

SC/68B/RP/11

---

CMP - Workshop on the IWC Conservation  
Management Plan for the Southern Right  
Whale Southwest Atlantic Population - a  
comprehensive review

IWC



INTERNATIONAL  
WHALING COMMISSION



INTERNATIONAL  
WHALING COMMISSION

135 Station Road, Impington, Cambridge, UK,  
CB24 9NP; Tel: +44 1223 233397 - Fax: +44 1223  
232876

E-mail: [secretariat@iwc.int](mailto:secretariat@iwc.int)

## PROJECT PROPOSAL REQUEST

### 1 . PROPOSAL TITLE

Workshop on the IWC Conservation Management Plan for the Southern Right Whale Southwest Atlantic Population: A comprehensive review.

### 2 . BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSAL AND ITS EXPECTED OUTCOME

Give a very brief overview (max 150 words) on your proposal and its expected outcomes. Use bullet point to list outcomes. Be succinct and clear as this may be used to summarise your project for the report.

During the last workshop of the SRWSWA CMP held in 2016 in Peninsula Valdes, Argentina, the nine CMP priorities related to research, management, education and monitoring of this plan were reviewed. Notwithstanding, 4 years have passed since the last CMP revision, therefore, in order to continue increasing the knowledge and conservation of this population, a review of the established actions, as well as the establishment of new actions if necessary should be carried-out. Among the actions to be discussed, it is expected to define which should be the priorities (short term) and which should be addressed in the medium and long term, aiming to obtain the best scientific data and results for the conservation of this species over time.

As a result, the definition of work actions is expected, but also the establishment of commitment by governments, researchers and other actors, to contribute to the conservation of the species. All of the above will be summarized in a report to be presented during the next SC and CC meeting.

### 3 . RELEVANT IWC SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE GROUPS OR SUB-GROUPS

List all the IWC Scientific Committee groups or sub-groups that the outcomes of this work would be relevant to and provide a brief (1-2 lines) explanation of how it would contribute more widely to their ongoing programmes of work. Where possible, do not simply list only the sub-committee within which or for which the project proposal was generated.

- Sub-committee on Conservation Management Plans
- Standing Working Group on Abundance Estimates, Stock Status and Int Cruises
- Sub-committee on Environmental Concerns
- Working Group on Non-deliberate Human-induced Mortality of Cetaceans
- Ad hoc working group on Photo Id
- Working Group on Stock Definitions and DNA testing
- Sub-Committee on Other Southern Hemisphere Whale Stocks
- Sub-Committee on Whale Watching

### 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:

Provide a clear explanation of the background and rationale for the proposal and its relevance to Scientific Committee identified priorities. Clearly identify the most relevant and recent Scientific Committee recommendations.

The Southern Right Whale (SRW) is classified by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) as of "Least Concern". This species was seriously depleted by the whaling industry and, even though it was protected since 1935, illegal hunting from the 1950s to 1970s delayed any recovery, when over 1,000 whales were killed. In spite of the fact that some of the South Atlantic population are increasing, the survival and recovery of Southwest Atlantic Southern right whales population requires a prompt and effective conservation action throughout their range.

The IWC endorsed the Conservation Management Plan for the Southwest Atlantic Southern Right Whale in 2012 with Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Uruguay as signatories to the CMP. The overall goal of this CMP is to protect SRW habitat and minimize anthropogenic threats to maximize population recover to healthy levels and recolonise their historical range. The CMP provides a platform and framework for range states to work collaboratively and cooperatively to monitor population recovery and to address actual and potential threats to the population. All actions have been undertaken in cooperation with the wide range of relevant stakeholders, including national and local governments, NGOs, scientists, 'users' (e.g. whalewatching industry, coastal developers) and the general public.

The priority actions in progress includes the appointment of a Coordinator and Steering Committee, research into the population's geographic interaction, capacity building of range states to respond to whale strandings and whale entanglement, studies with satellite telemetry on southern right whales off Peninsula Valdes to determine their migratory route, and efforts to share data across catalogues that provide complementary information.

In order to accomplish the main objective of the CMP, ten goals were established divided into four different tasks as follows:

1. Public Awareness Capacity Building
  - a. PACB-01: develop a strategy to increase public awareness
  - b. PACB-02: build capacity in range states in order to strengthen management systems
2. Research
  - a. RES-01: Determine movements, migration routes and location of feeding ground(s)
  - b. RES-02: Development of a GIS (meta) database on information on human activities that might have an adverse impact on whales
3. Monitoring
  - a. MON-01: Ensure long-term monitoring of abundance, trends and

biological parameters

- b. MON-02: Enhance existing strandings networks including the capacity for undertaking post-mortems

#### 4. Mitigation

- a. MIT-01: Development of a regional entanglement response strategy
- b. MIT-02: Develop and implement a strategy to minimize kelp gull harassment
- c. MIT-03: Establishment of an expert advisory panel
- d. MIT-04: Develop mitigation actions to address major threats identified through the Sensitivity Atlas

Some of these tasks have been accomplished (SH/68b/CMP/19), while there are others that need to advance substantially. Taking into account the previous and although the CMP should be reviewed annually, every 4 years a comprehensive evaluation should be done in order to understand what has been accomplished and which should be the next steps. The first comprehensive review was done in 2016 during a workshop held in Argentina, and it was suggested that one of the priorities should be strengthening the works in Brazil, Chile (Magallanes region) and Uruguay.

During 2019 SC meeting, the CMP Sub-committee (SC/68a/AnnexO) welcomed the progress being made on this CMP and looks forward to more information on the species in this area, recommending the following points:

The sub-committee commends the amount of effort and highlighted the impressive array of work being conducted by the researchers and encourages its continuation. The Committee reiterates the importance of continued long-term monitoring of the southwestern Atlantic population of southern right whale and the importance of the CMP for the conservation of the population. The Committee therefore:

(1) encouraged the researchers to continue work on stress hormones in baleen and present a full report to the Committee when it becomes available;

(2) encouraged collaboration with range states to generate more new information and more effort from Brazil given the additional funding received;

(3) encouraged comparisons of photo-identification catalogues between Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay;

(4) commended the telemetry work, and looks forward to new information as it becomes available; and

(5) recommended that the Secretariat write to the IWC Commissioner for Argentina and ask them to facilitate the internal permit process for the tagging project.

Thus, taking into account the recommendations made by the committee and that four years have passed since the last workshop, in order to advance in the proposed points, it is suggested to hold a workshop in November of this year 2020.

(B) SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OR TOR AND DELIVERABLES/OUTCOMES:

Provide the specific objectives and the expected deliverables. In the case of workshops and meetings, include the Terms of Reference (ToR) and expected outcomes.

1. Review of the 10 different actions of the CMP in order to establish the actual status of the action (e.g. complete, half complete, none advance);
2. Review and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses presented during the development of each action;
3. Evaluate the next steps in order to accomplish those actions not completed yet;
4. Evaluate the continuity of accomplished actions and establishment of new actions if necessary (e.g. actions that should be considered at the light of environmental changes);
5. Strengthen bounds and develop an appropriate data availability agreement that facilitates data sharing between the four different range states (e.g. photo-id catalogues, biopsy samples, cruises, among others);
6. Move forward with the commitment of the range states to strengthen the databases (facilitation of the use of data on anthropogenic activities, environmental data and whale data in a GIS context);

As a result, a report is expected with the review of the actions, the establishment of new goals (including already delineated actions and new actions if necessary), as well as the establishment of commitments by researchers, stakeholders and governments when necessary.

#### (C) METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH/WORK PLAN/ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS

Format of workshop: 'invitation only' workshop

Vennue: The workshop is expected to be held in the city of Santos (SP, Brazil), coordinated by the ICMBio-Centro Nacional de Pesquisa e Conservação de Mamíferos Aquáticos (CMA), given the experience the center has in host this kind of events (eg IWC workshop of Sotalia, IWC Piracatinga WS).

Dates: Depending on the COVID situation, two tentative dates are proposed: First week of November (2020) or between January and March 2021.

The meeting will take place over 3 full days of double-time work (8: 30-12: 00 and 14: 00-18: 00) divided as follows:

Before the meeting it is expected to receive from the different participants (working groups) a manuscript summarizing the actions of each group.

Day 1. The participants will present (by research group, working group) the results of the different actions in which they have been working or collaborating, highlighting: i) the progress in each of these actions, ii) difficulties and iii) future of these actions. All

this information will be synthesized by the sub-coordinator of each country and will be presented in a single living document during the meeting.

Day 2. Priority actions will be evaluated by country (understanding that not all 10 actions are equally important for each of the countries), as well as new actions that could be important for each range state. After that, a joint discussion on priority actions taking into account the full range of distribution of the species and what will be the tools and the times to complete these actions will be carried out.

Day 3. Preliminary cooperation agreements and commitments by the different participants will be discussed in order to establish these agreements in a short time after the meeting. These cooperation agreements may also be established during the meeting, when the parties so decide.

The workshop steering committee will be made up of researchers from the 4 countries who, in turn, act in most cases as regional sub-coordinators. It is also expected to have the participation of representatives of the 4 governments (e.g. commissioners), researchers from different countries as well as the CC chair and SC CMP Sub-committee chair. A tentative list of invited researchers is presented below:

- Juan Pablo Torres-Florez (Brazil)
- Karina Groch (Brazil)
- Miguel Iñiguez (Argentina)
- Barbara Galletti-Vernazani (Chile)
- Daniela Haro (Chile)
- Cecilia Passadore (Uruguay)
- Fabia Luna (Brazil)
- Paulo Ott (Brazil)
- Daniel Danilewicz (Brazil)
- Milton Marcondes (Brazil)
- Enrique Crespo (Argentina)
- Mariano Coscarella (Argentina)
- Mariano Sironi (Argentina)
- Federico Riet (Uruguay)
- Alexandre Zerbini (Brazil)
- Vanesa Reyes (Argentina)

Other participants may be invited, depending on approval of ICMBio (Brazilian Government) internal funds.

#### (D) SUGGESTIONS FOR OUTREACH

Please, note that successful proponents will be requested to produce ad hoc material that will be used by the IWC Secretariat for dissemination and outreach.

Audio-visual material is expected to be produced during the meeting (photos, videos). This material (mainly photographs) will be sent to the IWC for dissemination and outreach. Taking advantage of the fact that a large number of Southwest Atlantic right whale researchers will be at the meeting, it is expected to make short films (20-30 seconds) with the permission of the researchers, in which a call will be made for the conservation and knowledge of the species. These shorts will be uploaded and disseminated through social networks and pages of the different research and work organizations (always with the permission of the interviewees and for that sole purpose).

This audiovisual material will serve as support for one of the actions related with public awareness.

Material to be published at the CMP Newsletter.

#### 6 . TIMETABLE FOR ACTIVITIES AND OUTPUTS

Specify the timetable for project activities and expected out puts separately. For projects with multiple distinct elements please indicate interim goals and timeframes. Add as many rows as you need to the tables below. If publications are an expected output please note whether you will submit the manuscript to the IWC's Journal of Cetacean Research and Management.

Activity to be undertaken	Key person(s)	Start(mm/yy)	Finish (mm/yy)
Establish workshop Steering Committee	SRW SWA CMP Coordinator & Steering Committee	1-6-2020	4-11-2020
Submit of the summarized actions manuscript	Participants	12-10-2020	26-10-2020
Workshop	Steering committee	02-11-2020	04-11-2020
Report	SRW SWA CMP Coordinator and Steering Committee		04-12-2020



--	--	--	--

Expected outputs	Completion date (mm/yy)
Report	04-12-2020
Audiovisual material	30-01-2021

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

Please, also specify if the project team has any direct connection (e.g. same research group or institute, collaborator on common project) with people involved or likely to be involved in taking the funding decision (e.g. IWC SC heads of delegations, SC convenors, etc.). Add as many rows as you need to the table below.

Name	Affiliation	Connection with decision
Juan Pablo Torres-Florez	ICMBio- Centro Nacional de Pesquisa e Conservação de Mamíferos Aquáticos (Brazil)	SWA SRW Coordinator
Miguel Iñiguez Bessega	Fundación Cethus (Argentina)	
Barbara Galletti-Vernazanni	Centro de Conservación Cetacea (Chile)	
Cecilia Passadore	DINAMA (Uruguay)	
Karina Groch	Instituto Australis	
Fabia Luna	ICMBio- Centro Nacional de Pesquisa e Conservação de Mamíferos Aquáticos (Brazil)	

## 8 . TOTAL BUDGET

Breakdown into: (1) salaries/wages (include name/position of each individual and breakdown of time and duties i; (2) travel/subsistence expenses (breakdown by person and justification) unless for IPs for workshops where a total estimate based on an average for the total number of IPs is acceptable; (3) services (e.g. aircraft/vessel time, consultancy fees, ARGOS fees, etc.); (4) reusable capital equipment (e.g. reusable equipment such as a hydrophone, cameras, etc. Note that this equipment will have to be registered at the IWC Secretariat and will remain property of the IWC at the end of the project), (5) expendable capital equipment (e.g. consumables, tags, stationery), (6) shipping costs, (7) insurance costs, (8) in kind co-funding (specify whether other funding is available for personnel/name, equipment, venues, etc.). Note that "Overheads" are not admissible. Add as many rows as you need to the table below.

Type	Detailed description	Cost in GB pounds
Travel/subsistence (by person or est. total for IPs)	Air ticket and subsistence stipends for 20 people (~583 GBP per person)	11660.00
Services (by item)	Meeting Venue	1600.00
Co-funding	CMA	5660.00
Total		13260.00
Total requested to IWC		7600.00

## 9 . DATA ARCHIVING/SHARING

Please state your plans for data archiving and sharing. Note that data collected primarily under IWC grants are considered publicly

available after an agreed period of time for publication of papers, usually about two years. The work of the IWC depends on the voluntary contribution of data to the various databases and catalogues IWC supports. Please consult the Secretariat ([secretariat@iwc.int](mailto:secretariat@iwc.int)).

## 10 . PERMITS (PLEASE TICK)

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

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	Score
<i>Relevance to Scientific Committee priorities</i>				
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 - N o t a t a l l 2 - P o o r l y 3 - R e a s o n a		

		<p>b l y o r o v e r t h e l o n g e r t e r m 4 - W e l l o r o v e r t h e m e d i u m t e r m 5 - Excellentl y or to almost immedia te effect</p>		
<p><u>Note:</u> 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 within a sub-group would only be developed if in their estimation scores were of 4 or above.</p>				
<p><b>Approach and methodology</b></p>				
3	<p>What degree of scientific merit/value is there in carrying out the work?</p>	<p>1 - Not demonstrated or of low scientific value 2 - Useful/basic scientific value 3.- Very good scientific value 4.- Excellent/innovative scientific value</p>		

4	Is the proposed methodology scientifically sound and feasible in terms of field and analytical methods?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. - Feasibility unrealistic &amp; poor methodology or not properly addressed</li><li>2. - Feasibility &amp; methodology acceptable but would benefit from some substantial amendments</li></ol>		
---	---	--	--	--

		<p>3. - Feasibility &amp; methodology good, some small changes beneficial</p> <p>4. - Feasibility &amp; 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>1. - Low chance of success/better approaches available 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>1. - Partially or potentially ambitious 3 - Yes with some minor suggestions 4 - Yes</p>		
5 b	Are any proposed intermediary targets timely and achievable?	<p>1 - N o o r u n l i k e l y 2 - P a r t i a l l y 3.- Probably 4.- Yes</p>		

5 c	Is the proposed time-frame/work necessary (e.g. can the project produce results in a shorter time period)?	1 - N o o r u n l i k e l y 2 - P a r t i a l l y 3.- Probably 4.- Yes		
5 d	Is the sample size adequate to achieve the stated objectives?	1 - Not demonstrated/not properly addressed 2 - No or unlikely (too low/too high) 3 - Probably (additional analysis needed) 4 - Yes		
6	Is the project likely to affect adversely the population(s) involved?	1 - Not properly addressed/ unknown 2 - Yes severely 3 - P o s s i b l y a t a l l o w l e v e l 4 - N o		



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		
<p><u>Note:</u> 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 detail. If a sub-group within a sub-group would only be developed if in their estimation scores were of 3 or above.</p>				
<p>Project team and Project management</p>				

7	To what extent does the team have the relevant expertise, experience, and balance?	<p>1 - Poor or not demonstrated</p> <p>2 - Sufficient but could be improved</p> <p>3 - Very good</p> <p>4 - Excellent</p>		
8	Contingency plan: To what extent have potential problems/risks been considered and appropriate mitigation proposed?	<p>1.- Poor or not demonstrated</p> <p>2.- Sufficient but could be improved</p> <p>1. - Fully or requiring only minor suggestions or not applicable</p>		
Value for Money				

1 0	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		
1 1	Have sufficient links been made to the wider research community/other organisations/capacity building.	1.- No 1. – Some but significant amendments needed 3 – Yes but with some minor additions 4 – Yes or not applicable		