



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 advance the In-Depth Assessment of North Atlantic humpback whales

2 . BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSAL AND ITS EXPECTED OUTCOME

The Comprehensive Assessment of North Atlantic humpback whales was completed in 2002 (IWC 2002, 2003). In 2018, the Committee agreed that it was timely to consider a range-wide in-depth assessment (IWC, 2019c, p.133) and has since been collecting and evaluating information needed for assessment through an intersessional correspondence group. After some intersessional work via zoom, a 3 day, in-person meeting is proposed for 2022 to evaluate this information in the context of assessment and in particular to (a) finalise the initial conceptual stock structure and movement hypotheses (b) identify how these can be parameterised; and (c) develop a workplan to allow some preliminary modelling to occur before the next Scientific Committee meeting.

3 . RELEVANT IWC SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE GROUPS OR SUB-GROUPS

This workshop would advance the work of NH, in combination with SDDNA, to prepare and evaluate available information for an in-depth assessment under IA. The in-depth assessment is fundamental to the undertaking of the mandatory *Implementation Review* of West Greenland humpback whales planned under IST.

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.

The Comprehensive Assessment of North Atlantic humpback whales was completed in 2002 (IWC 2002, 2003). In 2018, the Committee agreed that it was timely to consider a range-wide in-depth assessment (IWC, 2019c, p.133) and has since been collecting and evaluating information needed for assessment through an intersessional correspondence group. The in-depth assessment is fundamental to the undertaking of the mandatory *Implementation Review* of West Greenland humpback whales planned under IST.

Some of the work will be undertaken by one or more Zoom calls but it is clear that the complexity and integration required to develop hypotheses to allow an in-depth assessment to begin means that progress will only be successfully achieved in the context of a face-to-face expert workshop. The workshop will include relevant experts from NH, SDDNA, IA and IST. The objectives of the workshop are identified in the section below and are in accord with SC practice for assessments.

Any new abundance estimates identified will be submitted to ASI for evaluation.

(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 Terms of Reference for the workshop would be as follows:

- (1) review available information identified by the Steering Group and others intersessionally in the context of in-depth assessment modelling;
- (2) identify data gaps and mechanisms and priorities for obtaining additional information within the time frame of the in-depth assessment (i.e. around 2 years) or longer-term work that might be suitable for a future in-depth assessment
- (3) develop preliminary stock structure and movement hypotheses and identify data sources needed to (a) parameterise them in a modelling context and (b) break down key information (e.g. removals and abundance) in accord with those hypotheses
- (4) develop a workplan that will allow at least some preliminary modelling to be undertaken before the next SC meeting to identify potential issues – NB this time frame will only work if the Workshop is held intersessionally rather than as a pre-meeting workshop

(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 intersessional correspondence group (ISG) on North Atlantic humpback whales will also serve as the Steering Group for the workshop. The ICG will compile and review available data by correspondence throughout 2021, possibly conducting one or more virtual (Zoom) meetings. ICG members Robbins and Donovan will coordinate to arrange the 3 day in-person meeting, which will preferably be a stand-alone workshop to allow some modelling work prior to the annual meeting, or, if not a pre-meeting to SC68d (this latter option will slow progress). The timing of the Workshop will depend on intersessional progress (and COVID-19 travel restrictions, if applicable) but Spring 2022 should allow some preliminary modelling to occur. A stand-alone workshop is budgeted, given the higher associated travel costs with that format. It assumes a venue in Massachusetts (likely on Cape Cod), given that air travel would then not be needed for nearly half of the potential participant list.

(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.
N/A

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)
Email correspondence for Steering Group and related work	ICG (convened by Robbins)	05/21	04/22
In-person meeting planning	Robbins and Donovan	05/21	01/21
Holding in-person meeting (3 days)	ISG and invited participants	Before SC68d,preferably in Spring 2022	

Expected outputs	Completion date (mm/yy)
In-person meeting	By SC68d
Preliminary set of data for assessment, including preliminary stock structure hypotheses	By SC68d

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
Jooke Robbins	IP	Workshop convenor
Greg Donovan	IP	Workshop co-convenor, IST convenor
Debi Palka	US	SG member, IA convenor
Judy Allen	IP (US)	SG member
Cherry Allison	IWC	SG member
Danielle Cholewiak	US	SG member
Phil Clapham	US	SG member
Lindsey Jones	IP (US)	SG member
Aimee Lang	US	SG member, SD&DNA co-convenor
Sarah Malette	US	SG member
David Mattila	IWC	SG member
Nils Øien	Norway	SG member
Per Palsbøll	IP (Netherlands)	SG member
Andre Punt	IP (US)	SG member

Howard Rosenbaum	IP (US)	SG member
Ralph Tiedemann	IP	SG member, SD&DNA co-convenor
Michel Vély	France	SG member
Gisli Vikingsson	Iceland	SG member
Mason Weinrich	IP (US)	SG member
Mike Wilberg	IP	SG member
Lars Witting	Denmark	SG member

8. TOTAL BUDGET

PROJECT BUDGET						Co-funding
Description	Cost per unit	Number of units	Total Cost £GBP			
(1) Salaries (by person)	n/a					All participants will donate their time (preparation, attendance and travel time)
(2) Travel/subsistence (by person or est. total for IPs)	498	20	9,960			
	700	10	7,000			
(3) Services (by item)	n/a					The venue will be provided free of charge
(4) Reusable equipment	n/a					
(5) Consumables	n/a					
(6) Shipping & Customs (by item)	n/a					
(7) Insurance (by item)	n/a					
(8) Other	n/a					
			TOTAL			

Co-funding Memo:

Source	Purpose of Funding	Amount	Secured/Tentative?
	TOTAL		

Total value of project:	£GBP
Funds requested from IWC	16,960
Co-funding	In kind
TOTAL	

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?	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:

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
Relevance to Scientific Committee priorities			
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.			
Approach and methodology			
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	

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	