

SC/68B/RP/23

CMP - Franciscana assessment workshop

IWC



INTERNATIONAL
WHALING COMMISSION

PROJECT PROPOSAL REQUEST

1 . PROPOSAL TITLE

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

Franciscana assessment workshop

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 franciscana (*Pontoporia blainvillei*) is a small cetacean endemic to southwestern Atlantic coastal waters between central Brazil and central Argentina (Fig. 1, Crespo et al. 1998, Siciliano et al. 2002). It is considered the most threatened marine cetacean species in South America (Secchi et al. 2003a) and is listed as 'Vulnerable' by the IUCN (Zerbini et al., 2017). The SC first reviewed the status of the franciscana in 2004. A task team for FMA I was established in 2015. A year later, the IWC created a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) for the franciscana. This year a review of the status of the franciscana by the SC began but due to the COVID-19 pandemic, it was not possible to complete it. We intend to organize a workshop in South America (most likely Brazil) to complete the review of the status of the franciscana, strengthen the scientific knowledge but also the science-governance interaction to address recommendations for future studies and conservation actions. A report of the proposed workshop will be submitted to the 69A IWC SC in order to refine the species' CMP research, monitoring and actions.

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 workshop is relevant to the CMP subcommittee as well as to the SM, HIM and E subcommittees. The work on this taxon will also involve the sub-committees SD-DNA and ASI.

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 (<i>please specify below</i>)	

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 Scientific Committee first reviewed the status of the franciscana in 2004 and the species has been on the agenda of the Committee for several years. A task team for FMA I was established in 2015. In 2016, the IWC created a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) for the franciscana. The Scientific Committee agreed at their 2019 meeting (SC68A) that a review of the status of the franciscana was a priority and started intersessional preparation for the review, which was expected to be completed in 2020. As part of the preparation, review papers on stock structure, abundance and trends, threats, biological parameters and conservation/management actions were prepared by collaborating scientists working on the various FMAs. Unfortunately, the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in the extremely changes of the SC68B meeting and the review of the status of the franciscana could not be presented and discussed by multiple subcommittees, and particularly by the CMP team. Review of stock-structure and abundance of the species will be carried out interessionally by SD-DNA and ASI, respectively, and the results and recommendations will be available for the assessment. The workshop proposed here intends to bring together local scientists, government and NGO representatives, and SC members for a four-day meeting in order to i) consolidate the SD-DNA and ASI recommendations, ii) complete the review of the other priorities topics to assess the status of the franciscana dolphin, and also iii) propose recommendations on future studies and conservation actions supporting the CMP.

(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.

Primary objective

Complete the review of the status of franciscana by the SC.

Terms of reference

- Review a report from the ASI working group on the review of franciscana abundances estimates and trends;
- Review a report from the SD-DNA group on the review of franciscana population structure;
- Review documents on biological parameters, threats and conservation actions;
- Evaluate whether an assessment of the franciscana stocks by the SC is feasible given the existing information;
- Propose recommendations for research, monitoring and conservation to update the Franciscana CMP (IWC/66/CMP11);
- Produce a report of the workshop to be presented at next year's annual meeting of the SC (IWC68C).

(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).

Format of workshop: 'invitation only' workshop

Timetable for workshop: 4 days (3 meeting days + 1 day for drafting the report).

Location: Santos, Brazil.

Dates: TBD, most likely between January and March 2021.

Number of participants: ~35-40 including franciscana researchers from Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay, government representatives and SC members.

Co-Funding: Co-funding will be provided by CMA (Brazilian Center for Aquatic Mammals – Ministry of Environment), FUNBIO (Brazilian Biodiversity Fund). Estimated co-funding of £10,000

Draft Agenda

1. Election of the Chair and Rapporteurs of the Workshop
2. Presentation of participants
3. Review and approval of the agenda
4. Explanation of the review process on Franciscana by the SC
5. Review franciscana population structure
6. Review franciscana abundance estimates
7. Review documents on biological parameters for each Franciscana Management Area (FMA)
8. Review documents on threats for each FMA
9. Review documents on management and conservation actions for each FMA.
10. Feasibility of an assessment by the IWC
11. Recommendations
12. Work Plan
13. Adoption of the report

(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.

- Texts regarding the workshop goals and the Franciscana conservation issues to upload at the IWC website and to be spread out by scientific institutions and national governments.

-Material to be published at the CMP Newsletter.

-

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)
Establish workshop Steering Group which select workshop venue, dates, prepare draft agenda and budget, identify participants including IWC experts, send invitations	Steering Group	6/2020	1/2021
Request documents to be submitted to the workshop	Steering Group	10/2020	12/2020
Conduct workshop	Chairpersons and participants	2 or 3/2021	2 or 3/2021
Finalize workshop report	Chairperson and Steering Committee	3-4/2021	3-4/2021
Present report at the IWC Scientific Committee meeting SC68C	Chairperson	4/2021	4/2021
Update CMP for Franciscana by the governments of Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay	Coordinator IWC CMP for Franciscana	5/2021	9/2021

Expected outputs	Completion date (mm/yy)
Complete workshop report/ documents and present to the IWC Secretariat	4/2021
Update the CMP for Franciscana by the governments of Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay	9/2021
Disseminate the updated CMP for Franciscana	10/2021

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.

Steering Committee

Name	Affiliation	Connection with decision
Miguel Iníguez	IWC Delegate of Argentina	Steering Group, Coordinator CMP for Franciscana (Convener)
Marta Cremer	Universidade da Região de Joinville	Steering Group member
Daniel Danilewicz	GEMARS, Instituto Aqualie (Brazil)	Steering Group member
Camila Domit	Universidade Federal do Paraná (IWC Delegate of Brazil)	Steering Group member
Paulo Ott	Universidade Estadual do Rio Grande do Sul; GEMARS (IWC Delegate of Brazil)	Steering Group member
Alexandre Zerbini	JISAO-UW/MML-AFSC-NOAA, Instituto Aqualie (Brazil) (IWC Delegate of Brazil).	Vice-chair of IWC SC, ASI Convener
Fabia Luna	ICMBIO/CMA, Brasil	Steering Group member
Cecilia Passadore		Steering Group member

Potential Participants (in addition to steering group members)

Name	Affiliation	Connection with decision
Leonardo Berninsone	Aquamarina, Argentina	
Enrique Crespo	CENPAT – CONICET, Argentina	
Diego Rodriguez	UNMDP – CONICET, Argentina	
Luis Cappozzo	MACN, Argentina	
Mauricio Failla	Fundación Cethus, Argentina	
Constanza Gariboldi	Universidad Maimónides, Argentina	
Pablo Denuncio	UNMDP – CONICET, Argentina	
Valentina Franco-Trecu	Facultad de Ciencias – UDELAR, Uruguay	
Sebastián Jiménez	DINARA – MGAP, Uruguay	
Caterina Dimitriadis	Vida Silvestre, Uruguay	
Martin Laporta	DINARA –MGAP, Uruguay	
Artur Andriolo	UFJF/Brazil	
André Silva Barreto	UNIVALI/Brazil	
Carolina Bertozzi	UNIFESP/Brazil	
José Lailson Brito Júnior	MAQUA/UERJ/Brazil	
Pedro V. Castilho	UDESC/Brazil	
Haydée Cunha	MAQUA/UERJ/Brazil	
Silvina Botta	FURG/Brazil	
Ana Paula Cazerta Farro	UFES/Brazil	
Milton Marcondes	Instituto Baleia Jubarte/Brazil	
Eduardo R. Secchi	FURG/Brazil	
Salvatore Siciliano	FIOCRUZ/Brazil	
Juliana Di Tullio	FURG/Brazil	
Federico Sucunza	GEMARS/Brazil	
Jonatas Prado	Brazil	
Fábia Luna	CMA/Brazil	
Juan Pablo Torres Florez	CMA/Brazil	
Larissa R. Oliveira	Unisinos/Brazil	
Sandro L. Bonatto	PUCRS/Brazil	
Martin Mendez	Wildlife Conservation Society - Southern Cone	
Government representative	Government of Argentina	
Government representative	Government of Brazil	
Government representative	Government of Uruguay	
Frances Gulland	SC member	
Randall Reeves	SC member, IUCN CSG Chair	
Peter Thomas	SC member, Marine Mammal Commission	

Greg Donovan		IWC Science Emeritus
CMP convener or representative		
E convener or representative		
HIM convener or representative		
SD-DNA convener or representative		
SM convener or representative		

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)	Travel for 10 SC members including air ticket, lodging, per diem and ground transportation for 3-4 days @ an average of £1410/person	£14,100
	Travel for franciscana scientists within South America (25 attendees), including air ticket, lodging, per diem and ground transportation 3 days @ an average of £400/person	£10,000
(3) Services (by item)	Meeting venue	£2,500
(4) Reusable equipment		
(5) Consumables		
(6) Shipping (by Item)		
(7) Insurance (by item)		
(8) Co-funding	Meeting costs and logistics by FUNBIO and CMA (estimate)	£10,000
(9) Other		
Total		£26,600
Total requested to the SC		£16,600

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).

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	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		