



## 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

This funding request is to continue work that has been 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 this work would continue to be undertaken by the Ship Strikes Data Manager and this funding requested would cover an appropriate portion of the costs of this position.

If the coordinator cannot be retained for work in 2022 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 Data Manager 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.*

HIM – Ship strikes is an important subject within the Human Induced Mortality sub-Committee that is highlighted by the related recommendations made, and the funding previously requested, by this group over many years.

E – The database manager will also scope the IWC approach to strandings which is an important part of the E sub-committee with information feeding into other groups.

GDR – The Ship Strikes database is also considered by the Ad hoc Working Group GDR and the database manager supported by this work will be part of the ongoing review of all IWC data holdings.

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

Research project	<input type="checkbox"/>
Modelling	<input type="checkbox"/>
Workshop/meeting	<input type="checkbox"/>
Database creation/maintenance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Compilation work/editing ( <i>e.g. on whalewatching regulations, SOCER, etc.</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other ( <i>please specify below</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/>

**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 crosscheck 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 and it was agreed that a dedicated staff member focussing on ship-strikes would be able to develop the necessary expertise across all aspects of the issue, implement the programme of work and represent the IWC. In 2020 it was proposed, and approved, to hire a Data Manager attached to the Secretariat and the post was successfully filled in April 2021.

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 2022-2023 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. South Africa, USA, Australia)

Records included and reviewed in a reasonable timeframe

- **Promoting access to information in the database**

Develop the database documentation that describes the data fields, classification criteria, review process and caveats and can be sent out with any data requested

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 2022 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).*

The Data Lifecycle illustrates the data management stages that will guide the workplan and describe the methods used to manage the ship strikes data. Data and data needs will vary; therefore, the Data Lifecycle stages do not need to be sequential to achieve high quality data. However, it is important that the data management work accounts for each step of the Data Lifecycle to ensure the integrity and quality of the data. The following are the Data Lifecycle stages, their definitions and the steps to be taken at each stage.

**Plan**

Definition: Scoping the data management needs of the project and creating a strategy for how data will be managed throughout the lifecycle.

Steps:

1. Review the current ship strikes database using a SWOT analysis to understand how the database can be advanced to meet the IWC Strategic Plan..

2. Have scoping meetings with relevant individuals and groups pertinent to the ship strikes database to understand how the database can be advanced to meet the IWC Strategic Plan.

### **Acquire**

Definition: Collecting or generating new data or obtaining existing data.

Steps:

1. Systematic outreach to countries and regional authorities to obtain and secure data to integrate into the database.
2. Systematic outreach to shipping sectors, including shipping associations, to seek support with data entry.
3. Review the National Progress reports for potential data to be integrated into the database.
4. Collaborate with countries and regional authorities with known datasets to include in the database.

### **Process**

Definition: Handling new or previously collected data inputs through validating data, transforming data, and integrating data into a database.

Steps:

1. Review and include records in a reasonable timeframe.
2. Develop documentation that describes procedures and protocols for processing and storing the data.

### **Analyse**

Definition: The exploring and interpreting of processed data.

Steps:

1. Regularly publish summary statistics from the ship strikes database.
2. Perform analysis 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.
3. Develop documentation on the data workflow to document the process of how data are analysed and transformed after collection.

### **Preserve**

Definition: The actions and procedures used to ensure long-term viability and accessibility of data.

Steps:

1. Develop metadata that describes the data fields, classification criteria, and data review caveats.
2. Develop documentation on data storage specifications and the database schema.
3. Work with the IWC Secretariat IT Team to ensure regular maintenance and systematic backups of the database.

### **Share**

Definition: The preparation and release of data and the communication to relevant stakeholders of data availability.

Steps:

1. Develop documentation to be included when responding to data requests.
2. Communicate database updates to relevant individuals and organisations.
3. Maintain a compendium of relevant papers and reports of ship strikes issues.

**(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 Data Manager 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 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)
Outreach to data providers and identification of data to be included in the database	Data Manager	04/22	04/23
Data review within a reasonable timeframe	Data Manager	04/22	04/23
Inclusion of known datasets	Data Manager	04/22	04/23
Production of summary statistics from the database	Data Manager	04/22	04/23
Promote access to information in the database through IWC website	Data Manager	04/22	04/23

Expected outputs	Completion date (mm/yy)
Interim report and summary on new data added to database	April, 2023
Report from strategic review of database	April, 2023

**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
Lydia O' Loughlin	Ship Strikes Data Manager, IWC Secretariat	
Russell Leaper	Convenor HIM subcommittee	Advice on tasks required for database
Dave Weller	Chair, Ship Strikes SWG	



## 8 TOTAL BUDGET

PROJECT BUDGET					Co-funding
	Description	Cost per unit	Number of units	Total Cost £GBP	
(1) Salaries (by person)	SC contributions to relevant staff costs (25% of full costs)	£40,000	.25	£10,000	£30,000
(2) Travel/subsistence (by person or est. total for IPs)					
(3) Services (by item)					
(4) Reusable equipment					
(5) Consumables					
(6) Shipping & Customs (by Item)					
(7) Insurance (by item)					
(8) Other					
<b>TOTAL</b>				£10,000	

### Co-funding Memo:

Source	Purpose of Funding	Amount	Secured/Tentative?
Voluntary conservation & Welfare funds	Contributions to staff costs	£30,000	Tentative
<b>TOTAL</b>			

<b>Total value of project:</b>	<b>£GBP</b>
Funds requested from IWC	<b>£10,000</b>
Co-funding	<b>£30,000</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	

## 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](mailto: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:*

## 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		