

SC/68B/RP/30

WW - Chile-Peru CMP Workshop of
Experience Exchange on Whale Watching
Regulation and Research Permit Systems

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

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

Chile-Peru CMP Workshop on Experience Exchange on Whale Watching Regulation and Research Permit Systems

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.

Chile-Peru southern right whales have been continuously harrassed over the years when a sighting is reported near coast. In addition, Chile and Peru have a relatively recent and growing whale watching industry that could be regulated and enforced since its beginning. On the other side, the permit requirement to conduct research, or rapid respond to entanglements or strandings are extensive processes that may delay the urgent need to take actions when any emergency event occur.

The IWC adopted a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) for this population in 2012. The conduction of a workshop on experience exchange on whale watching and research permit was identified as a priority action at the 2019-2020 CMP Implementation Strategy that was endorsed by the Commission at its 67th meeting.

The workshop will cover all cetacean species and take special emphasis on southern righ whale. It should focused in: give a general overview of existent whale watching regulations and research permit systems, review research and rescue proceedings in Chile and Peru, identify challenges and propose standardized processes for both States.

The government of Peru has kindly offered to host the workshop. However, the date is on hold due to COVID-19. Funds are requested to IWC Scientific Committee specifically to cover participation of experts and CMP coordinator at the workshop.

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.

A CMP for Chile-Peru southern right whales was adopted by the IWC in 2012 and since then it has been included as a priority for the work of the Conservation Management Plan sub-committee. In addition, Chile and Peru have an increasing whale watching industry at an early development stage. Therefore, the Whale Watching sub-committee could contribute enourmously to provice advice on whale whatching regulations. Moreover, the Modelling and Assessment of Whale Watching Impacts (MAWI) work of the WW sub-committee could also benefit since Chile and Peru have a recent whale watching industry and baseline (or near-baseline) data can still be collected to track the industry over time, with impacts similarly monitored. The workshop will provide an exceptional opportunity to involve these governments to facilitate the MAWI work of WW sub-committee in these countries.

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 (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:

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.

In 2012, the IWC adopted a CMP for the Critically Endangered Chile-Peru subpopulation of southern right whale (Galletti Vernazzani *et al.* 2016) and in 2018, the governments of Chile and Peru signed a Memorandum of Understanding for the conservation of this population (MOU, 2018). One of the CMP priority actions includes to “Provide advice on whale watching regulations for the species (MIT-03)”. Considering that during 2016-2018, there was no significant advance on this action, the CMP Steering Committee agreed to conduct a workshop on experience exchange about whale watching regulations (CC, 2018). It was also decided to include in the workshop issues related to permits for scientific research operations on the species since it has been noted that permits processes may delay rapid response to critical actions (entanglements, strandings, data collection, etc.). The workshop was identified as a priority action at the 2019-2020 CMP Implementation Strategy (CC, 2018) and was endorsed by the Commission at its 67 meeting in Florianopolis, Brazil (IWC, 2018).

Unregulated approaches to mothers and calves may seriously disrupt nursing behavior and could result in negative impacts. In extreme situations, they may even cause the death of the animals. Harrasment to coastal sightings of southern right whales are common and a death of a calf was even reported in Chile back in 1980’s. The lack of regulations, enforcements capacities and/or the delay in granting permits may result in the loss of valuable response time and opportunities to save individuals and/or collect important scientific information. The CMP provides an excellent opportunity to standardize measures in both countries to have consistent regulations that facilitate the protection of individuals and/or collection of samples.

These are two important issues closely related to scientific aspects, whale watching impact/regulations and research permits. The workshop will greatly benefit from the contributions from experts in these fields.

Although the workshop was proposed and originated at CMP southern right whale discussions, Chile and Peru have a growing whale watching industry with other species. Therefore the workshop is intended to cover all species with special note of southern right whales and the need to protect them.

The target audience of the workshop are specifically the governmental representatives not only in charge of cetaceans species management but also in fisheries, tourism, environment and maritime transport authority among others, because in Peru whale watching’s regulation involve differents institutions and competences. Therefore the workshop will have a great impact at national level in the implementation of national systems

with focus on compliance and ways to make sure regulations are effective. According to the IWC WW Handbook, this seems to be the biggest challenge for most managers.

(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.

Draft Terms of Reference for the proposed workshop

The workshop has been identified as a priority action under the CMP and has been endorsed by the Commission in 2018. The workshop will cover all cetacean species and take special note on southern right whale.

Terms of Reference

- Review current whale watching regulations and permitting systems in each country (laws, regulations, codes of conduct, etc).
- Advance in the standardization of research and rescue proceedings, as well as whale watching regulations, particularly for southern right whales.
- Propose the adoption of regulations, protocols or systems to have consistent measures along both countries.

Expected outcome:

- A meeting report that will include a comprehensive summary of the workshop discussions and deliver according recommendations.
- Design an implementation plan at national level in Chile and Peru of proposed recommendations.

(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).

The CMP Steering Committee is responsible of coordinating the workshop. The government of Peru has kindly offered to host the workshop on experience exchange on whale watching and research permits initially planned during the first semester 2020. However due to COVID-19 the workshop is on hold. The next possible date could be november 2020 or alternatively April 2021 depending on COVID-19 developments.

The workshop on experience exchange is planned as a two day workshop with presentations and group discussions. It should focused in: give a general overview of existent whale watching regulations and research permit systems, review research and rescue proceedings in Chile and Peru, identify challenges and propose standardized processes for both States. Special emphasis will be taken for southern right whales. A draft revised agenda, that includes recent comments from whale watching sub-committee, is given as Annex 1 below.

Workshop participants will not exceed 20 people and should include participants from governmental institutions of the Range States as well as two to three specialists from other countries. Government representatives attending the workshop will have competence in the granting of marine mammal research permits and the enforcement of whale watching regulations. Depending on room availability, cetacean researchers and civil society organizations may also be welcome.

(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 workshop will provide the IWC Secretariat with a copy of all workshop materials, to be made available via a webpage accessible on the IWC website (if feasible). The workshop report will be submitted to the IWC Scientific Committee, Conservation Committee and Secretariat to be made available to IWC Contracting Governments and observers and to be submitted as a document for consideration at next IWC Scientific Committee meeting.

Press releases and media outreach will be conducted in Chile and Peru prior and during the workshop to promote the international collaboration, the CMP on southern right whale works and the importance of whale watching regulations among others. Media material will also be provided to the IWC Secretariat and the Conservation Committee Standing Working Group on CMPs to promote the activities through the IWC portal or CMP newsletter (if feasible).

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)
Coordinate workshop dates, finalize agenda, identify participants including experts and distribute invitations	CMP Steering Committee	06/20	08/20
Request materials from countries and experts, compile them, and make them available to all workshop participants.	Bárbara Galletti, CMP coordinator	09/20	11/20
Address any logistical issues (i.e., catering, room seating arrangements, equipment availability)	Government of Perú CMP coordinator IWC Secretariat	10/20	11/20
Conduct workshop	Government of Perú	11/20 (04/21*)	11/20 (04/21*)
Finalize workshop report, submission to IWC and reporting back to SC	CMP coordinator	11/20	05/21

*alternative date depending on Covid-19

Expected outputs	Completion date (mm/yy)
Complete report, report formatting, and submission to IWC Secretariat	04/21
Develop a plan to implement recommendation at national level	11/20
Provide workshop materials to the IWC Secretariat to be made available on the IWC website	12/20

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
José Fernandez	IWC Chile Commissioner, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Chile	Member of CMP Steering Committee
Jorge Guerra	Undersecretariat of Fisheries of Chile (SUBPESCA)	Member of CMP Steering Committee
Mauricio Ulloa	Fisheries Service of Chile (SERNAPESCA)	Member of CMP Steering Committee
Marcela Zamorano	Directorate of Maritime Territory and Merchant Marine, Chilean Navy (DIRECTEMAR)	Member of CMP Steering Committee
Andrés Garrido	IWC Peru Commissioner, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Peru	Member of CMP Steering Committee

Elisa Goya	Peru's Institute of the Sea (IMARPE)	Member of CMP Steering Committee
Juan Carlos Moreno Echeandia	Vice Ministry of Fisheries and Aquaculture, Ministry of Production	Member of CMP Steering Committee
Milena Vásquez Figueroa	Directorate of International Affairs and OMI Affairs, Representative of the Directorate of Captaincies and Coastguards of Peru	Member of CMP Steering Committee
Tte2 Ing. Anthony López Crizanto	Directorate of Environment, Representative of the Directorate of Captaincies and Coastguards of Peru	Member of CMP Steering Committee
Frida Rodríguez Pacheco	Directorate of Sustainable Conservation of Ecosystems and Species of the General Directorate of Biological Diversity, Ministry of the Environment	Member of CMP Steering Committee
Bárbara Galletti Vernazzani	CMP Coordinator	Member of CMP Steering Committee
Robert L. Brownell Jr. / Jorge Urban	Convenor/Co-convenor of Sub-Committee on Conservation Management Plan of the IWC Scientific Committee.	Member of CMP Steering Committee

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 2021
(1) Salaries (by person)		0
(2) Travel/subsistence (by person or est. total for IPs)	Travel to Lima, Peru: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One Person from Ecuador 350 - Two persons from USA or abroad (@GBP 600 each) 1,200 - CMP coordinator from Santiago 200 Daily subsistence (lodging & meals @GBP 205) for four persons, three days. 2,250	
(3) Services (by item)		0
(4) Reusable equipment		0
(5) Consumables		0
(6) Shipping (by item)		0
(7) Insurance (by item)		0
(8) Co-funding	Travel and subsistence for remaining participants, workshop room, coffee breaks and local transport to the venue will be provided inter alia by the Governments of Peru and Chile.	7,400
(9) Other		
Total		11,650
	Total requested to IWC*	4,250

*IWC Secretariat should manage these funds.

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).

Not applicable

10. PERMITS (PLEASE TICK)

Do you have the necessary permits to carry out the field work and have animal welfare considerations been appropriately considered?	Not applicable
Do you have the appropriate permits (e.g. CITES) for the import/export of any samples?	Not applicable

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

References:

Conservation Committee. CC. 2018. Eastern South Pacific Southern Right Whale Conservation Management Plan Implementation Strategy 2019-2020. Document IWC/67/CC/18 presented at IWC 67 biennial meeting, Florianopolis, Brazil. September 2018. 8pp. [Available from the IWC]

Galletti Vernazzani, B., Arroyo, P. Goya, E. and Palma. A. 2016. Revised Conservation Management Plan for Eastern South Pacific Southern Right Whale Population (*Eubalaena australis*). Paper IWC/SC66b/BRG23 submitted by the Governments of Chile and Peru to the 66 Biennial Meeting of the International Whaling Commission, June 2016. (unpublished). 30pp. [Available from the IWC]

International Whaling Commission. IWC. 2018. Chair's Report of the 67th Meeting. Florianópolis, Brazil, 10-14 September 2018. 46pp. [Available from the IWC]

Memorándum de Entendimiento. MOU. 2018. Memorándum de Entendimiento entre el Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores de la República de Chile y el Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores de la República de Perú para Coordinar la Cooperación en la Conservación de la Población de la Ballena Franca Austral del Pacífico Sudeste. 4pp

ANNEX 1

Draft Agenda

Workshop on Experience Exchange on Whale Watching Regulations and Research Permits

1. Welcome and introduction
2. Adoption of the agenda

PART 1 – Whale Watching

3. Overview of whale watching regulations
 - o General review (speaker - IWC WW)
 - o The values of whale watching (educational, scientific, economical, social, etc.) (speaker - IWC WW)
 - o Whale watching in Chile
 - Main species and areas (speaker - Subpesca)
 - Regulations: History and Current State (speaker - Subpesca)
 - Special regulations for SRW WW and Contingency Plan for SRW (speaker Subpesca and Directemar)
 - o Whale watching in Peru
 - Main species and areas (speaker IMARPE)
 - COMUMA, Advances and Future Work (speaker – TBC)
4. Case study 1 – Whale Watching in Ecuador: History, Successes and Challenges (speaker – TBC)
5. Capacity building, information exchange and collaboration
6. Working group discussions 1 “Developing whale watching regulations and compliance mechanisms”
 - o Species, safety, values and type of regulations (air, at sea, diving, etc.)
 - o Compliance and license mechanisms
 - o Special measures for eastern South Pacific southern right whales
7. Work plan to standardize measures and protocols

PART 2 – Research Permits

8. Overview of research permits processes for sampling dead stranded and live animals
 - o Permit process in Chile (speaker Subpesca y Sernapesca)
 - o Permit process in Peru (speaker Produce e Imarpe)
9. Case study 2 – Challenges faced by research permits in XXX (speaker - TBC)
10. Working group discussion 2 “Processes, Timing and Rapid Response”
 - o Stranding procedures
 - o Live animal procedures
 - o Developing networks for southern right whales - Creation and implementation of a rapid response system (speaker CMP coordinator)
11. Workplan to standardize measures and protocols
12. Final conclusions
 13. Review and adoption of workshop report

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	

		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		
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.				
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		
Value for Money				
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		