

SC/68B/RP/17

IA - Assessment modelling for an in-depth
assessment of North Pacific sei whales -
2020

IWC



INTERNATIONAL
WHALING COMMISSION

Appendix 1 – PRO FORMA FOR PROJECT PROPOSALS

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**

Please provide the title of the project or the name of the workshop/meeting.

Assessment modelling for an in-depth assessment of North Pacific sei whales - 2020

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.

The IA sub-committee is currently conducting an in-depth assessment for North Pacific sei whales. Part of an in-depth assessment is evaluating the status of a population using some sort of population dynamics model that is specific to the biological and behaviour parameters of that particular population and is fitted to monitoring data. During the intersessional period after the 2020 SC meeting it is expected the population dynamics models will be refined using the existing data. This will result in an assessment of the status of the population.

The project involves developing and utilizing population dynamics models as required to progress the work on the IA sub-committee.

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.

This work is directly related to the work of the In-depth assessment sub-committee in regards to North Pacific sei whales. In addition, the population dynamic models proposed to be refined can also be applied to other species being studied in any of the sub-groups, with modifications to incorporate species specific details.

4. TYPE OF PROJECT (PLEASE TICK)

Research project	
Modelling	X
Workshop/meeting	
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)

<p>(A) BACKGROUND, RATIONALE, AND RELEVANCE TO THE PRIORITIES IDENTIFIED BY THE IWC SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE:</p>
<p><i>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.</i></p> <p>The Committee recommended an assessment of the North Pacific sei whales be conducted. This work is being done in the IA subcommittee. The proposed work is to further develop the population dynamic models needed to conduct that assessment.</p>
<p>(B) SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OR TOR AND DELIVERABLES/OUTCOMES:</p>

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

The objective is to further develop and implement the assessment model applied to the North Pacific sei whale data. Then run the model, assemble the results into a paper that describes the methods and results and to present this paper to the Scientific Committee meeting.

The deliverables are the code to the model, results, and summary documentation.

(C) METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH/WORK PLAN/ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS

Specify the methods to be applied (novel methods require more explanation than standard ones) and the broad workplan – the detailed timetable appears under Item 5 below.

In the case of workshops and meetings, include the broad work plan including any pre-requisites for the workshop/meeting to take place (apart from funding, e.g. completed analyses, papers etc.) and administrative details (e.g. location, dates, number of participants).

A sex- and age-structured population dynamics model is to be further developed represents the stock hypotheses identified during the 2020 meeting of the Scientific Committee. This model allows for multiple breeding stocks, each of which may be located on multiple feeding and wintering grounds. The values for the parameters of the model can be estimated by fitting it to data on trends in relative and absolute abundance, in addition to tagging data.

(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.

NA

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)
Further develop population dynamic model in cooperation with people developing the input data. Then present paper documenting work to the next SC meeting.	Punt	5/20	4/21

Expected outputs	Completion date (mm/yy)
Report of methods and results	4/21 SC meeting

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

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
(1) Salaries (by person)	Salary of Dr. Punt	£2,500
(2) Travel/subsistence (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		

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).

It is expected the model code and results will be archived at the IWC Secretariat.

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
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?	1 - Feasibility unrealistic & poor methodology or not properly addressed 2 - Feasibility & methodology acceptable but would benefit from some substantial amendments	

		<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>		
5a	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>		
5b	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>		
5c	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>		
5d	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/foo 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>		
6a	IF YES , are analyses provided on simulations of the effects using different time-frames for the project if applicable?	<p>1 - No</p> <p>2 - Partially</p> <p>3 - Yes</p>		
<p>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.</p>				
<p>Project team and Project management</p>				

<p>7</p> <p>To what extent does the team have the relevant expertise, experience, and balance?</p>	<p>1 – Poor or not demonstrated 2 – Sufficient 3 - Very good 4 - Excellent</p>		
<p>8</p> <p>Contingency plan: To what extent have potential problems/risks been considered and appropriate mitigation proposed?</p>	<p>1 – Poor or not demonstrated 2 – Sufficient but could be improved 3 - Fully or requiring only minor suggestions or not applicable</p>		
<p>Value for Money</p>			
<p>10</p> <p>Does the project represent good value for money?</p>	<p>1 – No or significant amendments would be needed 2 – Yes but with some minor amendments 3 – Yes</p>		
<p>11</p> <p>Have sufficient links been made to the wider research community/other organisations/capacity building.</p>	<p>1 – No 2 – Some but significant amendments needed 3 – Yes but with some minor additions 4 – Yes or not applicable</p>		