

SC/68A/RP/05

ASI - Meetings/Workshops (ASI Group)
Pre-Meeting of the Abundance Steering
Group



INTERNATIONAL
WHALING COMMISSION



135 Station Road, Impington, Cambridge, UK, CB24 9NP;
 Tel: +44 1223 233397 - Fax: +44 1223 232876
 E-mail: secretariat@iwc.int

PROJECT PROPOSAL REQUEST

1. PROPOSAL TITLE

Pre-Meeting of the Abundance Steering Group

2. BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSAL AND ITS EXPECTED OUTCOME

Pre-meeting prior to SC68B for the Abundance Steering Group to meet and evaluate abundance estimates received intersessionally following the process established by the ASI Working Group.

3. RELEVANT IWC SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE GROUPS OR SUB-GROUPS

Relevant for the following groups: ASI, ASW, EM, IST, IA, NH, SH, SM.

4. TYPE OF PROJECT (PLEASE TICK)

Research project	
Modelling	
Workshop/meeting	X
Database creation/maintenance	
Compilation work/editing (e.g. on whalewatching regulations, SOCER, etc.)	
Other (please specify below)	

5. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ITS CONNECTION WITH SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS (DO NOT EXCEED 1500 WORDS)

(A) BACKGROUND, RATIONALE, AND RELEVANCE TO THE PRIORITIES IDENTIFIED BY THE IWC SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE:
The Standing Working Group on Abundance Estimates, Status and International Cruises (ASI) was established to formally review abundance estimates submitted to the Scientific Committee across all of the Committee’s subcommittees and working groups. This document describes the review process. At the 2019 meeting (SC68A), the working group developed a process, including the formation of an Abundance Steering Group (ASG) to facilitate the review of abundance estimates. The ASI recommended that the ASG meet permanently for one day prior to prioritize estimates for review by the Committee during the annual meeting.
(B) SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OR TOR AND DELIVERABLES/OUTCOMES:
Provide an initial review of abundance estimates received by the Committee following the process outlined in the report of the Abundance, Status of Stocks and International Cruises Working Group (Annex Q).

(C) METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH/WORK PLAN/ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS
A one day pre-meeting would occur immediately prior to SC68B (2020) and would require the attendance of the SC Chair, Vice-Chair, Head of Science, at least one convener of ASI, ASW, EM, IST, IA, NH, SH, SM. ASI, and potentially 2-5 experts. Funding for up to 10 participants is requested to cover for per diem and hotel. Note that many of the participants are national delegates and their countries would cover their cost.
(D) SUGGESTIONS FOR OUTREACH
The conclusions from the workshop will be disseminated among SC members during the annual meeting that would follow the ASG one day pre-meeting.

6. TIMETABLE FOR ACTIVITIES AND OUTPUTS

Activity to be undertaken	Key person(s)	Start(mm/yy)	Finish (mm/yy)
Review of abundance estimates	Abundance Steering Group	Intersessionally (05/19)	SC68B (05/2020)

Expected outputs	Completion date (mm/yy)
Report of SC	SC68B (05/2020)

7. RESEARCHERS' (OR STEERING GROUP) NAME(S) AND AFFILIATION

Name	Affiliation	Connection with decision
Robert Suydam	North Slope Borough, US	SC Chair
Alexandre Zerbini	Alaska Fisheries Science Center, NOAA, USA	SC Vice Chair/ASI Convener
Greg Donovan	IWC	IWC Head of Science
Cherry Allison	IWC	IWC Head of Statistics
Geof Givens	Given Statistical Solutions LLC, USA	ASI Co-convener
Lars Walloe	University of Oslo, Norway	ASW Convener
Toshi Kitakado	Tokyo University of Marine Science and Technology, Japan	EM Convener
Debra Palka	Northeast Fisheries Science Center, NOAA, USA	IA Convener
Jooke Robbins	Center for Coastal Studies, USA	NH Convener
Jen Jackson	British Antarctic Survey, UK	SH Convener
Lindsay Porter	Sea Mammal Research Unit, Hong Kong	SM Convener

8. TOTAL BUDGET

Funds are requested to cover hotel and per-diem for a one day pre-meeting prior to SC68B.

Type	Detailed description	Cost in GB pounds
(1) Salaries (by person)		
(2) Travel/subsistence	Per-diem and hotel for 10 participants (members of the ASG and invited experts)	£2,000

(by person or est. total for IPs)		
(3) Services (by item)		
(4) Reusable equipment		
(5) Consumables		
(6) Shipping (by Item)		
(7) Insurance (by item)		
(8) Co-funding		
(9) Other		
Total		£2,000

9. DATA ARCHIVING/SHARING

N/A

10. PERMITS (PLEASE TICK)

Do you have the necessary permits to carry out the field work and have animal welfare considerations been appropriately considered?	N/A
Do you have the appropriate permits (e.g. CITES) for the import/export of any samples?	N/A

If 'Yes' please provide further details and enclose copies where appropriate:

Appendix 2 – DRAFT SCORING SHEET

If a project presents multiple primary objectives which are achieved using sub-projects, a sheet should be used to evaluate each single sub-project. Note that not all criteria are equally applicable depending on the nature of the project (e.g. field work versus workshops).

IWC SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE PROPOSALS FOR FUNDING - REVIEW CRITERIA - TEST				
TITLE OF THE PROJECT/sub-projects:				
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:				
Key criteria	Explanation of scoring	Score	Supporting Remarks	
Relevance to Scientific Committee priorities				
1	How well aligned are the scientific outcomes of the project/activity with the current SC priority areas?	1 - Not aligned/poorly aligned (e.g. too vague or generic reference to general SC priorities) 2 - Reasonably aligned (e.g. some aspects may be vague or links are not clear) 3 - Well aligned (e.g. outcomes clearly deliver in the most part on priority areas, may also address longer term or potential future issues). 4 - Closely aligned (e.g. of interest for multiple sub-groups or delivers on specific SC high priority topics/recommendations in the immediate or short term).		
2	To what extent will the outcomes of the project/activity contribute to improvements in the conservation and management of cetaceans?	1 - Not at all 2 - Poorly 3 - Reasonably or over the longer term 4 - Well or over the medium term 5 - Excellently or to almost immediate effect		
Note: if in each of the two above key criteria under this section the project does not score singularly at least 2 points, do not proceed in further evaluation. Of course, proposals within a sub-group would only be developed if in their estimation scores were of 4 or above.				
Approach and methodology				
3	What degree of scientific merit/value is there in carrying out the work?	1 - Not demonstrated or of low scientific value 2 - Useful/basic scientific value 3 - Very good scientific value 4 - Excellent/innovative scientific value		

4	Is the proposed methodology scientifically sound and feasible in terms of field and analytical methods?	<p>1 - Feasibility unrealistic & poor methodology or not properly addressed</p> <p>2 - Feasibility & methodology acceptable but would benefit from some substantial amendments</p> <p>3 - Feasibility & methodology good, some small changes beneficial</p> <p>4 - Feasibility & methodology excellent or a highly promising innovative approach to an important question facing the Committee</p>		
5	What is the likelihood of success based on the proposed overall approach and methodology?	<p>1 - No chance of success</p> <p>2 - Low chance of success/better approaches available</p> <p>3 - Medium chance of success/some changes to the approach necessary</p> <p>4 - High chance of success/little or no changes to the approach necessary</p>		
5 a	Are objectives of the research likely to be achieved within the proposed time-frame?	<p>1 - No or unlikely</p> <p>2 - Partially or potentially ambitious</p> <p>3 - Yes with some minor suggestions</p> <p>4 - Yes</p>		
5 b	Are any proposed intermediary targets timely and achievable?	<p>1 - No or unlikely</p> <p>2 - Partially</p> <p>3 - Probably</p> <p>4 - Yes</p>		
5 c	Is the proposed time-frame/work necessary (e.g. can the project produce results in a shorter time period)?	<p>1 - No or unlikely</p> <p>2 - Partially</p> <p>3 - Probably</p> <p>4 - Yes</p>		
5 d	Is the sample size adequate to achieve the stated objectives?	<p>1 - Not demonstrated/not properly addressed</p> <p>2 - No or unlikely (too low/too high)</p> <p>3 - Probably (additional analysis needed)</p> <p>4 - Yes</p>		
6	Is the project likely to affect adversely the population(s) involved?	<p>1 - Not properly addressed/ unknown</p> <p>2 - Yes severely</p> <p>3 - Possibly at a low level</p> <p>4 - No</p>		

6 a	IF YES , are analyses provided on simulations of the effects using different time-frames for the project if applicable?	1 – No 2 – Partially 3 - Yes		
Note: if in each of the above key criteria under this section the project does not score singularly at least 2 points, do not proceed in further evaluation. Of course, proposals within a sub-group would only be developed if in their estimation scores were of 3 or above.				
Project team and Project management				
7	To what extent does the team have the relevant expertise, experience, and balance?	1 – Poor or not demonstrated 2 – Sufficient 3 - Very good 4 - Excellent		
8	Contingency plan: To what extent have potential problems/risks been considered and appropriate mitigation proposed?	1 – Poor or not demonstrated 2 – Sufficient but could be improved 3 - Fully or requiring only minor suggestions or not applicable		
Value for Money				
10	Does the project represent good value for money?	1 – No or significant amendments would be needed 2 – Yes but with some minor amendments 3 – Yes		
11	Have sufficient links been made to the wider research community/other organisations/capacity building.	1 – No 2 – Some but significant amendments needed 3 – Yes but with some minor additions 4 – Yes or not applicable		