

SC/68B/RP/20

IST - Workshop to complete the updating
of the IUCN/IWC CMP on western gray
whales and to develop
conservation-related questions to be
addressed within the Rangewide
population modelling framework - updated
proposal from last year

IWC



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

Workshop to complete the updating of the IUCN/IWC CMP on western gray whales and to develop conservation-related questions to be addressed within the Rangewide population modelling framework

2. BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSAL AND ITS EXPECTED OUTCOME

The CMP is over 10 years old and requires updating. Initial work has been undertaken. However, the results of the rangewide workshops need to be incorporated and conservation-related questions need to be developed that can be addressed within the new population modelling framework developed as a result of the Committee's work

3. RELEVANT IWC SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE GROUPS OR SUB-GROUPS

This is primarily related to the CMP and IST groups. However, it is of importance to the work of IA and ASI in terms of precedents for future assessments and the work of HIM in terms of examining scenarios that take into account bycatch and ship strikes and the uncertainty associated with estimating these

4. TYPE OF PROJECT (PLEASE TICK)

Research project	
Modelling	X/2
Workshop/meeting	X
Database creation/maintenance	
Compilation work/editing (e.g. on whalewatching regulations, SOCER, etc.)	X
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 :

This is a continuation of work endorsed by the Scientific Committee (and the Conservation Committee)

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

The objectives are to:

- (1) update the western gray whale CMP in the light of new information in preparation for the forthcoming stakeholder workshop*
- (2) develop conservation questions that can be addressed and undertake using the new modelling framework for gray whales rangewide*

(C) METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH/WORK PLAN/ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS

This is a continuation of work undertaken over the last four years with respect to updating scientific components of the CMP in light of the rangewide assessment of status of gray whales. A steering committee has been established to ensure progress prior to and after the workshop.

(D) SUGGESTIONS FOR OUTREACH

This is a major international effort that will provide excellent outreach material especially in promoting the concept of CMPs

6. TIMETABLE FOR ACTIVITIES AND OUTPUTS

Specify the timetable for project activities and expected outputs 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)
Hold workshop in Gland (IUCN) or La Jolla (SWFSC)	Steering Group	Tbd after September 2020	
Produce workshop report	Donovan		
Implement modelling recommendations	Punt		Before SC68C

Expected outputs	Completion date (mm/yy)
Workshop report – eventually published in JCRM, presented to IWC, IUCN	1 month after workshop
Modelling results – paper to IWC SC	SC68C

7. 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
Donovan	IWC Scientist Emeritus, IUCN WGWAP
Punt	University of Washington
Reeves	IUCN WGWAP
Kato	Co-ordinator, western gray whale MoC
Weller	US co-ordinator western gray whale MoC
Kim	Korea co-ordinator western gray whale MoC
Urban	Mexica co-ordinator western gray whale MoC
Zharikov	Russia co-ordinator western gray whale CMP
Rojas-Bracho	IWC Conservation Committee Chair

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)		
(2) Travel/subsistence (by person or est. total for IPs)	6 participants for 5 days @1500	£7500
(3) Services (by item)		
(4) Reusable equipment		
(5) Consumables		
(6) Shipping (by Item)		
(7) Insurance (by item)		
(8) Co-funding	Time donated by participants, venue plus travel	[£8,000]
(9) Other	Modelling by Punt	£3,000
Total		£10,500

9. DATA ARCHIVING/SHARING

Model and results archived at the 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?	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
<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 - 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.				
<i>Approach and methodology</i>				
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		

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 - Feasibility & methodology good, some small changes beneficial 4 - Feasibility & methodology excellent or a highly promising innovative approach to an important question facing the Committee 		
5	What is the likelihood of success based on the proposed overall approach and methodology?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 - No chance of success 2 - Low chance of success/better approaches available 3 - Medium chance of success/some changes to the approach necessary 4 - High chance of success/little or no changes to the approach necessary 		
5a	Are objectives of the research likely to be achieved within the proposed time-frame?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 - No or unlikely 2 - Partially or potentially ambitious 3 - Yes with some minor suggestions 4 - Yes 		
5b	Are any proposed intermediary targets timely and achievable?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 - No or unlikely 2 - Partially 3 - Probably 4 - Yes 		
5c	Is the proposed time-frame/work necessary (e.g. can the project produce results in a shorter time period)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 - No or unlikely 2 - Partially 3 - Probably 4 - Yes 		
5d	Is the sample size adequate to achieve the stated objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 - Not demonstrated/not properly addressed 2 - No or unlikely (too low/foo high) 3 - Probably (additional analysis needed) 4 - Yes 		
6	Is the project likely to affect adversely the population(s) involved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 - Not properly addressed/ unknown 2 - Yes severely 3 - Possibly at a low level 4 - NO 		
6a	IF YES , are analyses provided on simulations of the effects using different time-frames for the project if applicable?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 - NO 2 - Partially 3 - Yes 		
<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>		