

SC/68B/RP/21

ASI - IWC-POWER cruise in 2021 including associated meetings and processing

IWC



INTERNATIONAL
WHALING COMMISSION

PROJECT PROPOSAL REQUEST

1. PROPOSAL TITLE

IWC-POWER cruise in 2021 including associated meetings and processing

2. BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSAL AND ITS EXPECTED OUTCOME

The Committee strongly advocated the development of an international medium- to long-term research programme involving sighting surveys to provide information for assessment, conservation and management of cetaceans in the North Pacific, especially areas that have not been surveyed for decades. The programme has been running since 2010 and has contributed greatly to the work of the Committee and its assessment work. This was summarized and commended most recently this year (SC68B report, Item 21.2). Objectives have been developed for the overall plan and requested funding will allow for the finalisation of the initial phase and progress on developing the medium-term phase. The amount of money is extremely small when seen in the context of Japan providing the vessel and associated costs which it wishes to do although it has now left the IWC. The IWC contribution is for: (1) IWC researchers and equipment; (2) to allow the Committee's Technical Advisory Group to meet to review the multi-year results thus far and develop the plans for the next phase of POWER based on the results obtained from Phase I; and (3) to enable analyses and the photographic database to be updated prior to the 2021 Annual Meeting.

3. RELEVANT IWC SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE GROUPS OR SUB-GROUPS

IA, NH, IST, E, ASI, SDDNA

4. TYPE OF PROJECT (PLEASE TICK)

Research project	X
Modelling	
Workshop/meeting	X
Database creation/maintenance	X
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:

This is a long-term plan that has international collaboration and provides important data relevant to conservation and management of cetaceans in the North Pacific. The data contribute to the work of the Scientific Committee under many sub-committees. It is designed by the Committee itself and is a formal IWC long-term programme.

Last year (IWC, 2020 Item 24.1, 27.8) the Committee had reiterated to the Commission

'...the great value of the data contributed by the Committee-designed IWC-POWER cruises which cover many regions of the North Pacific Ocean not surveyed in recent years and addresses an important information gap for several cetaceans species, providing fundamental information on abundance necessary for developing conservation and management advice' and

'...that it would be valuable for the scientific, conservation, management and assessment work of the Committee for these cruises to continue, particularly in light of the information being provided on the status of species once heavily exploited by whaling including blue, fin, sei, humpback, gray, and right whales.'

The Committee concurred with these sentiments and reiterated the small cost to the Scientific Committee compared to the donation of a vessel and crew for around 60 days or more.

It has provided important quantitative information on stock structure, distribution, movements (via photo-ID) and abundance for the assessments of Bryde's whales, sei whales and humpback whales as well as for other large whales including the critical North Pacific right whale in the eastern North Pacific.

The reports and planning meetings for the programme are available online

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

Objectives:

- (1) complete the initial phase of the Committee- approved IWC-POWER programme in the Russian part of the Bering Sea in 2021 by finalizing the plan and developing a backup in case of unforeseen problems
- (2) hold an expert workshop to further develop the post 2021 medium-term strategy (that has been approved in outline) in light of the results of the programme thus far with a focus on the biennial programme required to be discussed at SC68C
- (3) Present the cruise report following IWC-guidelines
- (4) Update the photographic database including the 2019 (and if possible 2020) cruise images and share the relevant photographs with other research groups in the region to forward the work of the SC (e.g. wrt the in-depth assessment of NP humpback whales)

(C) METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH/WORK PLAN/ ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS

The 2021 cruise plan (SC/68b/Rep02) have already been endorsed by the Committee and a Steering Group established to finalise details and if necessary develop a backup plan. The Technical Advisory Group (TAG) Workshop will be run by the IWC-POWER Steering Group and will focus on the medium-term strategy and the immediate 2022 and 2023 cruises to be discussed at SC68C

(D) SUGGESTIONS FOR OUTREACH

The Cruises contribute to the IWC's photographic database which is of value for a wide range of outreach to the IWC including examples of international collaboration for the IWC website. International collaboration is an important component of the IWC's work and in addition to the IWC-POWER section of the website the data are shared with other relevant research organisations and are available to researchers upon submission and approval of a research proposal.

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)
TAG workshop for medium-term and associated planning meeting	Kitakado	To be decided in light of COVID-19	4 days
Cruise in 2021	Matsuoka/ Murase	20 July 2021 approx.	20 Sept. approx
Incorporation of photographs into IWC database	Taylor	1 January 2021	Summer 2021

Expected outputs	Completion date (mm/yy)
Cruise report	Present at SC69a
Workshop report	Present at SC69a
Cruise report	Present at SC68b

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	Connection with decision
Staniland	IWC Secretariat	
Murase	Tokyo University of Marine Science and Technology	
Matsuoka	Institute of Cetacean Research, Tokyo	
Donovan	IP, IWC Scientist Emeritus until 9 May 2021	IST convenor
Crance	NOAA, USA	
Palka	NOAA, USA	IA convenor/USA Head of Del
Brownell	NOAA, USA	CMP convenor
Kitakado	Tokyo University of Marine Science and Technology	EM convenor
Kato	IP, Professor Emeritus	

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	Estimated Cost in GBP (2021)
(1) Salaries (by person)		
(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		£32,320

See Appendix 1 for details

9. DATA ARCHIVING/SHARING

All data archived at the IWC Secretariat and are available to interested scientists upon submission of a data request.

10. PERMITS (PLEASE TICK)

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

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

Table 1. Estimated budget for 2021 cruise and associated work (estimated value in UK pounds) **NB: the vessel and associated costs are provided by the Government of Japan and equal and estimated equivalent of 800,000GBP**

Item	Grant	Travel	Insurance	Shipboard	Shore	Bank charge	Total
Cruise							
Cruise Leader (Japan)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scientist 1 (US)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scientist 2	6,200	1,700	100	830	550	30	9,410
Scientist 3	6,200	1,700	100	830	550	30	9,410
Sub-total							18,820
Equipment / Communications / Transportation*							
Repair/maintenance/purchase							
Cameras							1,600
Expendables (Darts and ammunition for biopsy)							1,200
Official communications (via Inmarsat)							500
Transportation of IWC data							200
Sub-total							3,500
Expert workshop (TAG) and planning							
TAG (Technical advisory group) 3 days							
Planning (2 days)							
Travel and subsistence for 4 participants:							6,000
Sub-total							6,000
Incorporate outstanding photographs into database and provide summaries as requested							4,000
Total							32,320

*This is the amount expected for the planned 2021 cruise. Some flexibility may be needed if circumstances prevent the cruise occurring in Russian waters – this will be known at the 2021 SC meeting and any changes ratified there (NB there are funds available that were unspent from previous cruises that will provide such flexibility without affecting the overall SC budget)

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		
<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 in further evaluation. Of course, proposals within a sub-group would only be developed if in their estimation scores were of 4 or above.</p>				
<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		

		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?	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?	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?	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)?	1 – No or unlikely 2 – Partially 3 - Probably 4 - Yes		
5d	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 – 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?	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 evaluation. Of course, proposals within a sub-group would only be developed if in their estimation scores were of 3 or above.</p>				
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		
<i>Value for Money</i>				
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		