



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.

IWC-POWER cruise in 2022 including associated meetings and processing

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 Committee strongly advocated the development of an international medium- to long-term research programme involving sighting surveys to provide information for assessment, conservation and management of cetaceans in the North Pacific, especially areas that have not been surveyed for decades. The programme has been running since 2010 and has contributed greatly to the work of the Committee and its assessment work. This was summarised and commended most recently this year (SC68C report, item 22.1). Objectives have been developed for the overall plan and requested funding will allow for the finalisation of the initial phase and progress on developing the medium-term phase. The amount of money is extremely small when seen in the context of Japan providing the vessel and associated costs which it wishes to do although it has now left the IWC. The IWC contribution is for: (1) IWC researchers and equipment; and (2) to enable analyses and the photographic database to be updated prior to the 2022 Annual Meeting.

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.

The IWC POWER programme provides data relevant to a range of sub-committees. The main focus of the work is to provide data and abundance estimates for priority species in the North Pacific region to the ASI and IA groups. The biopsy samples are relevant to SD -DNA and the photographic data to PH. These provide, *inter alia*, essential data on stock structure, migratory linkages and demographics. The work of these groups underpin the work of other sub-committees including NH, EM and IST. Marine Debris observations and oceanographic measurements are also useful to the E and EM groups.

4 . TYPE OF PROJECT (PLEASE TICK)

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

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.

This is a long-term plan that has international collaboration and provides important data relevant to conservation and management of cetaceans in the North Pacific. The data contribute to the work of the Scientific Committee under many sub-committees. It is designed by the Committee itself and is a formal IWC long-term programme. Last year (IWC, 2021 Item 21.1) the Committee had reiterated to the Commission ‘...the great value of the data contributed by the Committee-designed IWC-POWER cruises which cover many regions of the North Pacific Ocean not surveyed in recent years and addresses an important information gap for several cetaceans species, providing fundamental information on abundance necessary for developing conservation and management advice’ and ‘...that it would be valuable for the scientific, conservation, management and assessment work of the Committee for these cruises to continue, particularly in light of the information being provided on the status of species once heavily exploited by whaling including blue, fin, sei, humpback, gray, and right whales.’ The Committee concurred with these sentiments and reiterated the small cost to the Scientific Committee compared to the donation of a vessel and crew for around 60 days or more. It has provided important quantitative information on stock structure, distribution, movements (via photo-ID) and abundance for the assessments of Bryde’s whales, sei whales and humpback whales as well as for other large whales including the critical North Pacific right whale in the eastern North Pacific. The reports and planning meetings for the programme are available online.

(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.

Objectives:

- (1) work on the initial phase of the Committee- approved IWC-POWER programme in the East of Kuril archipelago and Kamchatka Peninsula (Russian EEZ) by finalizing the plan and developing a backup in case of unforeseen problems
- (2) hold an online expert workshop to further develop the post 2021 medium-term strategy (that has been approved in outline) in light of the results of the programme thus far with a focus on the biennial programme required to be discussed at SC68D
- (3) Present the cruise report following IWC-guidelines
- (4) Update the photographic database with cruise images from 2021 and share the relevant photographs with other research groups in the region to forward the work of the SC (e.g. wrt the in-depth assessment of NP humpback whales and NP sei whale assessment)

(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 2021 cruise plan (SC/68C/Rep01) has already been endorsed by the Committee and a Steering Group established to finalise details and if necessary develop a backup plan. The Technical Advisory Group (TAG) Workshop will be run by the IWC-POWER Steering Group and will focus on completing the Short-term plan and the next steps for the medium-term strategy to be discussed at SC68D. The 2022 cruise plan will also be finalised at the TAG Workshop.

The IWC POWER programme was designed by the IWC SC and is overseen by a steering committee made up of experts from the IWC Scientific Committee and the Secretariat. Cruise Planning is undertaken by a technical advisory group (TAG). The programme's work plan is reviewed annually by the TAG and endorsed by the IWC SC. The cruises use approved IWC methodologies which are reviewed and updated as necessary.

(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 Cruises contribute to the IWC's photographic database which is of value for a wide range of outreach to the IWC including examples of international collaboration for the IWC website. International collaboration is an important component of the IWC's work and in addition to the IWC-POWER section of the website the data are shared with other relevant research organisations and are available to researchers upon submission and approval of a research proposal

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)
TAG workshop for medium-term and associated planning meeting (In principle virtual, but some key persons are in person)	Kitakado	To be decided in light of COVID-19	3 days for TAG, 2 days for planning
Cruise in 2022	Murase/ Matsuoka	15 July 2022 approx.	1 Oct. approx
Incorporation of 2021 photographs into IWC database	Taylor/Matsuoka	1 January 2022	Summer 2022
Incorporation of 2022 photographs into IWC	Taylor/Matsu	1 January	Summer

database	oka	2023	2023

Expected outputs	Completion date (mm/yy)
Cruise report (2022)	Present at SC69A
Workshop report	Present at SC68D
Incorporation of 2021 photographs into database	Present at SC68D
Incorporation of 2022 photographs into database	Present at SC69A

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
Staniland	IWC Secretariat	
Donovan	IP	IST convenor
Palka	NOAA, USA	IA convenor/USA Head of Del
Kitakado	Tokyo University of Marine Science and Technology	EM convenor
Brownell	NOAA, USA	CMP convenor
Crance	NOAA, USA	
Matsuoka	Institute of Cetacean Research, Tokyo	POWER group convenor
Murase	Tokyo University of Marine Science and Technology	
Kato	IP, Professor Emeritus	

8 TOTAL BUDGET

PROJECT BUDGET					
	Description	Cost per unit	Number of units	Total Cost £GBP	Co-funding
(1) Salaries (by person)	Scientist	6,200	2	12,400	
	Photographic database manager	7,000	1	7,000	
(2) Travel/subsistence (by person or est. total for IPs)	Scientist (travel, shipboard and shore allowance, insurance)	3,210	2	6,420	
(3) Services (by item)	Official Communications by Inmarsat	500	1	500	
(4) Reusable equipment	Cameras: purchase and repair	2,200	-	2,200	
(5) Consumables	Biopsy equipment (darts, tips and sample bottles, etc)	600	1	600	
(6) Shipping & Customs (by Item)	Transportation of IWC data (Japan->IWC)	150	2	300	
	Transportation of IWC data (Japan->SWFSC)				
(7) Insurance (by item)	-	-	-	0	
(8) Other	Workshop for future cruise after 2022 by TAG. Planning meeting for 2022. (In principle virtual, but one key person is in person)	1,400	1	1,400	
TOTAL				30,820	

Co-funding Memo:

Source	Purpose of Funding	Amount	Secured/Tentative?
US	Support, Travel and Subsistence for scientist	9,410	Y
Russia	Support, Travel and Subsistence for scientist	9,410	Y
Japan	Support, Travel and Subsistence for scientist	9,410	Y
Japan	Vessel provision and running costs	962,000	Y
TOTAL		990,230	

Total value of project:	£GBP
Funds requested from IWC	30,820
Co-funding	990,230
TOTAL	1,021,050

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).

All data archived at the IWC Secretariat and are available to interested scientists upon submission of a data request.

10 . PERMITS (PLEASE TICK)

Do you have the necessary permits to carry out the field work and have animal welfare considerations been appropriately considered?	Y/pending
Do you have the appropriate permits (e.g. CITES) for the import/export of any samples?	Y/pending

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	
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		

		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		