

SC/68B/RP/29

HIM - Progressing the development and use of the IWC Ship Strikes Database

IWC



INTERNATIONAL
WHALING COMMISSION

PROJECT PROPOSAL REQUEST

1 . PROPOSAL TITLE

Progressing the development and use of the IWC Ship Strikes Database

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 purpose of this proposal is to further progress the development of the ship strikes database and to ensure the increased reporting of ship strikes incidents into the IWC database including through:

- Systematic outreach to data providers
- Review and provision of data
- Promoting access to information in the database
- Increase use of the database
- Outreach to other organisations

It has been proposed that a dedicated coordinator attached to the Secretariat would implement the Ship Strikes programme of work, including this work on the ship strikes database and representing the IWC in other fora.

This funding request is for work that would be undertaken on the ship strikes database in 2021 which could be undertaken in two different ways depending on the endorsement by the Commission:-

It is proposed that if the proposal for a coordinator position is endorsed by the Commission before the end of 2020 then this work would be undertaken by the Ship Strikes Coordinator and this funding requested would cover an appropriate portion of the costs of this position.

If the coordinator cannot be hired for work in 2021 then this funding requested would cover delivery of this work by another means, to be determined by the Chair of the Committee and Chair of the Ship Strikes Working Group in liaison with the Secretariat and convenor of HIM.

A key task for the coordinator is to progress submission of data from national databases into the global IWC effort. This will be reliant on external factors, but making progress on including these large existing data sets into the IWC database is likely to take a substantial proportion of the coordinators time.

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.

4 . TYPE OF PROJECT (PLEASE TICK)

Research project	
Modelling	
Workshop/meeting	
Database creation/maintenance	X
Compilation work/editing (<i>e.g. on whalewatching regulations, SOCER, etc.</i>)	
Other (<i>please specify below</i>)	
Outreach to other organisations such as IMO, National agencies with ship strikes databases, Marine Traffic	

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.

Since 2007 the IWC has been developing a global database of collisions between ships and cetaceans. The ongoing development of the IWC Ship Strike Database requires data gathering, communication with potential data providers and data/database validation and management. The objectives of this database are to: (1) contribute to a better understanding of the scale of the problem and the factors that relate to risk (such as vessel type and speed); (2) estimate ship strike mortalities for different whale populations; and (3) identify High Risk Areas and inform mitigation measures.

The database went online in 2009 and the total number of records in the database is around 1,600 (as of May 2020). All new entries are verified and categorised by the current IWC Ship Strike Data Review Group. Since 2013, two dedicated data coordinators were contracted by the IWC to cross-check and verify the data entries and thereby enhance the quality of the database, as specified by the Scientific Committee.

The activities in this proposal are elaborated in the ship strikes workplan 2020-2022. This workplan represents an ambitious programme of work for which effective implementation would be aided significantly by a dedicated Coordinator attached to the Secretariat to implement the programme of work and represent the IWC. A dedicated staff member focussing on ship-strikes will be able to develop the necessary expertise across all aspects of the issue

There are numerous SC recommendations setting out SC priorities for ship strikes, specifically including SC1879 and SC19114 recommending continuation of work on the IWC Ship Strikes database

(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.

The objectives for 2021-2022 are to ensure the increased reporting of ship strikes incidents into the IWC database including through:

- **Systematic outreach to data providers**
Systematic outreach to countries (members and non-members) and regional authorities to help obtain and secure data for entry to the database.
Systematic outreach to shipping sectors, including shipping associations, to seek support with data entry
Data from National Progress reports assessed and entered where appropriate.
- **Review and provision of data**
Inclusion of known datasets (e.g. USA, Australia) and development of bulk upload tool
Records included and reviewed in a reasonable timeframe
- **Promoting access to information in the database**
Update the website with the most recent version of data
Ongoing, regular publication of routine summary statistics from the ship strikes database
Maintain a compendium of relevant papers and reports of ship strikes issues
- **Increase use of the database**
Undertake review of the database to understand how it can be used and improved to help meet the IWC Strategic Plan

Undertake analysis of the database to assess the scale of the problem, factors that relate to risk, estimate ship strikes mortalities for whale populations and assess effectiveness of mitigation measures taken

- ***Outreach to other organisations***

When database has been updated, communicate results to IMO, CMS, ACCOBAMS, ASCOBANS, industry organisations and others as appropriate.

Priorities for 2021 only are specified in the Table in Section 6

(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).

(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.

The Ship Strikes Coordinator will work closely with the Secretariat lead for communications to produce relevant promotional materials on IWC ship strikes work and the ship strikes database and to develop relevant content for the IWC website

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)
Outreach to data providers and identification of data to be included in the database	Ship Strikes Coordinator	Jan 2021	Dec 2021
Data review within a reasonable timeframe	Ship Strikes Coordinator	Jan 2021	Dec 2021
Inclusion of known datasets (An interim target would be IWC68c in May 2021)	Ship Strikes Coordinator	Jan 2021	Dec 2021
Undertake review of database to identify how it can be better used and promoted to deliver the IWC ship strikes strategic plan and workplan	Ship Strikes Coordinator	Jan 2021	May 2021
Production of summary statistics from the database	Ship Strikes Coordinator	Jan 2021	May 2021

Expected outputs	Completion date (mm/yy)
Interim report and summary on new data added to database	SC68C
Report from strategic review of database	SC68C

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
Ship Strikes Coordinator (to be recruited)	IWC Secretariat	
Russell Leaper	Convenor HIM subcommittee	Advice on tasks required for database
Dave Weller	Chair, Ship Strikes SWG	

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)	SC contribution to relevant staff or contractor costs	£10,000
(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		£10,000

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?	
Do you have the appropriate permits (e.g. CITES) for the import/export of any samples?	

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		