommended actions:

- Foster interagency collaboration at national level and engagement with private sector.
- Foster NGO partnerships at the national, regional and international levels.
- Foster greater engagement of US and French Territories in the development and implementation of the action plan.

Theme 9: Legislation and policy

Recommended actions:

- Develop industry based (eg tourism/fisheries/transport) guidelines, regulations and actions to reduce threats to cetaceans.
- Integrate international requirements into regional and national systems

Theme 10: Coordination and implementation

Recommended actions:

- Develop an implementation and reporting framework (including standard reporting template, indicators etc).
- Develop and maintain a database of achievements against agreed actions.
- Develop a communication strategy for the life of the plan.
- Undertake economic evaluation of the effectiveness of the plan to promote the value of cetaceans conservation with policy makers and the community.
- Develop a resource strategy to implement the Action Plan in partnership with the CMS secretariat, NGOs and seek partnership with the private sector.
- Facilitate the development of national implementation plans for cetacean conservation.

NEXT STEPS

Next steps in the lead up to the 18th SPREP meeting were outlined including actions, timelines and responsibilities between SPREP and partners.

ANNEX 1:

Draft 2006 IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE FOR SPREP WHALE AND DOLPHIN ACTION PLAN (WDAP) 2003-2007

1. PURPOSE

To update WDAP Expert Technical Meeting on Cetaceans in the Pacific Islands Region (1-4 August 2006) of implementation of the 2003-2007 SPREP Whale and Dolphin Action Plan.

The current WDAP will expire 31 December 2007 and requires review prior to a decision for a new strategy formulation. The steps in this process include expert review, preparation of a regional review document, regional meeting, decision for and development of a new strategy – all to take place prior to the 2007 SPREP meeting to enable endorsement of a new strategy.

This update and information from the August Expert Review will be used to prepare the regional document required and will consist of a regional and individual SPREP member (where appropriate) assessment of the WDAP's implementation.

2. CONTEXT

In 2003 SPREP members agreed the Regional Marine Species Programme Framework 2003-2007 and Action Plans for Dugongs, Whales and Dolphins, and Turtles. These were subsequently commended by Forum Leaders in August 2003. These Plans are intended to enable the peoples of the Pacific to take a primary role in achieving the following vision:

A Pacific Ocean where populations of whales, dolphins, dugongs and marine turtles have recovered to healthy levels of abundance, have recovered their former distribution and continue to meet and sustain the cultural aspirations of Pacific peoples.

It was also recognized in the Marine Species Framework document that successful implementation of the Action Plans would result in the people of the Pacific Islands being better able to plan, protect, manage and use their marine environment for sustainable development.

The Action Plans are the collective responsibility of SPREP member states, the SPREP Secretariat, partner non-governmental and intergovernmental organizations, and private sector organizations. The Framework recognised that significant additional resources would need to be sought to achieve the aims and objectives of the Action Plans. Participants of the workshop that established the Plans called upon all donor partners and supporters of the Plans to assist in providing the necessary resources to achieve these visions at both the regional and national levels. Network members agreed that the SPREP Secretariat would take primary responsibility for networking, information management and archiving and annual reporting.

The 2003-2007 WDAP was preceded by the Regional Marine Mammal Conservation Programme (1993-2003) and associated strategy which included cetacean and dugongs. This was reviewed prior to the WDAP in March 2003 with the review paper (Miller, 2003) used at the regional strategy meeting.

3. 2006 IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE

For each WDAP Action brief notes are provided to update progress in implementation. It is hoped that participants to this meeting will provide further information to update this review and be used to provide direction for the remaining ~1.5 years of the WDAP's implementation. This summary report has been based on a SPREP/IFAW compiled a matrix of WDAP Actions by country and region to assist information management for the WDAP (Excel spreadsheet). These Action spreadsheets will also be available to participants to further update actions on these issues across the region. It is hoped that this will be developed into an information source to support the monitoring, evaluation and information sharing on these issues across the region.

| | |
|--|---|
| 2003-2007 WDAP ACTIONS | July 2006 UPDATE |
| CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE | |
| <p><i>Action 1</i> Support and encourage local networks to research and share custom/cultural information on traditional values, uses and interactions with cetaceans throughout the region, in particular encourage governments to promote community/schools involvement in research on cultural significance of cetaceans. By 2005 at least three in-country projects have been developed, resourced and are underway.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cook Islands Whale Education Centre – ongoing (Hauser et al) ○ Vava'u IFAW Whale Education Cetnre – ongoing (Tonga et al), government and stakeholder recognized need to expand this role further in Vava'u to meet tourism and local interests. ○ Tuvalu projects (IFAW and NZODA) are underway including a component on cultural significance. NZODA Kiribati project has not gone ahead.(2006) ○ IFAW project will also review available literature in this area for Polynesia (2006) <p>More linkage with NSBAPs or equivalent are needed to promote action on this issue in PICTs.</p> |
| <p><i>Action 2</i> Identify, record and preserve artefacts and their stories, in particular whalers' stories, from whaling history. By end of 2003 museums and other institutions are approached to display artifacts and stories particularly in Fiji, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Samoa and Fiji's Museums have documented whale/whaling artifacts and include display material. ○ Tuvalu and wider Polynesia assessment underway (IFAW). |
| <p><i>Action 3</i> Support the development and distribution of existing education and awareness materials to effectively use the information generated above to build awareness, pride and understanding of this unique part of our heritage. In doing so promote the significance of conservation actions so as to not repeat the mistakes of the past. Education materials developed and distributed by 2005 as part of the in-country projects.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cook Islands Whale Education Centre – provides a good working model for this type of work. ○ Good in country media coverage for Tuvalu project. |
| WHALE AND DOLPHIN WATCHING TOURISM | |
| <p><i>Action 4</i> Provide assistance to SPREP members in progressing whale and dolphin watching activities, including documenting lessons learnt and enabling sharing of experiences.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2003 Government of Tonga/IFAW/SPREP First National Forum on Whale Watching agreed actions for further development of this now > million dollar tourism industry in Tonga. ○ 2006 SPREP/IFAW Review of Whale Watching in Vava'u Tonga ○ IFAW Whale Education Centre in Vavau continues to operate (2003-) during the whale watching season. ○ IFAW/Whales Alive have work with the Governments and private sector in Niue, Vanuatu and Samoa to assist development of whale watching tourism. ○ French Polynesia spinner dolphin tourism continues to be a very successful model for dolphin watching in the region. ○ Cook Islands Whale Centre continues to promote whale watching and conservation. ○ Draft Pacific Islands Region Whale Watching Assessment by Ecolarge (IFAW/SPREP/SPTO/SPWRC). ○ Key issues arising in New Caledonia with >9 operators in the southern lagoon and no effective regulation. <p>Significant effort still focused in Tonga. Baseline regional assessment nearly completed with positive</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | signs for growth of the industry but with significant issues raised for Vava'u, and New Caledonia. |
| WHALE SANCTUARIES | |
| <u>Action 5</u> Continue information exchange with the IWC and continue to attend the IWC as an observer in support of the SPWS proposal. SPREP Observer (and/or delegation) to attend annual IWC meetings (provided that funding is available). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SPREP sent an Observer delegation in 2003 (Job Opu), gave an observer statement in 2004, no direct input in 2005, 2006 but observer statements were made remotely. ○ IFAW has provided some information on the IWC to SPREP members re follow up to whales and fisheries concerns. ○ No significant progress on SPWS proposal at IWC since 2003. Discussions have now moved this to the Conservation Committee, given the lack of a ¾ majority required to pass a SPWS. |
| <u>Action 6</u> Encourage IWC member countries to support the proposed South Pacific Whale Sanctuary. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SPREP continued to do this via Observer Statements to the IWC (2004, 2003, 2004, 200 and in previous years). ○ In this time there are now more PIC IWC members (Nauru, Palau, Kiribati, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, Marshall Islands) and some of these have made statements contrary to the Forum Leader's decision of 2001 which endorsed the Apia Statement a proposal for a South Pacific Whale Sanctuary. |
| <u>Action 7</u> Encourage New Zealand and Australia to continue to promote the SPWS at IWC Annual Meetings on behalf of SPREP member countries. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Australia and NZ have continued to strongly support the SPWS at the IWC proposal, however, it has failed to secure the needed ¾ majority to be established. In the current IWC voting climate it is unlikely to succeed and it is hoped that the IWC's Conservation Committee can make significant progress on building support for the SPWS. |
| <u>Action 8</u> Encourage France and the U.S.A. to include SPREP territory representatives in their delegations to IWC, to facilitate promotion of the SPWS at IWC Annual Meetings on behalf of SPREP member countries. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ France has included New Caledonia representatives in previous years (eg IWC, 2001 Adelaide) – need to check. |
| <u>Action 9</u> Acknowledge and promote efforts of member countries who have declared sanctuaries or are preparing to declare whale sanctuaries and/or related marine protected areas (MPAs). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ongoing by SPREP and other agencies. Significantly NGOs eg IFAW, WWF, SPWRC have been assisting this process with SPREP members as has the Governments of Australia and NZ. ○ There is now 10.7 million sq kilometers of national EEZ whale Sanctuaries in the region. Thirteen (Samoa?, Niue, PNG?, Cook Islands, French Polynesia, New Caledonia, Pitcairn (UK), Tokelau (NZ), American Samoa, Guam, Vanuatu, Tonga, Fiji) Pacific Island countries and territories have either declared their Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs) as whale sanctuaries or have other legislation in place that protects whales. <p>There is a need to follow up to support gazettement of sanctuaries from those nations that declared these conservation initiatives (Samoa, Fiji, PNG).</p> |
| <u>Action 10</u> Encourage and support the development of management plans to foster research, education, awareness, capacity building, monitoring and enforcement for those countries that have declared whale sanctuaries and or/marine protected areas. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Niue has a draft plan, development supported by IFAW/Whales Alive (2005) ○ Tonga has a statement (2003) on development of whale watching that encompasses much of this Action, noting whales are fully protected in Tongan waters but a sanctuary not declared. ○ Samoa (2003/4) has prepared a draft Sanctuary plan and built this into a national plan for marine biodiversity conservation and management. It has also produced draft marine wildlife regulations with IFAW support. <p>There is a need to support management planning for those states that have sanctuaries in place. eg Vanuatu.</p> |
| <u>Action 11</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ See above. |

| | |
|--|--|
| Facilitate, encourage and support the provision of technical advice to declare whale sanctuaries and/or marine protected areas for countries that are considering the declaration of such national sanctuaries or MPAs. | |
| <u>Action 12</u> Encourage SPREP members north of the equator to consider the declaration of national whale sanctuaries within their Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>No independent SPREP member has declared a whale sanctuary north of the equator.</i> ○ <i>American territories are effectively covered for marine mammal conservation in these areas eg Guam</i> ○ <i>Effort is required in Micronesia eg FSM – however increasingly Micronesian countries have joined the IWC (Palau, Kiribati, Marshalls) which make the likelihood of whale sanctuaries non existent.</i> |
| CMS | |
| <u>Action 13</u> Facilitate and encourage discussions and actions on whale sanctuaries in other forums such as the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS). Convene initial CMS meeting on a proposed agreement for a regional marine mammal sanctuary by March 2003. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Significant progress has been made with 3 CMS workshops by SPREP/CMS in 2003, 2004, 2005 and a completed a MOU is now available for SPREP member and NGO signature (SPREP 2006 meeting).</i> ○ <i>It is hoped that this MOU will provide international recognition and support to marine mammal conservation in this region.</i> <p>Important to support early signature of CMS Cetacean MOU by PICTs and by NGOs.</p> |
| STRANDINGS | |
| <u>Action 14</u> WWF have produced an excellent pamphlet on what to do in the event of a stranding. SPREP to work with WWF to produce an amended version of this document for SPREP member countries and to distribute this. Each country can arrange to have this translated into local languages. WWF-SPP to contact WWF-Indonesia (Wallacea Programme) for reproduction of strandings pamphlet by 31 st March 2003. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ? |
| <u>Action 15</u> Strandings report card also to be translated and distributed. NZ has provided a standard form. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ? |
| <u>Action 16</u> In the case of a death of a stranded animal, countries need to know the appropriate autopsy methods, particularly to take samples and send them to appropriate institutions (eg. Auckland Uni) for genetic analysis. SPREP to produce a standard operating procedure manual for sampling and transporting samples. A draft procedure to be provided to SPREP Secretariat by 31 March 2003. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ? |
| <u>Action 17</u> Investigate provision of facilities for autopsy of cetaceans from the Pacific by April 15 th 2003. Department of Conservation (NZ) will provide advice to SPREP on this issue. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>DOC (NZ) provided this information to SPREP in 2003 indicating the prospect of convening a necropsy workshop at Massey University in Palmerston North. Pdraig Duignan confirmed that it would be technically possible, subject to his availability and other bookings for the facility.</i> |
| <u>Action 18</u> IFAW to arrange for regional strandings workshop by end of 2003. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>North Pacific Regional Strandings Workshop (July 2006)</i> ○ <i>South Pacific Regional Strandings Workshop (in prep 2006)</i> <p><i>This action will be completed prior to the end of 2006.</i></p> <p>Strandings Workshops will provide an opportunity for the region to strategically plan for these issues in a coordinated way.</p> |

| FISHERIES INTERACTIONS | |
|--|--|
| <u>Action 19</u> Participants endorsed the Action Plan from the SPREP Longline / Cetacean Interactions workshop (November 2002). This also included: | - |
| 19.1 SPREP Secretariat to encourage further research into this issue in this region, in particular species involved in depredation, extent of impact, and possible methods for mitigation. The situation in Samoa, Fiji, Tonga and PNG requires priority attention. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>IFAW is supporting research in Samoa (Walsh) by Southern Cross University/SPWRC and in partnership with Samoan Fisheries and Environment agencies.</i> ○ <i>Whales and Fisheries workshop in planning (Aus, SPREP, IFAW).</i> |
| 19.2 SPC Secretariat to produce an identification sheet for species of toothed whales that may be involved in depredation of hooked fish on pelagic longlines in this region and dolphins that may remove bait from hooks. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>? need to check with SPC</i> ○ <i>IFAW have produced a general Pacific regional ID guide and these are widely available and include the toothed whales.</i> |
| 19.3 Development of an education campaign to teach fishers mitigation methods as they become available as fishermen may be taking this issue into their own hands, e.g shooting whales. | ○ <i>?</i> |
| 19.4 SPREP Secretariat to highlight these issues and recommendations to the next meeting of the Marine Sector Working Group of the CROP to ensure coordination with other organizations. An information package to be provided for this purpose by 30 April 2003. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>SPREP has raised this at the MSWG.</i> ○ <i>SPREP Information Package on Whales and Fisheries issues sent to SPREP Focal points in September 2004.</i> ○ <i>IFAW Whales and Fisheries Information Package, including SPREP Executive Summary, sent to SPREP and Fisheries Focal Points and other key agencies in June 2005.</i> <p>Clearly more investment is required to reach PICT fisheries and environment agencies on this issue.</p> |
| <u>Action 20</u> Encourage networking and information exchange on this issue, through the list server established by SPREP following the Longline / Cetaceans Interactions Workshop | ○ <i>Listserver was established and worked well in 200 and early 2004 but not maintained and needs to be reestablished, perhaps for the Action Plan as a whole or key initiatives eg CMS.</i> |
| OTHER THREATS | |
| WHALING <u>Action 21</u> Information exchange – recommend the production of a pamphlet to summarise the available information on humpback whales in Tonga and a public awareness campaign to accompany its distribution, including to government agencies. This to include information on the economic benefits of whale watching in Tonga. SPWRC will produce a draft for such a pamphlet by 31 st July 2003. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Although the pamphlet has not been produced the Government of Tonga, SPREP, SPWRC, IFAW (2003) have held a National Forum on Whale Watching in which humpback information was summarized and distributed to all government and private sector stakeholders.</i> ○ <i>IFAW has also produced a video “Giants of Tonga” (2005) that in part covers this information and will be used by Govt of Tonga (TVB,DOE Fisheries)</i> ○ <i>Tonga Visitors Bureau and IFAW have produced permanent displays in Nuku’alofa and Vavau on humpback whales that also contain much of the information the proposed pamphlet would have.</i> ○ <i>IFAW continues to operator the Vava’u Whale Education Center providing this information in Tonga during the whale watching season.</i> ○ <i>The SPWRC humpback researchers continue to give public seminars during the field programme and briefings to Government agencies.</i> ○ <i>IFAW SPREP Tonga Whale Guide Sheet continues to be widely used by TVB and operators.</i> ○ <i>IFAW Tonga Humpback Whale poster produced 200 with the aim to build pride in Tonga’s humpback whales.</i> <p>A pamphlet on the values of humpback whales to Tonga and related issues eg JARPA II is more than timely and could be produced by SPREP in partnership with one more of</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | |
| <p>DIRECTED TAKES OF SMALL CETACEANS</p> <p><u>Action 22</u></p> <p>Government agencies in the Solomon Islands encouraged to conduct research on how many animals are taken and which species. Support to be sought for this work.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>TNC Rapid Ecological Assessment (Kahn et al 2004) in partnerships with the Solomon Islands government investigated traditional dolphin takes in Malaita Province and in key communities (report available). This has documented a useful baseline and clear next steps needed.</i> <p>Recommendations from Kahn et al should form the basis for follow up on the Solomon Islands, particularly dedicated cetacean surveys to substantiate the REA's observations.</p> |
| <p>POLLUTION</p> <p><u>Action 23</u></p> <p>Public education/awareness. Develop public awareness and education campaign to dispose of plastics properly;</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>SPREP produced an inventory of shipwreck threats (2003)</i> ○ <i>SPREP members the 2005 Year of Action on Waste which broadly covered this action in many countries and territories.</i> ○ <i>Samoa has banned plastic bags (June 2005) – yet ot be fully implemented).</i> ○ <i>Many SPREP IWP projects are focusing on waste issues eg Kiribati.</i> |
| <p><u>Action 24</u></p> <p>Encourage local governments to provide adequate garbage disposal facilities.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>See above for Action 23.</i> |
| <p>VESSEL COLLISIONS</p> <p><u>Action 25</u></p> <p>NZ and Australia to provide information, including regulations on this issue to SPREP Secretariat for wider distribution by 15 March 2003.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>?</i> |
| <p>HARASSMENT OF CETACEANS</p> <p><u>Action 26</u></p> <p>SPREP to encourage development and implementation by member countries of regulations to ensure appropriate behaviour of vessels involved in watching cetaceans.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>No PIC SPREP member has regulations adopted for cetacean watching, including for vessel behaviour.</i> ○ <i>However, guidelines have been developed and are in use in Niue (IFAW), Tonga (SPREP/IFAW/Whales Alive), French Polynesia (Poole), Vanuatu (IFAW), New Caledonia(Garrigue et al)</i> |
| POPULATION STATUS AND TRENDS AND RESEARCH PRIORITIES | |
| <p><u>Action 27</u></p> <p>Use of lethal techniques to address research issues connected with cetaceans is unacceptable and any such programmes involving the killing of cetaceans under the guise of research are not supported in this Action Plan.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>9 SPREP PIC members confirmed not to support lethal research, number likely higher</i> ○ <i>Tonga – draft provision for lethal research in 2005 Fisheries regulations remains</i> ○ <i>Some PIC IWC members have made some statements and support for lethal research (scientific whaling) eg Nauru, Tuvalu</i> |
| <p><u>Action 28</u></p> <p>Recommend initiation of baseline studies as required</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Samoa – 2003 survey as follow up to 2001 baseline (Paton et al), ongoing effort in MNREM (Ward et al)</i> ○ <i>Vanuatu – 2003 partial baseline survey (Garrigue & Russell)</i> ○ <i>Fiji - second year of research in Fiji was conducted in Lomaiviti Island group (Paton et al) in 2003</i> ○ <i>American Samoa programme expanded beyond Tutilla in 2003 (Matilla et al)</i> ○ <i>Kiribati (Phoenix Islands) baseline observations 2000,2002,2004,2006)</i> ○ <i>Solomon Islands baseline as part of RAP (Kahn et al 2004)</i> ○ <i>Tuvalu baseline study underway in 2006 (Donoghue et al)</i> ○ <i>Kiribati turned down initial funded opportunity for baseline study in 2006.</i> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | Baseline studies still limited in the countries in terms of scope and species coverage. Need better linkages to National Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) |
| <u>Action 29</u> Recommend continuation of existing monitoring programmes for humpbacks (SPWRC) and sperm whales (Ocean Alliance), including the involvement of local people wherever possible. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Existing humpback programmes ongoing in French Polynesia, Cook Islands, Tonga, New Caledonia, Fiji, Vanuatu, Niue, American Samoa, NZ, Australia – 10 SPREP members ○ Sperm Whales - ? Initial baseline surveys in PNG, not sure of status – no information available on website on PNG work <p>SPWRC humpback whale research has grown in recent years with new effort in Vanuatu and American Samoa. Key ongoing resourcing issue.</p> |
| <u>Action 30</u> Recommend expansion of existing research programmes (wherever possible) to include areas not previously covered (including SPREP region north of Equator). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Since 2003 humpback research has expanded to American Samoa (NOAA, Matilla et al), Tuvalu (Donoghue et al) ○ Some new surveys include marine mammals eg Kiribati – Phoenix Islands project (Stone et al, 2003, Kerr et al 2006), Solomon Islands (TNC, 2004). ○ In all at least 8/21 PICs have current research programmes continued or underway (American Samoa, Cook Islands, New Caledonia, Samoa, Tonga, Tuvalu, Kiribati (Phoenix), French Polynesia) <p>Still overall patchy effort and poorly sustained in terms of resources needed for long term research requirements.</p> |
| <u>Action 31</u> SPWRC Annual Reports to be provided to SPREP Secretariat for distribution to member countries. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SPWRC reports prior to 2003 summarized by SPREP member and referenced in RMMCP report ○ SPWRC 2003, 2004, 2005 report at CMS2, 3 workshops ○ SWPRC 2006 report? ○ Suggest SPREP to post SPWRC reports on website |

4. SUMMARY

Whilst significant progress has been achieved in the 3.5 years of the WDAP implementation it has been notably limited by lack of human and financial resources.

In the same time it is heartening to note the following:

- Significant new partnerships and programmes by NGOs in the region eg IFAW, WWF South Pacific, WDACS which have grown in the region post 2003 and are making a significant contribution to the WDAP's implementation at regional and country level .
- The SPREP/CMS partnership in developing a regional agreement for marine mammal conservation in the region has progressed well.
- The SPREP/IFAW MOU has for the first time formally cemented an IGO NGO partnership for marine species conservation in the region.
- The vital and growing role the South Pacific Whale Research Consortium (SPWRC) and its members are playing in developing research, providing information and in many cases building significant capacity and long term research programmes for marine mammals in the region.
- Incorporation by NGOs and Governments of marine mammal issues into ecological assessments eg Solomon Islands TNC REA, NEA/CI Phoenix Islands Conservation Project.

However, in the same time new issues of concern have arisen

- Japan plans to expand its 'scientific whaling' programme to include more minke whales, fin and humpback whales, the latter of which form the foundation of whale watching tourism in the region.
- A dolphin capture trade for tourism began in the Solomon Islands leading to an international outcry at this practice. Although export is now banned there is a caged dolphin tourism attraction in the Solomon Islands and in Palau.

It is planned that this update will be added to during this weeks meeting and circulated to the marine mammal network as part of the monitoring and evaluation of the WDAP. It is suggested that SPREP, with support, look further at information management tools eg database to collate, share and use information on these issues across the region. This has begun with the development of matrix spreadsheets that were used to compile this report.

ANNEX 2:

SWOT analysis of the action plan and its implementation

1) Strengths

- Amount of work achieved
- Rallying/focus point for activity and investment
- Endorsed document
- Partnership engagement (eg with NGOs)
- Timely document
- Driver for the MoU
- Government support/action
- Reference point for tracking activity and progress

2) Weaknesses

- National implementation patchy
- Lack of resources (including under utilisation)
- Not always linked to national policies and planning
- Lack of communication in country
- Lack of monitoring, evaluation and reporting
- Too much IWC focus
- No ongoing coordination mechanism at SPREP
- Lack of clear priorities/timelines
- Structure not 'implementation friendly'
- Includes objectives (and identified threats) not covered by actions
- Lack of capacity in some countries
- Capacity sharing not included
- Actions not specific enough

3) Opportunities

- High profile of ecotourism in the region and increased accessibility of areas
- CMS MoU
- Leverage funding/resources
- In-country models as examples
- Enhance collaborative opportunities
- Make conservation progress on ground and promote it
- Greater awareness in the region
- Greater international coordination
- Reinvigorate countries
- Reporting more frequently
- Celebrate achievements
- UN Year of the Dolphin (2007)
- Linkages to other issues with momentum (ie high seas)
- Australian Centre for Applied Marine Mammal Science
- USP

4) Threats

- Divergence of political views on cetacean conservation
- Inadequate national management mechanisms to protect cetaceans
- Expansion of lethal research in cetaceans from the region
- Adverse promotion of fisheries interactions with cetaceans
- Lack of long term data sets
- Noise issue
- Accessing sustained funds
- Limited capacity
- Limited public awareness
- Limited funds at SPREP and CMS
- Lack of long-term commitment to marine species officer at SPREP

ANNEX 3:

**Forward Technical Meeting Work Plan for the Current WDAP
through to September 2007**

Threats

| Action | Priority Level | Plan | Lead | Collab |
|--|-----------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|--|
| General | | | | |
| 1. Develop issues briefings about known threats to cetaceans happening or likely in this region and forward to review meeting | 1 | 1 | SPREP | Cara IFAW |
| 2. Develop a briefing paper on the potential impact of climate change to cetaceans in the region | 2 | 1 | WDACS | |
| 3. Increase training in appropriate dead stranding protocols and procedures to ensure better data collection; | - | 1 | DOC TWG | |
| 4. Complete species distribution and threats report and include commentary recommendations on in country work needed to maximise value from the report | 1 | 1 | Cara | TWG SPREP |
| Fisheries interaction | | | | |
| 5. Summarise all fishing interactions happening or likely in this region and forward to review meeting and appropriate regional forums for input | 1 | 1 | Sue T IFAW SPREP | David M Cara Mike D WWF |
| 6. Identify appropriate forums and meetings and build strategic relationships with the fishing sector to increase cross-pollination of data and expertise; | 1 | 1 | SPREP | Sue T IFAW WDACS WWF |
| 7. Identify where mitigation measures are required; | 1 | 1 | IFAW SPREP | David M Cara Mike D WWF |
| 8. Attend Vancouver workshop | 2 | 1 | ? | Simon Walsh? SPC/Tuna Commission? |
| 9. Request that SPC provide observer data available and inventory of fisheries within the PIR; | 1 | 1 | Simon Walsh? SPREP | |
| 10. Develop communication process about fisheries interactions with cetaceans | 1 | 1 | | |
| Directed takes | | | | |
| 11. Assess the impacts on island breeding populations of humpback whales in the Pacific of whaling operations on their feeding grounds | 1 | 1 | Australia New Zealand | SPWRC IWC SC |
| 12. Assess the impacts on island breeding populations of humpback whales in the Pacific of whaling operations on their feeding grounds | 1 | 1 | Australia New Zealand | SPWRC IWC SC |
| Ship strikes | | | | |
| 13. none specified | | | | |
| Acoustic disturbance | | | | |
| 14. none specified | | | | |
| Pollution (including marine debris) | | | | |
| 15. none specified | | | | |

ANNEX 3:

Cetacean watching

| Action | Priority Level | Plan | Lead | Collab |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Develop issues briefing about cetacean watching in this region and forward to review meeting | 1 | 1 | SPREP | IFAW Mark O |
| 2. Draft region-wide cetacean-watching guidelines and forward to the review meeting to consider | 2 | 1 | Olive | DEH IFAW |
| 3. Hold workshop to develop regional whale watching guidelines | 2 | 1 | Claire G IFAW | |
| 4. Create a cetacean-watching template for use in national guidelines and regulations | 2 | 1 | Olive | DEH IFAW |
| 5. Monitor, document and support Tonga as a model in addressing cetacean-watching licensing (including monitoring, compliance and enforcement) and management of the number of cetacean-watching vessels | 1 | 1 | SPREP | IFAW |
| 6. Review the sustainability of existing cetacean-watching operations where cetaceans may be experiencing significant pressures | 1 | 1 | Mark O | Dave J IFAW Cara |
| 7. Assess the impacts of cetacean-watching operations, including <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Conduct an impact assessment on swim-with-whales operations in Vava'u b. Conduct an impact assessment on the impacts of vessels and dolphin-watching operators in New Caledonia c. Conduct an impact assessment the development of dolphin tourism in Guam and French Polynesia | 1 | 1 | ??????? | Mark O Dave J (Guam) |
| 8. Assess the cetacean/tourism impacts on: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Whale swim – Tonga b. Dolphin watching and swim-with (spinner dolphins)– Guam/Moorea | [cross ref with above] | [cross ref with above] | [cross ref with above] | [cross ref with above] |
| 9. Complete the baseline economic review of cetacean-watching and promote understanding of the finding as widely as possible and follow up with a more detailed socio-economic comparative analysis | 1 | 1 | ECOLAR GE | SPTO SPWRC SPREP IFAW |

CMS MoU

| Action | Priority Level | Plan | Lead | Collab |
|--|----------------|------|--------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Integrate CMS MoU requirements into revised WDAP to provide continuity of work in the PIR | 1 | 1 | SPREP CMS | DOC DEH WDCS TWG |
| 2. Integrate CBD indicators integrated into revised WDAP | 1 | 1 | SPREP CMS | DOC DEH WDCS TWG |

ANNEX 3:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------|---|
| 3. Map CMS reporting requirements and timelines are integrated into the revised WDAP | 1 | 1 | SPREP CMS | DOC DEH WDCS TWG |
| 4. Review CITES and CMS listed species that occur in the PIR to establish current gaps in listings (provide consistency for the PIR | 1 | 1 | WDCS | |
| 5. Organize the signing ceremony for CMS MoU | 1 | 1 | SPREP | DOC DEH WDCS IFAW WWF TWG |
| 6. Promote membership of CMS | 1 | 1 | CMS | DOC DEH SPREP |
| 7. Promote signatures to MoU | 1 | 1 | CMS | DOC DEH SPREP |
| 8. Prepare for and hold the first Meeting of the Parties | 1 | 1 | CMS | SPREP DOC DEH WDCS IFAW WWF TWG |

Implementation

| Action | Priority Level | Plan | Lead | Collab |
|--|----------------|------|-----------------|-------------|
| 1. Review options for summarising information to monitor and report on achievements | 1 | 1 | SPREP/ PICTs | TWG |
| 2. Develop a communication strategy for WDAP | 1 | 1 | SPREP/ PICTs | TWG |
| 3. Develop a reporting template for advancements against each WDAP action | 1 | 1 | SPREP | TWG |
| 4. Maintain & update a database of achievements against each WDAP action (linking format to CBD and CMS etc) | 1 | 1 | SPREP/ PICTs | TWG |
| 5. Propose annual reporting by all countries and partners - potentially linked to the annual SPREP meeting | 1 | 1 | SPREP | |
| 6. Develop standard reporting format – a simple web-based template allowing simple analysis/summary by SPREP; should also cater for CMS/CBD reporting requirements | 1 | 1 | SPREP | TWG |
| 7. Ensure French and English working versions of the Action Plan are available | 1 | 1 | SPREP | |
| 8. Maintain a contacts database | 1 | 1 | SPREP | IFAW TWG |
| 9. Seek funding to support full coordination in relation to WDAP and CMS MoU | 1 | 1 | SPREP CMS | TWG WDCS |
| 10. Develop linkages with NBSAPs, RFMOs, Tuna commission ecosystem and bycatch working group, Regional oceans policy/action strategy | 1 | 1 | SPREP | TWG |

ANNEX 3:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------|--------------|
| on nature conservation, relevant international conventions/agreements and the private sector | | | | |
| 11. Develop detailed country briefing/policy advice on the identified emerging issues | 1 | 1 | SPREP | TWG |
| 12. Assign dollar values against the work undertaken to date under the WDAP. Include a column showing value (including in-kind) against each action in the plan | 1 | 1 | SPREP | TWG |
| 13. List, archive and make available publications related to/generated by work under the plan | 2 | 1 | SPREP | TWG David |
| 14. Develop clear indicators of the success of the plan | 1 | 1 | SPREP CMS | TWG |

Technical resources and research

| Action | Priority Level | Plan | Lead | Collab |
|---|----------------|------|---------------------------------|--------------|
| 1. Complete legislative report by extending to cover US, UK, Pitcairn, France, Australia, NZ. and including review of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. country capacity to implement CMS MoU and potential legislative barriers, b. legislation to implement CITES/CBD, c. habitat protection legislation, d. declaration of EEZs etc. e. Regulation on distant water fleets | 1 | 1 | Olive Margi | TWG SPREP |
| 2. Create summary briefings of completed species distribution and threats report and legislative report into country profiles | 1 | 1 | Olive Cara Margi SPREP | |
| 3. Review and identify priority areas for species inventory/baseline surveys | 2 | 1 | Cara SPREP PICTs | SPWRC |



COUNTRY LISTINGS for CETACEANS WITHIN THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

Cara Miller, Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society

Records related to Pacific Island cetaceans were garnered from a variety of sources including peer-reviewed journals, field reports, museum stranding records, whaling ship reports, internal records, personal unpublished sightings, anecdotal reports and newspaper reports. A particularly useful resource for this undertaking was Reeves et al. (1999) “Marine Mammals in the Area Served by the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)” report. This review had substantial summarization of historical knowledge, unpublished anecdotal sightings, and museum records. The present document adds to this review in several ways:

(1) As information gathering for the Reeves report concluded in 1996 this document incorporates research and records from this time until the present.

(2) A broader geographic range is covered (termed the “Pacific Region”) in this chapter. The boundaries of the Pacific region are the marine areas under the jurisdiction of each State or Territory of the Pacific Islands region, and also extend to the area defined by the Noumea Convention. The region stretches over 10000 km from east to west and 5000 km from north to south, with a combined EEZ of close to 30 million km².

(3) An attempt has been made to qualify each cetacean record included in this chapter. This classification was intended to provide a means of indicating relative confidence in a given record in regards to present-day distribution of the cetacean species within a particular nation’s waters. Three classifications of records were designated. Class 1 refers to a relatively recent field (or museum) confirmation of the given species within the EEZ of a nation. Class 2 refers to a good record that may either be dated, not confirmed by field observations, or, a Class 1 record that may be marginally outside of a given EEZ. Class 3 refers to records that were either uncertain in sub-species identification, from a stranding event (which may not indicate geographic distribution of the species), or an anecdotal report which for various reasons may be difficult to corroborate. Of course not all records fell easily into these general characterizations, however, attempts were made to ensure that classifications were relatively consistent in regard to the level of confidence in present-day distribution. Potential species listings were also developed for each nation. These listings were primarily based on confirmed (Class 1) records in nearby nations’ waters, recent tentative field observations, and, estimated geographic distribution of given species.

(4) Each record has been converted into a country-specific reference. When only island name and not nation was given for a record, care was taken to correctly trace this record to a given country. Records given only as a latitude-longitude location were assessed for approximate inclusion (by my estimation) within a given EEZ. Records from Australia, New Zealand and the Hawaiian Islands are presented only as species-listings falling into the Class 1 criteria listed above. These listings are

presented for comparison purposes and also to facilitate potential listings for neighbouring nations.

It is hoped that this country-specific information will assist national management plans and objectives, as well as demonstrate the benefit of increased survey and monitoring efforts in uncovering the diversity of cetaceans that appear to be evident within Pacific Island waters.

Finally, for clarity some records that did not specifically add to geographic distributional information are omitted from this document. Full listings for both species and environmental issues on a country-specific basis have been recorded in a supporting document that is available upon request.

Country Listings

1. American Samoa

Balaenoptera acutorostrata, *Globicephala macrorhynchus*, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, *Orcinus orca*, *Physeter macrocephalus*, *Pseudorca crassidens*, *Stenella attenuata*, *Stenella longirostris*, *Steno bredanensis*, *Tursiops truncatus*, *Ziphius cavirostris*

2. Cook Islands

Balaenoptera sp., *Balaenoptera acutorostrata sp.*, *Balaenoptera bonaerensis*, *Balaenoptera borealis sp.*, *Balaenoptera edeni*, *Balaenoptera musculus sp.*, *Delphinus sp.*, *Globicephala macrorhynchus*, *Lagenorhynchus australis*, *Lagenodelphis hosei*, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, *Mesoplodon densirostris*, *Orcinus orca*, *Peponocephala electra*, *Physeter macrocephalus*, *Stenella attenuata*, *Stenella longirostris*, *Tursiops sp.*, *Ziphius cavirostris*

3. Federated States of Micronesia

Balaenoptera edeni, *Globicephala macrorhynchus*, *Lagenodelphis hosei*, *Orcinus orca*, *Peponocephala electra*, *Physeter macrocephalus*, *Stenella coeruleoalba*, *Stenella longirostris*, *Tursiops sp.*, *Ziphius cavirostris*

4. Fiji

Balaenoptera acutorostrata sp., *Balaenoptera borealis sp.*, *Balaenoptera brydei*, *Balaenoptera edeni*, *Balaenoptera musculus*, *Balaenoptera physalus*, *Delphinus delphis*, *Globicephala macrorhynchus*, *Kogia breviceps*, *Lagenodelphis hosei*, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, *Orcinus orca*, *Physeter macrocephalus*, *Pseudorca crassidens*, *Stenella attenuata*, *Stenella longirostris*, *Steno bredanensis*, *Tursiops truncatus*

5. French Polynesia

Balaenoptera edeni, *Balaenoptera physalus*, *Feresa attenuata*, *Globicephala macrorhynchus*, *Grampus griseus*, *Kogia sima*, *Lagenodelphis hosei*, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, *Mesoplodon densirostris*, *Orcinus orca*, *Peponocephala electra*, *Physeter macrocephalus*, *Pseudorca crassidens*, *Stenella attenuata*, *Stenella longirostris*, *Steno bredanensis*, *Tursiops truncatus*, *Ziphius cavirostris*

6. Guam

Balaenoptera borealis, *Balaenoptera edeni*, *Globicephala macrorhynchus*, *Grampus griseus*, *Kogia breviceps*, *Kogia sima*, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, *Orcinus orca*, *Peponocephala electra*, *Physeter macrocephalus*, *Stenella coeruleoalba*, *Stenella longirostris*, *Ziphius cavirostris*

7. Kiribati

Balaenoptera musculus, *Eubalaena australis*, *Globicephala macrorhynchus*, *Hyperoodon planifrons*, *Lagenodelphis hosei*, *Mesoplodon sp.*, *Mesoplodon densirostris*, *Orcinus orca*, *Peponocephala electra*, *Physeter macrocephalus*, *Pseudorca crassidens*, *Stenella attenuata*, *Stenella coeruleoalba*, *Stenella longirostris*, *Steno bredanensis*, *Tursiops truncatus*, *Ziphius cavirostris*

8. Marshall Islands

Balaenoptera acutorostrata, *Balaenoptera borealis*, *Balaenoptera edeni*, *Balaenoptera musculus*, *Balaenoptera physalus*, *Delphinus delphis*, *Globicephala macrorhynchus*, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, *Orcinus orca*, *Peponocephala electra*, *Physeter macrocephalus*, *Stenella attenuata*, *Stenella coeruleoalba*, *Stenella longirostris*, *Tursiops truncatus*

9. Nauru

Balaenoptera edeni, *Lagenodelphis hosei*, *Orcinus orca*, *Peponocephala electra*, *Physeter macrocephalus*, *Ziphius cavirostris*

10. New Caledonia and Dependencies

Balaenoptera acutorostrata subsp., *Balaenoptera bonaerensis*, *Balaenoptera edeni*, *Balaenoptera musculus brevicauda*, *Delphinus delphis*, *Globicephala macrorhynchus*, *Grampus griseus*, *Kogia breviceps*, *Kogia sima*, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, *Mesoplodon densirostris*, *Orcinus orca*, *Physeter macrocephalus*, *Pseudorca crassidens*, *Stenella attenuata*, *Stenella longirostris*, *Steno bredanensis*, *Tursiops sp.*, *Tursiops truncatus*

11. Niue

Balaenoptera acutorostrata, *Balaenoptera bonaerensis*, *Globicephala macrorhynchus*, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, *Orcinus orca*, *Physeter macrocephalus*, *Pseudorca crassidens*, *Stenella longirostris*

12. Northern Mariana Islands

Balaenoptera borealis, *Balaenoptera edeni*, *Delphinus delphis*, *Globicephala macrorhynchus*, *Grampus griseus*, *Kogia sima*, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, *Orcinus orca*, *Physeter macrocephalus*, *Stenella coeruleoalba*, *Steno bredanensis*, *Tursiops truncatus*, *Ziphius cavirostris*

13. Palau

Balaenoptera acutorostrata, *Balaenoptera edeni*, *Feresa attenuata*, *Globicephala macrorhynchus*, *Grampus griseus*, *Lagenodelphis hosei*, *Orcinus orca*, *Peponocephala electra*, *Physeter macrocephalus*, *Pseudorca crassidens*, *Stenella attenuata*, *Stenella coeruleoalba*, *Stenella longirostris*, *Tursiops truncatus*, *Ziphius cavirostris*

14. Papua New Guinea

Balaenoptera edeni, *Feresa attenuata*, *Globicephala macrorhynchus*, *Grampus griseus*, *Kogia breviceps*, *Lagenodelphis hosei*, *Lissodelphis peronii*, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, *Mesoplodon densirostris*, *Orcaella brevirostris*, *Orcinus orca*, *Peponocephala electra*, *Physeter macrocephalus*, *Pseudorca crassidens*, *Sousa chinensis*, *Stenella attenuata*, *Stenella longirostris*, *Steno bredanensis*, *Tursiops aduncus*, *Tursiops truncatus*, *Ziphius cavirostris*

15. Pitcairn Island

Globicephala macrorhynchus, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, *Physeter macrocephalus*

16. Samoa

Balaenoptera acutorostrata, *Balaenoptera bonaerensis*, *Balaenoptera edeni*, *Globicephala macrorhynchus*, *Globicephala melaena*, *Grampus griseus*, *Kogia sima*, *Lagenodelphis hosei*, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, *Mesoplodon sp.*, *Mesoplodon densirostris*, *Orcinus orca*, *Peponocephala electra*, *Physeter macrocephalus*, *Pseudorca crassidens*, *Stenella attenuate*, *Stenella coeruleoalba*, *Stenella longirostris*, *Steno bredanensis*, *Tursiops truncatus*, *Ziphius cavirostris*

17. Solomon Islands

Balaenoptera borealis, *Balaenoptera edeni*, *Balaenoptera sp.*, *Balaenoptera musculus*, *Delphinus delphis*, *Globicephala macrorhynchus*, *Grampus griseus*, *Lagenodelphis hosei*, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, *Mesoplodon densirostris*, *Mesoplodon sp.*, *Orcinus orca*, *Peponocephala electra*, *Physeter macrocephalus*, *Pseudorca crassidens*, *Stenella attenuata*, *Stenella coeruleoalba*, *Stenella longirostris*, *Steno bredanensis*, *Tursiops aduncus*, *Tursiops truncatus*, *Ziphius cavirostris*

18. Tokelau

Orcinus orca, *Physeter macrocephalus*

19. Tonga

Balaenoptera acutorostrata subsp., *Balaenoptera bonaerensis*, *Feresa attenuata*, *Globicephala macrorhynchus*, *Grampus griseus*, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, *Orcinus orca*, *Peponocephala electra*, *Physeter macrocephalus*, *Pseudorca crassidens*, *Stenella attenuata*, *Stenella longirostris*, *Tursiops sp.*

20. Tuvalu

Orcinus orca, *Physeter macrocephalus*, *Stenella attenuata*, *Stenella longirostris*, *Tursiops truncatus*

21. Vanuatu

Balaenoptera edeni, *Globicephala macrorhynchus*, *Grampus griseus*, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, *Peponocephala electra*, *Physeter macrocephalus*, *Stenella attenuata*, *Stenella coeruleoalba*, *Stenella longirostris*, *Tursiops truncatus*

22. Wallis and Futuna

Physeter macrocephalus

ANNEX 5:

Potential and known cetacean threats/impacts, with recommendation

Threats/Impacts

1. Threats/impacts session:
 - Directed takes and whaling, noting that many of these populations are recovery from past levels of heavy exploitation;
 - a. Known threats/impacts:
 - i. Existing JARPA II – no reliable abundance estimates to know the impact on PIR fin and mink whales
 - ii. The JARPA II programme may expand without this information being in place
 - iii. Solomon Islands historical takes with limited knowledge of impact, although speculation about decline in melon headed whales
 - b. Potential threats/impacts:
 - i. Commercial whaling might have a severe impact on specific PIR populations of fin, mink and humpback whales
 - ii. Subsistence whaling may resume in the PIR – Tonga in particular may call for this (proposed 10 humpbacks/year)
 - iii. Future Solomon Islands takes
 - c. Recommendations:
 - i. Lack of information and how to address
2. Fisheries interactions
 - a. Known threats/impacts:
 - i. Bycatch (long-line, purse seine and coastal artisanal);
 - ii. Entanglement;
 - iii. Depredation and actions taken by fisheries to prevent (shooting, harpooning, bombs);
 1. Dolphins are known to take bait;
 2. Whales are known to take hooked catch.
 - iv. Shark nets;
 - v. Ecological fisheries interactions;
 - b. Potential threats/impacts:
 - i. None identified during the technical meeting
 - c. Recommendations
 - i. Build strategic relationships with the fishing sector to increase cross pollination of data and expertise;
 - ii. Observer coverage on PIR fisheries and data collection needs to be increased. Effort at this stage is very low. Species identification is poor and observer training is needed;
 - iii. Develop observer training workshop for identification and catch log data analysis;
 - iv. Work with fishing sector to develop mitigation measures to reduce bycatch and depredation;
 - v. Photo and stranding data should be used to better understand impacts of fisheries interactions on cetaceans in the PIR and training is required;
 - vi. Request that SPC provide observer data available and inventory of fisheries within the PIR;
 - vii. Predicting bycatch by analogy should be improved by better data of effort and cetacean population distribution.
3. Live captures
 - a. Known threats/impacts:
 - i. Historical capture of population without sufficient data of populations;
 - b. Potential threats/impacts:

- i. Possible captures to supply the growth of the aquarium industry;
 - ii. Possible restraint of animals in sea pens and provisioning of wild animals for tourism access and interactions.
 - c. Recommendations:
 - i. Ensure that populations are not captured for captivity;
 - ii. Information if developed to demonstrate that capture and export of live animals is covered by CITES which requires populations estimates as part of the non-detriment findings.
- 4. Ship strikes
 - a. Known threats/impacts:
 - i. None identified during the technical meeting
 - b. Potential threats/impacts:
 - i. Cargo shipping
 - ii. Cruise liners
 - iii. High speed ferry
 - iv. Yacht
 - v. Small recreational vessels
 - c. Recommendations:
 - i. Consideration of mandatory reporting mechanisms in the PIR
 - ii. Accessing training programmes and education materials for circulation in the PIR vessel operators, regulators and flag states
 - iii. Identify hotspot areas of critical habitat and develop advice and regulation to minimise the threat
- 5. Climate change
 - a. Known threats/impacts:
 - i. Coastal erosion and encroaching sea levels surrounding low lying islands will change coastal habitats
 - ii. Impacts on krill abundance impacting baleen whales migrating between the PIR and Southern Ocean
 - b. Potential threats/impacts:
 - i. Other major predators (tuna) and systems (coral ecosystems) re known to be impacted
 - ii. Increase in aquaculture displacing populations and destruction or degradation of habitat
 - c. Recommendations:
 - i. None identified during the technical meeting
- 6. Habitat degradation
 - a. Known threats/impacts:
 - i. Direct habitat interference from aquaculture or stationary fisheries
 - b. Potential threats/impacts:
 - i. Under individual threats
 - c. Recommendations:
 - i. Developing a better understanding of critical habitat (area and oceanographic conditions) and migration pathways
 - ii. Developing a better understanding of about oceanographic conditions and their fluctuations and habitat needs in the PIR and reasons for why species are using these areas or conditions
 - iii. Identification of know critical habitats (breeding and feeding grounds);
 - iv. Developing critical habitat buffers/safety nets into legislation and management plans as they are developed.

7. Acoustic disturbance
 - a. Known threats/impacts:
 - i. None identified during the technical meeting
 - b. Potential threats/impacts:
 - i. Increasing in shipping and boat activity;
 - ii. Seismic activity;
 - iii. Military activity (low and mid frequency activity sonar);
 - iv. Land based drilling and machinery.
 - c. Recommendations:
 - i. Consider building acoustic monitoring into future surveys to build data on anthropogenic noise levels in the PIR;
 - ii. Map shipping routes and trends to overlay with critical habitat mapping work;
 - iii. Consider developing ambient noise budgets for the PIR;
 - iv. Increase training in appropriate dead stranding protocols and procedures to ensure better data collection;
 - v. Increase training on on-board observes of vessels conducting seismic surveys in the PIR to ensure appropriate interpretation of cetacean behaviours associated with the activity.

8. Pollution (including marine debris)
 - a. Known threats/impacts:
 - i. Domestic and municipal marine debris including plastics/waste disposal
 - b. Potential threats/impacts:
 - i. WWII wrecks;
 - ii. High nutrient levels changing coastal environments, food change and marine ecosystems;
 - iii. Mining operations.
 - c. Recommendations:
 - i. Consider developing toxicology research programmes in the PIR
 - ii. Develop guidelines for researchers to collect and maintain samples for future toxicology work.

9. Whale and dolphin watching
 - a. Cetacean-watching opportunities:
 - i. Considerable global demand for high quality cetacean-watching tour experiencing;
 - ii. The climate and opportunities available in the PIR are world class;
 - iii. The image of the PIR for most potential countries of origin for tourist is extremely positive;
 - iv. Cetacean-watching industry in the PIR can distinguish itself as 'best practice'.
 - b. Cetacean-watching concerns:
 - i. Tourism infrastructure is poor;
 - ii. Cynicism in the cetacean-watching community that the PIR is not able to carefully manage the industry;
 - iii. Unsustainable and poorly conducted activities can do harm to the reputation of the PIR and impacts on the growth of the industry.
 - iv.
 - c. Known threats/impacts:
 - i. Displacement from critical habitat;
 - ii. Harassment;
 - iii. Boat strikes.
 - d. Potential threats/impacts:
 - i. Behaviour changes have sub-lethal impacts such as decrease in resting behaviour, whistle rate increase, habitat displacement;
 - ii. Increase of psychological/social stress creating potential effects such as reduced immunity, increase disease, increased mortality, reduced reproductive rates, impaired development.

- e. Recommendations:
- i. Assess the effectiveness of existing guidelines, regulations and licensing schemes;
 - ii. Develop programmes for capacity building to address implement and enforcement challenges;
 - iii. Create region-wide cetacean-watching guidelines;
 - iv. Create a cetacean-watching template for use in national guidelines and regulations;
 - v. Create cetacean-watching licensing system (including monitoring, compliance and enforcement) to manage the number of cetacean-watching vessels;
 - vi. Promote the requirement of regular training and certification programmes or both operators and guides;
 - vii. Develop local plans of management in areas of high cetacean-watching use or where there are sensitive/endangered populations of cetaceans;
 - viii. Improve the understanding of cetacean populations to create greater certainty to access to cetacean-watching viewing opportunities;
 - ix. Review the sustainability of existing cetacean-watching operations where cetaceans may be experiencing significant pressures;
 - x. Assess the impacts of swim-with cetacean-watching operations;
 - xi. Develop programmes for cetacean-watching operators to collect data.
 - xii. Conduct an impact assessment on swim-with-whales operations in Vava'u
 - xiii. Conduct an impact assessment on the impacts of vessels and dolphin-watching operators in New Caledonia
 - xiv. Conduct an impact assessment the development of dolphin tourism in Guam and French Polynesia

Annex 6:

Pacific Islands Marine Mammal Protection Measures & Convention Membership

| COUNTRY | National legislation | | | Regional Conventions | | | | | International Conventions | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|-------|-------|----------------------|-----|-----|-----|------|---------------------------|-----|-------|-----|-----|--------|-----|
| | Sanctuary | NMMPL | SMMPL | SPREP | PIF | FFA | SPC | SPTO | SOPAC | IWC | CITES | CMS | CBD | UNCLOS | FAO |
| American Samoa (US) | x | x | | x | | | x | | x | | x | | | x | x |
| Cook Islands | x | x | | x | x | x | x | x | x | | | (x) | x | x | x |
| Federated States of Micronesia | | | x | x | x | x | x | | x | | | (x) | x | x | x |
| Fiji | (x) | | | x | x | x | x | x | x | | x | (x) | x | x | x |
| French Polynesia (FR) | x | x | | x | | | x | x | x | | x | x | x | x | x |
| Guam (US) | | x | | x | | | x | | x | | x | | | x | x |
| Kiribati | | | | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | | | x | x | x |
| Marshall Islands | | | x | x | x | x | x | | x | | | | x | x | x |
| Nauru | | | | x | x | x | x | | x | x | | | x | x | x |
| New Caledonia (FR) | x | x | | x | | | x | x | x | | x | x | x | x | x |
| Niue | x | x | | x | x | x | x | | x | | | (x) | x | x | x |
| Northern Mariana Islands (US) | | x | | x | | | x | | | | x | | | x | x |
| Palau | | | x | x | x | x | x | | x | | x | | x | x | x |
| Papua New Guinea | (x) | | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | | x | | x | x | x |
| Samoa | | (x) | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | | x | x | x | x | x |
| Solomon Islands | | (x) | | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | | | x | x | x |
| Tokelau (NZ) | | | x | x | | x | x | | | | x | (x) | x | x | x |
| Tonga | | x | | x | x | x | x | x | x | | | (x) | x | x | x |
| Tuvalu | | | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | | (x) | x | x | x |
| Vanuatu | x | x | | x | x | x | x | x | x | | x | | x | x | x |
| Wallis and Futuna (FR) | | x | | x | | | x | | | | x | x | x | x | x |

Key

NMMPL = National Marine Mammal Protection Legislation

SMMPL = Some Marine Mammal Protection Legislation

ANNEX 7: Cetacean watching industry study results for individual countries/territories

| Country | Estimated numbers of whale watchers | Estimated numbers of whale watchers | Annual average growth rate (1998-2005) | Average Ticket Price (USD) | Direct Economic Value (USD) | Total Economic Value (USD) |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| TOTAL: | 10,309 | 110,746 | 45% | \$ 76 | \$7,525,500 | \$21,012,000 |
| American Samoa | None identified | Minimal | 0% | NA | Minimal | Minimal |
| Cook Islands | None identified ^[2] | 3,715 | 64% | 46 | 9,890 | 474,265 |
| Federated States of | 230 | Minimal | 0% | NA | Minimal | Minimal |
| Fiji | Minimal | Minimal | 0% | 80 | Minimal | Minimal |
| French Polynesia | 1,000 ^[3] | 6,000 | 30% | 94 | 564,000 | 13,140,000 |
| Guam | 4,000 | 84,000 | 70% | 68 | 5,712,000 | 16,212,000 |
| Kiribati | None identified | None identified | 0% | NA | 0 | 0 |
| Marshal Islands | None identified | None identified | 0% | NA | 0 | 0 |
| Nauru | None identified | None identified | 0% | NA | 0 | 0 |
| New Caledonia | 1,695 | 4,906 | 17% | 85 | 417,010 | 1,030,260 |
| Niue | 50 | 270 | 28% | 32 | 7,360 | 41,110 |
| Northern Mariana Islands | None identified | Minimal | 0% | NA | Minimal | Minimal |
| Palau | None identified | Minimal | 0% | NA | Minimal | Minimal |
| Papua New Guinea | None identified ^[4] | 600 | 17% | 75 | 22,500 | 22,500 |
| Samoa | None identified ^[5] | 725 | 8% | 51 | 18,488 | 18,488 |
| Solomon Islands | Minimal | 500 | 14% | 145 | 36,250 | 36,250 |
| Tokelau | None identified | None identified | 0% | NA | 0 | 0 |
| Tonga | 2,334 | 9,000 | 22% | 82 | 738,000 | 1,863,000 |
| Tuvalu | None identified | None identified | 0% | NA | 0 | 0 |
| Vanuatu | None identified | None identified | 0% | NA | 0 | 0 |
| Wallis & Futuna | None identified | None identified | 0% | NA | 0 | 0 |
| Pitcairn Islands | None identified | None identified | 0% | NA | 0 | 0 |

ANNEX 8

A Brief Review of Impact Studies in New Zealand (Mark Orams, Massey University at Albany)

Bottlenose Dolphins

Bay of Islands, Northland (Constantine, 1995; 1999; 2001; 2002)

- Resting behaviour decreased with increasing boat numbers.
- Over a third of dolphin groups are exposed to a least one swim attempt.
- Swimmer placement method influences responses.
- Dolphins have become “sensitised” to swimmers over time.

Dusky Dolphins

Kaikoura (Barr, 1997; Yin, 1999)

- Whistle rate increased when swimmers close by.
- Potential disturbance of early afternoon rest time.
- Dolphins accompanied by vessels around two thirds of daylight hours.
- Dolphins formed “tighter groups” when vessels present.

Hector’s Dolphins

Porpoise Bay, Southland (Bejder, 1997)

- Dolphins used a preferred area less when swimmers were present.
- Dolphins swam in tighter groups when vessels or swimmers were present.
- Initial attraction to vessels for bow-riding.

Akaroa Harbour, Canterbury (Stone, 1999; Stone & Yoshinaga, 2000)

- Active swimming behaviour increased with increasing numbers of boats.
- Short-term change to interact with boats rather than interact with one another.
- Potential increase in boat strikes on calves.

Common Dolphins

Mercury Bay, Coromandel (Neumann, 2001)

- Avoidance of boats after around an hour.
- Larger groups more tolerant of boats.
- Larger groups more likely to interact with swimmers.
- Swim interactions brief and “safety distance” maintained.

Sperm Whales

Kaikoura (MacGibbon, 1991; Gordon et al, 1992; Richter, 2002)

- Shorter respiratory intervals in presence of vessels.
- Individual whales vary in tolerance of boats.
- Shallow dives in response to vessel proximity, sudden boat speed change and high speed approaches.
- “Residents” more tolerant than “transients”.
- Decrease in time to “first click” in presence of boats.
- Increased changes in whale’s heading in presence of boats.
- Whales at surface accompanied by boats approx. 50% of time during summer.

ANNEX 9:

Cetacean Information/Awareness Material

| Organization/Agency | Title of Information Material | Area | Type/Form | Contact |
|-----------------------|---|--|-----------------------|---------|
| IFAW | Marine Mammals and Marine Turtles of the Pacific Islands Region | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Species Identification, • Basic Information • Common visible behaviours and Terms, • Whale watching guide | Pamphlet (waterproof) | |
| | Humpback whale | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Illustration | Book mark | |
| WWF | Whales, Dolphins and Porpoises in the Pacific | | Pamphlet | |
| | Declare Pacific EEZs Whale Sanctuaries | | Pamphlet | |
| | Whale Sanctuaries | | Poster | |
| Australian Government | Watching Whales and Dolphins-Keep a safe Distance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Species Identification, • Whale and Dolphin watching guidelines | Pamphlet | |
| | Protected Marine Species | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification guide and basic information on Australian aquatic protected species including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ turtles, sharks, sawfish, handfish, seals, sea lions, dugong, whales & dolphins, sea-snakes, seabirds, pipefish/seahorses/ seadragons | Sheets (waterproof) | |
| | Protecting Whales and Dolphins | Protection and Management in Australia | Information sheet | |
| | Whale Research | Research methods and projects in Australia | Information sheet | |
| | Whales and dolphins in Australian waters | Species, distribution and basic information | | |
| | Australian National Guidelines for whale and dolphin watching 2005 | Whale watching guidelines | Document | |
| | Protecting Whales and Dolphins | Dolphin underwater photo | poster | |
| | Protecting Whales and Dolphins | Humpback whales underwater photo | poster | |

ANNEX 10

WDAP Implementation issues (Mind mapping exercise)

1. Communication
 - French & English needed
 - SPREP to be host of contact database that needs to be available to all and updated regularly;
 - (Links) NBSAP; Tuna Commission; SPC; FFA; CROP marine group facilitate;
 - Samoa good example to show advancement of WDAP – need to report to PICTs / Network;
 - Reporting / Monitoring needs to be communicated between and to PICTs;
 - Free network communication programmes (DJ)
2. Coordination
 - Tech group needs to stay in touch / coordinate approaches / strategies
 - SPREP key role
 - CMS/ partner organisations to support
3. Monitoring, evaluation and reporting
 - Concern of overloading SPREP – editorial and coordination
 - SPREP evaluation of progress following member reporting
 - Regular / annual reporting against action plan by members / partners – can be applied to CBD / CMS;
 - Simple template for reporting – structure web based
4. Information management
 - Way of summarising information to monitor advancements & strategy for dissemination;
 - Reporting template database of publications etc.; (way for PICTS to comment and make additions);
 - Working group or individuals to update database;
 - List server – linked to other networks
 - SPREP website to host PICT content database / legislative information relevant materials; partner organisation to assist in updating.
5. Ownership and commitment “political well” – sectoral
 - In-country NGO’s facilitating
 - Public support through MoU;
 - Demonstrating benefits
 - Cultural values to underpin management strategies.
6. Partnerships
 - Collaborating with institutions / sectors
 - NGOs/ Universities/ Private sector
 - In-country partnerships
 - SPREP & CMS
 - CMS integration with CBD / SIDS
7. In country linkages
 - NGO & Government
 - WDAP reporting / monitoring to include all relevant agencies / protocol;

ANNEX 10

8. Capacity

- Regional & in-country biggest limitation;
- USP Faculty of Islands & Oceans links
- Advancement have been in capacity building
- More CB programmes needed to implement WDAP
- Regional workshops need in-country follow up
- Participants / profession exchange

9. Investment value/demonstrating benefits

- Monetary value to existing work to profile commitment to WDAP 2003
 - Agencies
 - Governments
 - NGOs
 - In kind
 - Community
- Conservation value of marine mammals
- Potential benefits (eg) depredation mitigation
- Cost benefit analysis / profile to WDAP
- Socio / economic values of whale watching
- Annex science papers SPWRC
- Sanctuaries surrogate indicator (eg) brochures to indicate tourism benefits
- CMS / CBD / IWC indicators / obligations to other agreements

10. Priority setting/Specificity

- Issues and options to be prioritized by SPREP members
- Tech group to inform options issue
- Scientific prioritizing/ranking input
- Detailed plus inform by country issues

11. Linkages

- NBSAP/regional mechanisms/agreements
- Sectoral planning ie. Tourism/fisheries
- Regional oceans policy
- Tuna commission ecosystem and bycatch working group

12. Lack of data

- Ongoing and long term only for annual grants
 - a. Fundamental lack of species inventory, key habitats and threats

13. Gaps and emerging issues

- Advancements have been made re: Action 13 CMS
- Policy advice needed: JARPA II issue, live dolphin export
- National legislation reflects for potential lethal research
- Micronesian challenge
- MPA momentum - mm to part of that
- Ww industry standards needed/growth
- Whales and fisheries link to tuna commission

ANNEX 10

- Lack of info/observer coverage re. Bycatch and entanglement (fisheries interaction protocols)
- Need to extend cultural significance surveys
- IWC membership

14. Financial resource

- More needed
- Advancements have been made in organizing program and pitch
- More range of opportunities CMS/GEF/provide small grants
- Prioritizing/coordinating/presentation
- Industry support due to public concern
- Private sector involvement
- Internships good vehicle
 - a. USA & Potential with growing interest

WDAP broader recommendations

1. Streamlining permitting process
2. Need to ensure the WDAP highlights the need for a dialogue between conservation managers and the fishing sector (industry, government officials, RFMOs, FAO)
3. Lack of information sometimes disguises the potential of a threat or impact
4. Cumulative impacts
5. Disease and sub-lethal impacts
6. The state of knowledge in the PIR on cetacean distribution and threat impact remains low
7. Need to consider strategic relationship with the major industries in the PIR, in particular the tuna sector and associated working groups and scientific surveys

Actions:

Governments and organisations to provide public consumption document and lists of electronic materials to MSO

ANNEX 11

Issues under the subheadings of the MoU for the conservation of cetaceans in the Pacific Islands region, and tools to address them.

ISSUES

Threats reduction

- JARPA II.
- Live export of dolphins.
- *Drive hunts*
- IWC membership.
- Observer coverage/lack of information on whales/fish interactions including bycatch and entanglement.
- Lack of systems for addressing bycatch.

Responses to strandings and entanglements

Sustainable and responsible cetacean-based tourism

- Significant growth of the whale and dolphin watching issues.

Cultural significance (not in the MOU explicitly)

- Cultural significance studies.
- High profile support of the MoU.

IMPLEMENTATION /TOOLS/ MECHANISMS

Information exchange

- Need a way of summarising information to monitor and report on achievements.
- Strategy for information dissemination.
- Maintain & update a database of achievements against each WDAP action.
- List server (hosted by SPREP website) linked to other networks.
- Limited engagement under current WDAP with French speaking countries/territories. Need both French and English working versions of the Action Plan.
- Content management systems – easily downloadable.

Capacity building

- Regional and in-country capacity needs.
- Implementation at country level has been limited by lack of in-country capacity.
- Samoa – positive example of increase in country capacity.
- USP – Faculty of Islands and Oceans. Look for support for students.
- Role of capacity building workshops.
- Follow-up is critical to upholding the capacity built through workshops.
- Country-country exchange.

Habitat (and species) protection (including sanctuaries)

- CBD goals, eg in relation to protected areas, Fiji and the Micronesian challenge.
- Momentum on the development of MPAs – marine mammals need to be part of this agenda.

Research and monitoring

- Reporting template for advancements against each WDAP action.
- Annual reporting by all countries and partners would be desirable - potentially linked to the annual SPREP meeting.
- Reporting should use a standard format – a simple web-based template allowing simple analysis/summary by SPREP.
- Lack of data is a product of lack of long term funding for research programs.

- Lack of basic/fundamental data – species inventories, stock structure, key habitat, information about impacts of specific activities on cetaceans.
- List publications related to/generated by work under the plan.

Education and public awareness

- Imperative to communicate outcomes of annual reviews to PICTs, donors etc. There have been successes and achievements under the WDAP, but these have not necessarily been communicated widely.
- Role for internships.
- Some draft fisheries regulations in the region including whaling provisions.
 - Whales and fisheries – linked to tuna commission.
- Detailed country briefing/policy advice needed on the emerging issues
- List potential benefits of the action plan (eg addressing depredation issue, economic value of whale watching).
- High profile support of the MoU.

National, regional and international cooperation

- Reporting under WDAP should also cater for CMS/CBD reporting requirements.
- Contacts database produced by Olive Andrews need to be maintained/updated – potentially by SPREP. Need to add in other networks, eg BSAP co-ordinators, SPC/FFA/fisheries contacts. CROP working group can help with this.
- The development of the CMS MoU is a significant and substantial achievement.
- NBSAPs.
- RFMOs.
- Tuna commission ecosystem and bycatch working group.
- Regional oceans policy/action strategy on nature conservation.
- International conventions/agreements.
- Sectoral linkages, eg tourism.
- In country linkages – co-ordination between different agencies/departments. Also relevant to national NGOs.
- Benefits of the plan to other international agreements.
- Strengthen partnerships/collaboration, particularly in country.
- SPREP / CMS partnership is primary.
- Integrate with Small Island Developing States program.
- *NGO partnerships*

Coordination and implementation (not in the MOU explicitly)

Investment and resourcing

- SPREP plays a key and ongoing role.
- There are capacity issues – additional funding is required to support full coordination in relation to WDAP and CMS MoU.
- A technical group is required to support the implementation of the Action Plan.
- More funding needed to support the plan – serious funding.
- Prioritise and package actions from the Action Plan. Approach funding agencies and private sector with a shopping list.
- CMS Secretariat has a role in relation to securing funding for the Action Plan.
- Countries need to identify priorities.
- Technical advice is also needed about priorities, eg from a scientific/research needs viewpoint. Include rankings.
- Specificity – need to have more detail in the plan, including country specific actions.
- Assign dollar values against the work undertaken to date under the WDAP. Include a column showing value (including in-kind) against each action in the plan.
- Indicate dollar value for work planned too.
- Move towards clear indicators of the success of the plan.

Sanctuaries and protected areas (not in the MOU explicitly)

ANNEX 12

NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN (NBSAP) FORMAT

e.g. Samoa's NBSAP (FSM is very similar)

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Importance of Biodiversity
- 1.2 Background
- 1.3 Conventions on Biological Diversity

2 VISION, GUIDING PRINCIPLES AND GOALS

A. Vision

B. Guiding Principles

- Sovereign Rights
- Good Governance and Leadership
- Collective Responsibility
- Stakeholder Participation
- Traditional Knowledge, Practices and Innovations
- In situ and Ex situ Conservation
- Public Awareness and Capacity Building
- Respect for Biodiversity

C. Goals

- Policies and Legislation
- Community Involvement
- Co-operation and Coordination
- Public Awareness
- Capacity Building
- Protection of Genetic Resources
- Prevention, Control and Eradication
- Social and Economic Development

3 STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN

3.1 Theme 1: Mainstreaming Biodiversity

3.2 Theme 2: Ecosystem Management

3.3 Theme 3: Species Management

Strategy Goal: To promote the conservation of Samoa's native and other important species and provide mechanisms for their sustainable use.

Objective 1: Conservation of Species

To enhance the status of native and other important species in Samoa through effective conservation programmes

Monitoring Goal: number of programmes to conserve and sustainably manage Samoa's native species.

Actions:

1.1 Establish and maintain a complete threatened species list for Samoa...

1.2 Assess the need for Samoa's participation in international and regional efforts to protect migratory species

Key Players

DLSE, MAFFM,
MFA, NUS, USP

DLSE, MAFFM,
MFA, AG

ANNEX 12

Objective 2: Research and Monitoring

To promote and encourage research for the identification, documentation and monitoring of species and the implementation of appropriate conservation and management programmes.

Monitoring Goal: number of research, surveys and monitoring programmes in place.

Actions:

Objective 3: Sustainable Use and Management of Species

To ensure the sustainable use and management of species for social and economic development.

Monitoring

Objective 4: Public awareness & Education

To enhance knowledge and understanding of the public on the conservation, sustainable use and management of species

Objective 5: Capacity Building

To enhance and strengthen the capacity of all Samoans to ensure the sustainable use, management and conservation of native and other important species.

3.3 Theme 4: Community

3.4 Theme 5: Access and Benefit Sharing

3.5 Theme 6: Biosecurity

3.6 Theme 7: Agrobiodiversity

3.7 Theme 8: Financing Resources and Mechanism

4 IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

4.1 Management Structure for Implementing the Strategy

- Current situation
- Biodiversity Policy Committee
- National Biodiversity Policy
- Implementation priorities
 - Short Term Priorities
 - Long Term Priorities
- Expert Groups
- National Biodiversity Database
- Regional and International Linkages

4.2 Monitoring

4.3 Reporting

5. APPENDICES

5.1 Review of Samoa Biodiversity

- Global context
- Current status (regionally and nationally)
- Factors Causing Decline of Biodiversity
- Benefits of Biodiversity
- Economic value of biodiversity
- Past and current Management of Biodiversity

Technical Working Group Advice for the Future WDAP

Threats

| Action | Priority Level | Plan | Lead | Collab | Target/outcomes | Time-scale | Investmt |
|---|----------------|------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|------------|----------|
| General | | | | | | | |
| 1. Complete species distribution and threats report and include commentary recommendations on in country work needed to maximise value from the report | 1 | 2 | Cara | TWG SPREP | | | |
| Fisheries interaction | | | | | | | |
| 2. Develop strategies and plans for increasing observer coverage and data collection in PIR fisheries; | - | 2 | | | | | |
| 3. Develop and advocate the use of training and materials that could be used for observer training workshop for identification and catch log data analysis; | - | 2 | | (Dave J) | | | |
| 4. Work with fishing sector to develop mitigation measures to reduce bycatch and depredation; | - | 2 | | | | | |
| 5. Assess photo and stranding data to better understand impacts of fisheries interactions on cetaceans in the PIR; | - | 2 | ? | Simon Walsh? Dave M | | | |
| 6. Improve predicting bycatch by analogy by better data of effort and cetacean population distribution | - | 2 | ? | Dave J Cara | | | |
| 7. Assess the issues of fisheries interaction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Exchange information on depredation in local longline fisheries to determine mitigation techniques – particularly low tech b. Identify species involved in depredation and/or bait removal | 1 | 2 | SPREP Simon Walsh? | SPC FFA WCPTC NOAA | | | |
| 8. Developed information materials to demonstrate where capture and export of live animals is covered by CITES which requires populations estimates as part of the non-detriment findings | 3 | 2 | | | | | |
| Directed takes | | | | | | | |
| 9. Assess the effect of Solomon drive hunt on dolphin populations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Estimate population sizes b. Estimate takes by species c. Determine sustainability by species | 1 | 2 | SI SPREP | SPWRC IWC SC | | | |
| 10. Assess the impacts on island breeding populations of | 1 | 2 | Australia | SPWRC | | | |

ANNEX 13

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---------------|---------------------------------|--|--|--|
| humpback whales in the Pacific of whaling operations on their feeding grounds | | | New Zealand | IWC SC | | | |
| Ship strikes | | | | | | | |
| 11. Develop briefing on the potential for mandatory reporting mechanisms in the PIR | - | 2 | | | | | |
| 12. Access training programmes and education materials for circulation in the PIR vessel operators, regulators and flag states | - | 2 | SPREP | IMO NOAA | | | |
| 13. Identify hotspot areas of critical habitat and develop advice and regulation to minimise the threat | - | 2 | | | | | |
| 14. Develop better understanding of critical habitat (area and oceanographic conditions) and migration pathways in the PIR | - | 2 | | | | | |
| 15. Develop better understanding of about oceanographic conditions and their fluctuations and habitat needs in the PIR and reasons why species are using these areas or conditions, including accessing Seamount and Tuna Commission information | - | 2 | SPREP | Cara IFAW Sue T Dave J | | | |
| 16. Identify known critical habitats (breeding, resting and feeding grounds) | - | 2 | SPWRC NOAA | | | | |
| 17. Develop critical habitat buffers/safety nets into legislation and management plans as they are developed | - | 2 | SPREP | | | | |
| Acoustic disturbance | | | | | | | |
| 18. Build acoustic monitoring into future surveys to build data on anthropogenic noise levels in the PIR | - | 2 | TWG | | | | |
| 19. Map shipping routes and trends to overlay with critical habitat mapping work | - | 2 | TWG | SIO, IMO | | | |
| 20. Develop a briefing on the potential for ambient noise budgets for the PIR; | - | 2 | TWG | | | | |
| 21. Increase training in appropriate dead stranding protocols and procedures to ensure better data collection; | - | 2 | DOC TWG | | | | |
| 22. Increase training on on-board observes of vessels conducting seismic surveys in the PIR to ensure appropriate interpretation of cetacean behaviours associated with the activity; | - | 2 | SPREP | | | | |
| Pollution (including marine debris) | | | | | | | |
| 23. Develop toxicology research programmes in the PIR; | - | 2 | TWG | | | | |
| 24. Using Country reports and stranding data, and assess the impact of ingestion of marine debris in the region | - | 2 | TWG | | | | |
| 25. Develop guidelines for researchers to collect and maintain samples for future toxicology work; | - | 2 | TWG | | | | |

ANNEX 13

Cetacean watching

| Action | Priority Level | Plan | Lead | Collab | Target/outcomes | Time-scale | Investm,t |
|---|----------------|------|--------|----------------------------|-----------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Assess the effectiveness of existing guidelines, regulations and licensing schemes (using case studies) | | 2 | | | | | |
| 2. Develop programmes for capacity building to address implement and enforcement challenges | | 2 | | | | | |
| 3. Promote the requirement of regular training and certification programmes or both operators and guides | | 2 | | | | | |
| 4. Develop local plans of management in areas of high cetacean-watching use or where there are sensitive/endangered populations of cetaceans | | 2 | | | | | |
| 5. Improve the understanding of cetacean populations to create greater certainty to access to cetacean-watching viewing opportunities | | 2 | | | | | |
| 6. Review the sustainability of existing cetacean-watching operations where cetaceans may be experiencing significant pressures | 1 | 2 | Mark O | Dave J IFAW Cara | | | |
| 7. Assess the impacts of cetacean-watching operations, including <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Conduct an impact assessment on swim-with-whales operations in Vava'u b. Conduct an impact assessment on the impacts of vessels and dolphin-watching operators in New Caledonia c. Conduct an impact assessment the development of dolphin tourism in Guam and French Polynesia | 1 | 2 | ? | Mark O Dave J (Guam) | | | |

ANNEX 13

| | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 8. Assess the cetacean/tourism impacts on: a. Whale swim – Tonga b. Dolphin watching and swim-with (spinner dolphins)– Guam/Moorea | [cross ref with above] | [cross ref with above] | [cross ref with above] | [cross ref with above] | | | |
| 9. Develop programmes for cetacean-watching operators to collect useful data | | 2 | | Cara | | | |
| 10. Complete the baseline economic review of cetacean-watching and promote understanding of the finding as widely as possible and follow up with a more detailed socio-economic comparative analysis | 1 | 2 | ECOLA RGE | SPTO SPWRC SPREP IFAW | | | |

CMS MoU

| Action | Priority Level | Plan | Lead | Collab | Target/outcomes | Time-scale | Investm,t |
|------------------------------|----------------|------|------|---------------------|-----------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Promote membership of CMS | 1 | 2 | CMS | DOC DEH SPREP | | | |
| 2. Promote signatures to MoU | 1 | 2 | CMS | DOC DEH SPREP | | | |

Implementation

| Action | Priority Level | Plan | Lead | Collab | Target/outcomes | Time-scale | Investm,t |
|--|----------------|------|-----------------|--------|-----------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Develop a reporting template for advancements against each WDAP action | 1 | 2 | SPREP | TWG | | | |
| 2. Maintain & update a database of achievements against each WDAP action (linking format to CBD and CMS etc) | 1 | 2 | SPREP/ PICTs | TWG | | | |
| 3. Launch a list server (hosted by SPREP website) linked to other networks | 2 | 2 | SPREP | TWG | | | |
| 4. Move towards a rolling 5 WDAP year plan, including developing and seeking endorsement for a mid-term: | 1 | 2 | SPREP/ PICTs | | | | |

ANNEX 13

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--------------|--------------|--|--|--|
| a. review process b. forward planning process c. consultation process d. sign-off/confirmation process | | | | | | | |
| 5. Review available content management systems | 1 | 2 | SPREP | Dave J | | | |
| Coordination | | | | | | | |
| 6. Facilitate a system of internship support | 2 | 2 | SPREP | | | | |
| 7. Develop linkages with NBSAPs, RFMOs, Tuna commission ecosystem and bycatch working group, Regional oceans policy/action strategy on nature conservation, relevant international conventions/agreements and the private sector | 1 | 2 | SPREP | TWG | | | |
| 8. Assign dollar values against the work undertaken to date under the WDAP. Include a column showing value (including in-kind) against each action in the plan | 1 | 2 | SPREP | TWG | | | |
| 9. List, archive and make available publications related to/generated by work under the plan | 2 | 2 | SPREP | TWG David | | | |
| 10. Develop clear indicators of the success of the plan | 1 | 2 | SPREP CMS | TWG | | | |

Technical resources and research

| Action | Priority Level | Plan | Lead | Collab | Target/outcomes | Time-scale | Investm,t |
|---|----------------|------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Complete legislative report by extending to cover US, UK, Pitcairn, France, Australia, NZ. and including review of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. country capacity to implement CMS MoU and potential legislative barriers, b. legislation to implement CITES/CBD, c. habitat protection legislation, d. declaration of EEZs etc. e. Regulation on distant water fleets | 1 | 2 | Olive Margi | TWG SPREP | | | |

ANNEX 13

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---------------------------------|-------|--|--|--|
| 2. Create summary briefings of completed species distribution and threats report and legislative report into country profiles | 1 | 2 | Olive Cara Margi SPREP | | | | |
| 3. Review and identify priority areas for species inventory/baseline surveys | 2 | 2 | Cara SPREP PICTs | SPWRC | | | |
| 4. Conduct species inventory/baseline surveys, especially for areas of region where information is lacking | 2 | 2 | TWG SPREP PICTs | SPWRC | | | |



Technical Meeting on Cetaceans in the Pacific Islands Region

1st to 4th August 2006
Apia, Samoa - SPREP TEC

PARTICIPANTS LIST

| DELEGATES | CONTACT |
|--|---|
| <p>Dr Cara Miller Science Coordinator WDCS Australasia Inc. ABN 37 792 681 565 P O Box 720 Port Adelaide Business Centre SA 5015 Australia</p> | <p>P: +61 08 8440 3717 M: +61 0 422 388 725 F: +61 08 8447 4211 E: cara.miller@wdcs.org</p> |
| <p>Mr Darren Kindleysides Asia Pacific Campaigns Officer IFAW 8 Belmore Street Surry Hills Sydney NSW 2010 Australia</p> | <p>P: +61 2 9288 4929 M: +61 400 174 127 E: dkindleysides@ifaw.org</p> |
| <p>Dr Dave Johnston Cetacean Biologist Pacific islands Fisheries Science Center NOAA</p> | <p>P: M: F: E: Dave.Johnston@noaa.gov</p> |
| <p>Dr David Mattila Science & Rescue Coordinator Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale national Marine Sanctuary 726 S. Kihei Rd Kihei, Hawaii 96753</p> | <p>P: 808 879 2118 M: F: 808 874 3815 E: David.Mattila@noaa.gov</p> |
| <p>Mr David Paton Cetacean Policy and Recovery Officer Australian Department of Environment and Heritage Executive Member of the South Pacific Whale Research Consortium GPO Box 787 ACT 2601 Australia</p> | <p>P: +61 02 6274 2784 F: +61 02 6274 1771 E: david.paton@deh.gov.au</p> |
| <p>Ms Gillian Slocum Senior Policy Advisor Australian Antarctic Division Department of Environment and Heritage Channel Highway Kingston Tasmania 7050 Australia</p> | <p>P: +61 3 6232 6481 F: +61 3 6232 3500 E: Gill.Slocum@aad.gov.au</p> |
| <p>Ms Lesley Gidding Assistant Director Cetacean Policy and Recovery Marine Division Department of the Environment and Heritage GPO Box 787, ACT Australia 2601</p> | <p>P: +61 (0)2 62741030 F: +61 (0)2 62741662 E: Lesley.Gidding@deh.gov.au</p> |

ANNEX 14

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Mr Marc Oremus PhD Candidate University of Auckland/SPWRC Private Bag 92019 Auckland New Zealand</p> | <p>P: +64 9 373 7599 Ext 84588 F: +64 9 373 7417 E: m.oremus@auckland.ac.nz</p> |
| <p>Dr Margi Prideaux WDCS Global CMS Programme Leader P O Box 720 Port Adelaide Business Center Port Adelaide SA 5015 Australia</p> | <p>P: +61 8 8242 5842 F: +61 8 8242 1595 E: margi.prideaux@wdcs.org</p> |
| <p>Dr Mark Orams Director Coastal – Marine Research Group Ecology, Zoology and Environmental Sciences Institute of Natural Resources College of Sciences Massey University – Albany Private Bag 102 904 North Shore MSC New Zealand</p> | <p>P: +64 9 414 0800 x41194 F: +64 9 443 9790 E: M.B.Orams@massey.ac.nz</p> |
| <p>Mr Masanami Izumi Fishery Officer FAO Sub-Regional Office for the Pacific Islands Private Mail Bag Apia Samoa</p> | <p>P: +685 22127 or 20710 F: +685 22126 E: masanami.izumi@fao.org</p> |
| <p>Mr Mike Donoghue Senior International Relations Officer International Relations Unit Department of Conservation P O Box 10-420 Wellington New Zealand</p> | <p>P: +64 21 870310 F: +64 7 886 8262 E: donoghue@ihug.co.nz or mdonoghue@doc.govt.nz</p> |
| <p>Ms Olive Andrews Director, Whales Alive Marine mammal Consultant IFAW Asia Pacific Southern Cross University Whale Research Center 22 Seaview Street Byron Bay, NSW 2481 Australia</p> | <p>P: +61 02 6680 7223 F: +61 02 6680 7223 M: +61 0 4039 59007 E: olive@byronit.com</p> |
| <p>Ms Penina B Solomona Regional Marine Officer WWF South Pacific Programme 4 Ma'afu Street, Suva, Fiji Islands Private Mail Bag GPO Suva Fiji</p> | <p>P: +679 331 5533 F: +679 331 5410 E: psolomona@wwfpacific.org.fj</p> |
| <p>Mr Pouvave Fainuulelei Principal Fisheries Officer Fisheries Division Ministry of Agriculture & Fisheries Government of Samoa Apia</p> | <p>P: +685 22561 F: E: Pouvave.Fainuulelei@maf.gov.ws</p> |
| <p>Ms Malama Momoemausu Principal Marine Conservation Officer Division of Environment and Conservation Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment & Meteorology Government of Samoa Apia</p> | <p>P: +685 30100 F: E: malamas.usu@mnre.gov.ws</p> |

ANNEX 14

| | |
|---|---|
| Ms Juney Ward Senior Marine Conservation Officer Division of Environment and Conservation Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment & Meteorology Government of Samoa Apia | P: +685 31197 F: E: juney.ward@mnre.gov.ws |
| Ms Sue Taei IFAW c/o Conservation International SPREP Headquarters Vailima | P: +685 21593 F: +685 21593 E: staei@conservation.org |
| Dr William Perrin CMS Scientific Council Southwest Fisheries Science Center 8604 La Jolla Shores Drive La Jolla CA 92037 United States of America | P: +1 858 546 7096 F: +1 858 546 7003 E: William.Perrin@noaa.gov |
| Ms Dominique Benzaken Coastal Management Adviser SPREP Vailima | P: +685 21929 F: +685 20231 E: dominiqueb@sprep.org |
| Mr Lui Bell Marine Species Officer SPREP Vailima | P: +685 21929 F: +685 20231 E: luib@sprep.org |
| Ms Anne Trevor Associate Turtle Database Officer SPREP Vailima | P: +685 21929 F: +685 20231 E: annet@sprep.org |
| Ms Tamara Logan Education & Social Communication Officer SPREP Vailima | P: +685 21929 F: +685 20231 E: tamaral@sprep.org |
| Ms Makerita Atiga Secretary – PM-IE SPREP Vailima | P: +685 21929 F: +685 20231 E: makeritaa@sprep.org |