

SC/68B/RP/28

---

IA - Workshop to further the in-depth  
assessment of Western North Pacific  
minke whales with a focus on J-stock(s)

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 further the in-depth assessment of Western North Pacific minke whales with a focus on J-stock(s)*

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

*NB that this is not a completely new proposal but an update of the final year of the already approved RMP workshop proposal (SC/67B/RP21) that was approved to become an in-depth assessment workshop at the end of SC68A in light of Japan's withdrawal from the IWC. The aim of this proposal to provide the support for conducting an in-depth assessment with a focus on the status of J-stock(s) and bycatches.*

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

IA, HIM, ASI

### 4 . TYPE OF PROJECT (PLEASE TICK)

Modelling	X
Workshop/meeting	X

### 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:

*Regular Implementation Reviews are required under the RMP. The Committee had begun the second Implementation Review for the Western North Pacific minke whales in 2018 and had successfully undertaken the first of two planned workshops and made great progress, especially with respect to stock structure, abundance and removals. At last year's meeting (IWC, 2020) it was agreed that with the withdrawal of Japan from the IWC, it was not appropriate to continue with the ongoing RMP Implementation Review for common minke whales in the western North Pacific. Rather the process would become an in-depth assessment with a particular focus on levels of bycatch and the status of J-stock(s). The holding of a workshop to further the in-depth assessment was agreed but circumstances precluded holding it before SC68B. This proposal updates the already agreed workshop proposal.*

<b>(B) SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OR TOR AND DELIVERABLES/OUTCOMES:</b>
<i>The primary objectives are to build upon the work undertaken thus far on finalising and conditioning the operating models, review the results of the conditioning and determine the necessary scenarios to consider (including future projections that do not include use of the CLA as would be the case under the RMP) in order to receive results (and perhaps complete) the in-depth assessment at SC68C.</i>
<b>(C) METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH/WORK PLAN/ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS</b>
<i>The approach will follow that of previous in-depth assessments. The full agenda, required pre-workshop preparations, venue and invited participants will be determined by the Steering Group</i>
<b>(D) SUGGESTIONS FOR OUTREACH</b>
<i>The results from the Workshop will feed directly into the work of the Scientific Committee and will in particular assist in providing information on the status of common minke whales in the western North Pacific and the effect of removals (especially bycatches) on that status.</i>

## 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)
<i>Hold First Intersessional Workshop</i>	<i>Steering Group and participants</i>	<i>TBD depending on COVID-19</i>	<i>TBD depending on COVID-19</i>
<i>Code and conditioning trials and carry out projections under various scenarios</i>	<i>Allison and de Moor</i>	<i>Before workshop</i>	<i>SC68C</i>

Expected outputs	Completion date (mm/yy)
<i>Scenario and model specifications</i>	<i>At workshop</i>
<i>Conditioned trials</i>	<i>At workshop</i>
<i>Report and final projections</i>	<i>SC68C</i>

## 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
Scenario and model specifications	At workshop	Scenario and model specifications
Conditioned trials	At workshop	Conditioned trials
Report and final projections	SC68C	Report and final projections
Scenario and model specifications	At workshop	Scenario and model specifications
Conditioned trials	At workshop	Conditioned trials
Report and final projections	SC68C	Report and final projections
Scenario and model specifications	At workshop	Scenario and model specifications
Conditioned trials	At workshop	Conditioned trials
Report and final projections	SC68C	Report and final projections

## 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)	10 Invited participants	15,000
(3) Services (by item)		
(4) Reusable equipment		
(5) Consumables		
(6) Shipping (by Item)		
(7) Insurance (by item)		
(8) Co-funding		
(9) Other		
<b>Total</b>		15,000

## 9. DATA ARCHIVING/SHARING

All code and model output produced during the assessment is archived by the Secretariat and the report made publicly available and published in JCRM

## 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		
<b>Note:</b> 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		

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

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		
<b>Value for Money</b>				
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		