

# SC/J17/ForInfo01

---

## Annex P Process for the Review of Special Permit Proposals and Research Results from Existing and Completed Permits

International Whaling Commission



INTERNATIONAL  
WHALING COMMISSION

## Annex P

# Process for the Review of Special Permit Proposals and Research Results from Existing and Completed Permits<sup>1</sup>

### 1. SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

New proposals should be submitted to the Chair of the Scientific Committee at least **six months** prior to the Annual Scientific Committee Meeting (hereafter Annual Meeting) at which they are to be discussed. Proposers may request that the proposal remains confidential. The proposal shall be structured in the manner given below. In order to ensure that any proposal provides information on each of the items needed for review by the Expert Panel, the Proponent will perform a self-assessment using the checklist provided in Appendix 1. A completed checklist will be attached to the proposal.

#### (1) Objectives of the study

The objectives should:

- (a) be quantified to the extent possible;
- (b) be arranged into two or three categories, if appropriate: 'Primary', 'Secondary' and 'Ancillary';
- (c) include a statement for each primary proposal as to whether it requires lethal sampling, non-lethal methods or a combination of both; and
- (d) include a brief statement of the value of at least each primary objective in the context of the three following broad categories objectives:
  - (i) improve the conservation and management of whale stocks,
  - (ii) improve the conservation and management of other living marine resources or the ecosystem of which the whale stocks are an integral part; and/or
  - (iii) test hypotheses not directly related to the management of living marine resources;
- (e) include, in particular for d(i) and d(ii), at least for each primary objective, the contribution it makes to *inter alia*:
  - (i) past recommendations of the Scientific Committee;
  - (ii) completion of the Comprehensive Assessment or in-depth assessments in progress or expected to occur in the future;
  - (iii) the carrying out of *Implementations* or *Implementation Reviews* of the RMP or AWMP;
  - (iv) improved understanding of other priority issues as identified in the Scientific Committee Rules of Procedure (IWC, 2006, p.180); and
  - (v) recommendations of other intergovernmental organisations.

#### (2) Methods<sup>2</sup> to address objectives:

- (a) field methods, including:
  - (i) species, number (and see (c) below), time-frame, area;
  - (ii) sampling protocol for lethal aspects of the proposal; and
  - (iii) an assessment of why non-lethal methods, methods associated with any ongoing commercial whaling, or analyses of past data have been considered to be insufficient;
- (b) laboratory methods;
- (c) analytical methods, including estimates of statistical power where appropriate; and
- (d) time frame with intermediary targets.

#### (3) Assessment of potential effects of catches on the stocks involved:

- (a) a summary of what is known concerning stock structure in the area concerned;
- (b) the estimated abundance of the species or stocks, including methods used and an assessment of uncertainty, with a note as to whether the estimates have previously been considered by the Scientific Committee; and
- (c) provision of the results of a simulation study on the effects of the permit takes on the stock that takes into account uncertainty and projects: (1) for the expected life of the permit (i.e.  $n$  years); (2) for situations where the proposal is assumed to continue for: (a) a further  $n$  years; (b) a further  $2n$  years; and (c) some longer period of years since the start of the proposal.

#### (4) A note on the provisions for co-operative research:

- (a) field studies; and
- (b) analytical studies.

#### (5) A list of the scientists the proposers intend to send to the intersessional review Workshop

## 2. THE REVIEW PROCESS

### Intersessional Expert Panel Workshop

The initial review of a new proposal, or periodic and final reviews, shall take place at a small Expert Panel Workshop with a limited but adequate number of invited experts (who may or may not be present members of the Scientific Committee). A limited number of scientists associated with the proposal should attend the Workshop in an advisory role, primarily to present the proposal and answer points of clarification. It is important that the composition of the Expert Panel (hereafter 'the Panel') is considered balanced and fair (see below). The choice of experts shall be made by

<sup>1</sup>Annex P was modified at SC/66a in light of Resolution 2014-5 (IWC, 2016, pp.50-53) and at the SC/66b to adopt suggestions from the Expert Panel review.

<sup>2</sup>Where novel or non-standard methods are proposed, sufficient information must be given to allow these to be properly examined.

Table 1

Timetable for the review of a new Special Permit proposal with example dates assuming the Scientific Committee meeting starts on 1 June.

Action	Schedule of events	Example dates*
Receipt by Chair of Special Permit proposal (can request that it is confidential)	>6 months prior to Annual Meeting	30 November
Distribute proposal to Vice-Chair, Head of Science and SSG	1 week	7 December
SSG suggest names for the Expert Workshop	2 weeks	21 December
Make proposal available to the Scientific Committee		21 December
Observers indicate their interest in participating in the Workshop		4 January
Chair, Vice-Chair and Head of Science develop list of experts and reserves	2 weeks	4 January
Final comments from SSG	1 week	11 January
Invitation and documents to Panel	1 week	18 January
Committee member's reviews/analyses due at the Secretariat	1 week	25 January
Committee member's reviews/analyses sent to Specialists and Proponents		1 February
Hold Workshop	>100 days prior to Annual Meeting	22 February
Final Workshop report made available to Proponents	>80 days prior to Annual Meeting	13 March
Distribution of the Proposal, Workshop report and comments from Proponents to the Committee	>40 days prior to Annual Meeting	22 April
Discussion within the Committee	Annual Meeting	From 1 June
Submission to Commission	As soon as SC Report available	28 June

\*Normally to the nearest Friday.

Table 2

Timetable for periodic and final reviews with example dates assuming the Scientific Committee meeting starts on 1 June.

Action	Schedule of events	Example dates*
Announce intention to conduct periodic and final reviews	2 Annual Meetings prior	
Proponents submit a preliminary data description document explaining the data to be available for the Workshop	2 months before the Annual Meeting prior to the Workshop	1 April
Requests for use of data submitted as papers	4 weeks prior to Annual Meeting	4 May
Final data description documents and data themselves available in electronic form	1 month after end of Annual Meeting	14 July
Information on likely analytical methods to be submitted to the Workshop sent to the Secretariat	9 months prior to Annual Meeting	31 August
Distribute documents to Vice-Chair, Head of Science and SSG	1 week	7 September
SSG suggest names for the specialist Workshop	2 weeks	21 September
Announcement of review to IWC and call for observers		12 October
Chair, Vice-Chair and Head of Science develop list of specialists and reserves	2 weeks	12 October
Final comments from SSG	1 week	19 October
Invitation and documents to specialists	1 week	26 October
Indications of interest by Scientific Committee observers		2 November
Receipt and circulation of results/review documents from Special Permit research (including to IWC Scientific Committee members)	>6 months prior to Annual Meeting	30 November
Observers confirm wish to attend		3 December
Committee member's reviews/analyses due at the Secretariat	1 month	4 January
Committee member's reviews/analyses sent to Specialists and Proponents		11 January
Hold Workshop	>100 days prior to Annual Meeting	Fri. 22 February
Final Workshop report made available to Proponents	>80 days prior to Annual Meeting	13 March
Distribution of result documents, Workshop report and comments from Proponents to the SC	>40 days prior to Annual Meeting	22 April
Discussion within the Committee	Annual Meeting	From 1 June
Submission to Commission	As soon as SC report available	28 June

\*Normally to the nearest Friday.

the Chair, Vice-Chair and Head of Science in conjunction with a Standing Steering Group (SSG) established by the Chair at an Annual Meeting, with special emphasis on the field and analytical methods provided in the proposal and estimation of the effect of catches on the stocks(s). The SSG shall be selected by the Chair, Vice-Chair and Head of Science, such that it represents an appropriate range of experience and expertise within the Scientific Committee<sup>3</sup>. The selection process for the Panel shall occur in the manner described below. A schedule of events for the review process is shown in Table 1.

#### *Choice of Expert Panel*

The Scientific Committee Chair, Vice-Chair and Head of Science will take into account the comments made in IWC (2010; 2011; 2012), recognising that some of these issues reflected availability of selected Panel members. In particular, the goal is to obtain a full, fair, independent, balanced and

objective review and careful efforts will be made to avoid any inferences of potential conflicts of interest. Emphasis will be given to including outside experts (non-Scientific Committee members) but the precise balance will depend on the subject matter. The Panel membership will include experts in the relevant field and/or analytical methods used in the Permit activities which may include those that are not specialists in whales.

All members of the Panel shall sign a written agreement of confidentiality on the discussion and outcome of the review. The confidentiality agreement will terminate when the Report of the Expert Panel is received by the Scientific Committee and it becomes public (about 60 days after the Workshop).

#### *Format and observers*

Following discussions at IWC (2012), at the discretion of the Chair, Workshops will normally follow a format of two types of sessions: (1) open sessions where a limited number of scientists associated with the proposal present the proposal and answer questions; and (2) closed sessions

<sup>3</sup>Note: the SSG has thus far been agreed to be the four previous Scientific Committee Chairs.

where only the Panel members discuss the proposal and develop the report. There may be a final closing session for the Panel to ask further questions of clarification. For these reasons, Workshops will be held at a venue convenient for proponents.

Scientific Committee members are allowed to attend the same sessions as the proponents as observers (they will be referred to as observers from here on). These observers will not normally participate in discussions unless invited to do so by the Chair under special circumstances<sup>4</sup> (*cf* the rule for observers to the Committee's meeting). All observers shall sign a written agreement of confidentiality on the discussion and outcome of the review. The confidentiality agreement will terminate when the Report of the Expert Panel is received by the Scientific Committee and it becomes public (about 60 days after the Workshop).

In addition, any Scientific Committee member may submit reviews or analyses relevant to the review for consideration of the Panel following the agreed time frame outlined in Tables 1 and 2.

The admittance of observers has logistical implications for the hosting of the Workshop. The importance of hosting the Workshop in a venue convenient for the proponents is important given the alternating open and closed sessions. Deadlines for registering interest in attendance are given in Tables 1 and 2.

#### Procedure for review of new proposals

The Chair shall circulate the proposal to the Vice-Chair, Head of Science and SSG, normally within **1 week** of receipt.

- (1) The SSG shall examine the proposal and in particular the field and analytical methods and, normally within **2 weeks**, suggest names for consideration for the Panel (if these experts are not members of the Committee they shall include a rationale for their choice) and the suggestions will be available to all SSG members.
- (2) The Chair, Vice-Chair and Head of Science will develop a proposed final list (with reserves) for consideration by the SSG within **2 weeks** and begin the process of establishing the time and venue of the Workshop taking into account the availability of the proposed experts and the scientists associated with the proposal.
- (3) The SSG will send final comments within **1 week**.
- (4) The Chair, Vice-Chair and Head of Science will agree a final list (with reserves); the proposal (with a note concerning any restrictions) will be sent to the selected experts and reserves - the process thus far will have taken about six weeks since the proposal has been received.

The Workshop will take place at least **100 days** before the Annual Meeting. In addition to the selected experts it will include at least one of the Chair, Vice-Chair and Head of Science, one of whom shall chair the Workshop.

#### Terms of reference of the Expert Panel Workshop for the scientific review of new proposals [complete section modified at SC/66a]

The primary objective of the Scientific Committee and the Expert Panel Workshop will be to review the proposal in the light of the stated objectives following the checklist provided in Appendix 1. Recall, the three broad categories of objectives are: (1) improve the conservation and

management of whale stocks; (2) improve the conservation and management of other living marine resources or the ecosystem of which the whale stocks are an integral part; and (3) test hypotheses not directly related to the management of living marine resources. In particular, the review shall:

- (1) comment briefly on the perceived importance of the stated primary objectives from a scientific perspective and for the purposes of conservation and management, noting particularly the relevance of each to the work of the Scientific Committee<sup>5</sup>;
- (2) evaluate whether the objectives of the research could be achieved by non-lethal methods or whether there are reasonably equivalent objectives that could be achieved non-lethally<sup>6</sup>;
- (3) for broad categories of objectives 1 and 2, evaluate whether the elements of the research that rely on lethally obtained data are likely to lead to improvements in the conservation and management of whales. This evaluation should include whether the proposal demonstrates the likely magnitude and relevance of improvements to conservation and management arising from the achievement of the programme objectives;
- (4) evaluate whether the design and implementation of the programme are reasonable in relation to achieving the programme's stated research objectives<sup>7</sup>, and in particular, evaluate whether sample sizes and the spatial and temporal scales<sup>8</sup> are reasonable in relation to the programme's stated research objectives and whether non-lethal alternatives are not feasible to either replace or reduce the size of the lethal sampling being proposed;
- (5) assess the degree to which the programme coordinates its activities with related research projects<sup>9</sup>;
- (6) provide advice on the likely effects of the catches on the stock or stocks involved under various scenarios of length of the programme. This will include *inter alia* examination of abundance estimates provided and may involve a different analysis to that provided in the original proposal, including assumptions that short permit proposals may be projected further into the future;
- (7) determine whether the programme has specified intermediate targets that would allow for an adequate review of progress relative to programme objectives; and
- (8) consider any other relevant matters as decided by the Scientific Committee.

#### Procedure for periodic and final reviews

For ongoing research without a defined final year, a periodic review shall take place in accordance with either the advice provided under Item (5) of the Workshop to review

<sup>5</sup>Include whether the programme objectives are sufficiently defined to enable an evaluation of the likely contribution of the different data sets to objectives.

<sup>6</sup>The comparison of lethal and non-lethal means should be based on their potential to meet the programme objectives (or their reasonable equivalents) based on power analyses and feasibility, including effort and time frames required to produce comparable results.

<sup>7</sup>For broad categories of objectives 1 and 2, and with respect to methods and sample size, 'reasonable' is determined by a demonstration that methods and sample sizes are necessary and sufficient.

<sup>8</sup>With respect to spatial and temporal scales, assess whether the timeframe, as well as the seasonal and spatial distribution of lethal or non-lethal sampling are appropriate.

<sup>9</sup>This will include assessment of whether the degree of coordination is sufficient to ensure that the field and analytical methods are appropriate and best practice to achieve the stated objectives and whether the degree of coordination is sufficient to avoid unnecessary duplication.

<sup>4</sup>Note: this has been interpreted as allowing observers who submit papers with substantial analyses to be allowed to present them in a similar manner to proponents who present papers e.g. through a short PowerPoint presentation (*cf* the 2014 JARPA II review).



new proposals or on the advice of a periodical (normally around six years) review Workshop and taking into account the availability of the proponents. The final review shall normally take place no later than three years after the final take under Special Permits. The periodic and final reviews shall be based on documents provided by the proposers and other members of the Scientific Committee **six months** before the Annual Meeting at which the Workshop report is to be presented. In order to ensure that any periodic/final report provides information on each of the items needed for review by the Expert Panel, the Proponent will perform a self-assessment using the appropriate checklist<sup>10</sup>. A completed checklist will be attached to the report. Information on the analytical methods likely to be used in documents presented to the Workshop that might assist with the selection of appropriate experts shall be circulated **nine months** before the Annual Meeting.

The Chair shall circulate the information on the analytical methods to the Vice-Chair, Head of Science and SSG, normally within **1 week** of receipt.

- (1) The SSG shall examine the information available on the field and analytical methods and, normally within **2 weeks**, suggest names for consideration for the Expert Panel Workshop (if these experts are not members of the Committee they shall include a rationale for their choice) and the suggestions will be available to all SSG members.
- (2) The Chair, Vice-Chair and Head of Science will develop a proposed final list (with reserves) for consideration by the SSG within **2 weeks** and begin the process of establishing the time and venue of the Workshop taking into account the availability of the proposed experts and experts associated with the proposal.
- (3) The SSG will send final comments within **1 week**.
- (4) The Chair, Vice-Chair and Head of Science will agree a final list (with reserves); the proposal (with a note concerning any restrictions) will be sent to the selected experts and reserves - the process thus far will have taken about 6 weeks since the information on analytical methods has been received.
- (5) The full documents shall be circulated no later than 6 months before the Annual Meeting.
- (6) Responses to those documents shall be submitted no later than one month before the Workshop.

The Workshop will take place at least **100 days** before the Annual Meeting. In addition to the selected experts it will include at least one of the Chair, Vice-Chair and Head of Science, one of whom shall chair the Workshop.

#### Availability of data relevant to the periodic or final review

The decision to hold periodic or final reviews shall take place two Annual Meetings prior to the Specialist Workshop. **Two months** before the Annual Meeting prior to the Specialist Workshop, the proponents of the programme shall submit a preliminary<sup>11</sup> data description document that explains the data that will be available for the Workshop. That document will:

- (a) outline the data that will be available, including by broad data type (e.g. sighting data, catch data,

biological data); the years for which the data are available; the fields within the database (e.g. for sightings data: species, date, time, school size; visibility; perpendicular distance etc.); the sample sizes;

- (b) provide references to data collection and validation protocols and any associated information needed to understand the datasets or to explain gaps or limitations;
- (c) where available, provide references to documents and publications of previous analyses undertaken of data collected during the programme; and
- (d) contact details of who should be approached if scientists have questions regarding the data before submitting formal applications for them.

Members of the Scientific Committee and participants in the Expert Panel Workshop who wish to submit papers to the specialist Workshop should submit applications to the data holders in the data holders' data access protocol format via the Data Availability Group (DAG<sup>12</sup>). In accordance with a trial agreement reached at the 2014 Annual Meeting (IWC, 2015a, p.82), such requests should normally be developed for submission as a document to the Scientific Committee **four weeks** before the Annual Meeting<sup>13</sup>. This will allow other members of the Scientific Committee (including the data holders) to consider alternative analyses. The final data description document and the data themselves shall be available in electronic format **one month** after the close of the Annual Meeting. The timetable is displayed in Table 1.

Applications for the access to data for the purpose of periodic or final review, should follow the recommended approach of Procedure B of the IWC SC Data Availability Agreement (IWC, 2004). In order to facilitate this process, requests submitted in advance (see above) will then be considered at the Annual Meeting. Initially, data requesters, data owners and the DAG will discuss the request early in the Annual Meeting. This will provide opportunities for clarification and possible amendment of proposed studies. If there is disagreement over the acceptability of the request (e.g. whether analytical methods are appropriate and within the terms of reference of the Workshop), this will be referred by the DAG to the appropriate sub-committee or an *ad hoc* group. In the hopefully rare event that disagreement remain after the sub-group discussion, then the DAG will be authorised to take the final decision on the request. Data forms and requests can then be signed/authorised at the Annual Meeting. Data owners will provide the data in a prompt manner (usually within two weeks of the data becoming formally available one month after the close of the Annual Meeting) in accordance with the agreed protocols.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>12</sup>In order to enable the DAG to function if one or more members are unavailable, the usual membership of the DAG (Chair, Vice-Chair and Head of Science) will be expanded to include the Chair of the Special Permit working group and the Chair(s) of the most relevant sub-group(s). Any decisions (which should be few) can be taken with a quorum of three.

<sup>13</sup>While Committee members can still submit requests to the DAG after the meeting in accordance with the timeframe in the Tables, they should be aware that the process may take a longer time and the request may not be accepted.

<sup>14</sup>Collaborative studies are encouraged and have produced valuable results in the past but are not mandatory. For clarification, it is noted that the reference to offers of co-authorship within the DAA is not intended to allow the data owners to veto presentation of an analysis but rather to ensure that they are offered co-authorship which they may accept or decline. If data owners do not agree with analyses then they have time to respond with papers of their own given the DAA timeline.

<sup>10</sup>The checklist for periodic/final review will be developed in due course along with guidelines for the outline of the report.

<sup>11</sup>By use of the word 'preliminary', it is recognised that some information (e.g. exact sample sizes) may not be available but the document will be broadly complete including approximate sample sizes.

**Terms of reference of the Expert Panel Workshop for periodic and final reviews under Special Permits [complete section modified at SC/66a]**

The primary objective of the Scientific Committee and the Expert Panel Workshop will be to review the scientific aspects of the research under Special Permits in the light of the stated objectives. In particular, the review shall:

- (1) for continuing programmes, evaluate whether the design and implementation of the programme, including sample sizes, continue to be reasonable in relation to achieving the programme's stated research objectives<sup>4,6</sup>;
- (2) for continuing programmes, evaluate whether the temporal and spatial scale of lethal sampling continues to be reasonable in relation to the programme's stated research objectives<sup>5,6,7</sup>, and non-lethal alternatives are not feasible<sup>15</sup> to either replace or reduce the scale of lethal sampling proposed:
  - (i) compare sample sizes from the original research proposal and the achieved sample sizes, and assess the effect of any discrepancy on the ability to achieve the programme's stated research objectives; and
  - (ii) assess whether, in light of developments since the commencement of the programme, the objectives of the programme could be achieved by non-lethal means, or whether there are reasonably equivalent objectives that could be achieved non-lethally<sup>5,16,17</sup>.
- (3) assess the extent of the programme's scientific output, and whether this is appropriate in light of the stated research objectives and the time elapsed;
- (4) assess the degree to which the programme coordinated or continues to coordinate its activities with related research projects<sup>8,13</sup>;
- (5) evaluate other contributions to important research and information needs that were not part of the original set of objectives of the research programme;
- (6) in the case of continuing reviews, provide advice on:
  - (i) whether the programme continues to have specified intermediate targets that would allow for adequate review of progress in relation to programme objectives;
  - (ii) evaluate how well the initial, or revised, objectives of the research have been met to date, and for broad categories of objectives 1 and 2, include the extent to which progress has been regarding improvements in the conservation and management of whales;
  - (iii) practical and analytical methods, including for non-lethal methods, that can improve research findings relative to stated objectives;
  - (iv) appropriate sample sizes to meet the stated objectives, especially if new methods are suggested under item (ii);
  - (v) effects on stocks in light of new knowledge on status of stocks.
  - (vi) when future review(s) should be convened.

- (7) consider any other relevant matters as decided by the Scientific Committee; and
- (8) for final reviews, evaluate how well the initial, or revised, objectives of the research have been met, and for broad categories of objectives 1 and 2, include the extent to which results have led to demonstrated improvements in the conservation and management of whales.

**Reports of Workshops (applies to new proposals, periodic reviews and final reviews)**

The Chair is responsible for the level and nature of participation of the scientists involved in the proposal, which should be limited to:

- (1) providing information to the invited experts in addition to that contained in the proposal or research results; and
- (2) answering questions posed by the invited experts.

The specialist group should attempt to reach consensus on the individual issues referred to above, but where this is not possible, the rationale behind the disagreement should be clearly stated in the Workshop report. The final report of the Workshop shall be completed at least 80 days prior to the Annual Meeting and will be made available to the proponents.

*Circulation to the Scientific Committee*

The original special permit proposal, *or* the original result documents from ongoing or completed special permit research, the report of the Expert Workshop, and any revised permit proposal (following the agreed protocol), *or* any revised results, from the Contracting Government shall be submitted to Scientific Committee members no later than **40 days** before the Annual Meeting. The revised proposal, *or* revised results, will also be submitted to the members of the specialist group and they will be invited to submit joint or individual comments on that revision to the Annual Meeting.

**Discussion at the Scientific Committee**

The report of the Expert Panel Workshop will be discussed but not amended by the Scientific Committee. The comments of the Scientific Committee will be included in the Scientific Committee report. The original proposal and any revised proposal, the Expert Panel Workshop report (and subsequent comments on any revised proposal), and the Scientific Committee report will then be submitted to the Commission and become publicly available in accordance with the Commission's Rules.

**REFERENCES**

- International Whaling Commission. 2004. Report of the Scientific Committee. Annex T. Report of the data availability working group. *Journal of Cetacean Research and Management (Supplement)* 6:406-08.
- International Whaling Commission. 2006. Rules of Procedure of the Scientific Committee. *Annual Report of the International Whaling Commission* 2005:180-83.
- International Whaling Commission. 2010. Report of the Scientific Committee. *J. Cetacean Res. Manage. (Suppl.)* 11(2):1-98.
- International Whaling Commission. 2011. Report of the Scientific Committee. *J. Cetacean Res. Manage. (Suppl.)* 12:1-75.
- International Whaling Commission. 2012. Report of the Scientific Committee. *J. Cetacean Res. Manage. (Suppl.)* 13:1-74.
- International Whaling Commission. 2015a. Report of the Scientific Committee. *J. Cetacean Res. Manage. (Suppl.)* 16:1-87.
- International Whaling Commission. 2016. Report of the 65th Meeting of the International Whaling Commission. Annex E. Resolutions Adopted at the 65th Meeting. *Report of the 65th Meeting of the International Whaling Commission* 2014:46-53..

<sup>15</sup>In this case, the interpretation of 'feasible' or 'related' will be left to the opinions of the reviewers.

<sup>16</sup>For broad categories of objectives 1 and 2, where 'reasonably equivalent' is defined as having similar likely benefits in terms of improvements to conservation and management of whales.

<sup>17</sup>Evaluate the merits of replacing lethal sampling with non-lethal sampling, considering developments in non-lethal sampling protocols since the onset of the research programme.

## Appendix 1

## CHECKLIST: DOES THE NEW PROPOSAL INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING ELEMENTS?

	Y	N	n/a
<b>1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A short summary of the proposed programme (about 2 pages) covering:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Primary, Secondary (and, if appropriate Ancillary) objectives and their importance;</li> <li>b. evaluation of the use of lethal sampling instead of non-lethal methods (by objective) if it requires lethal sampling;</li> <li>c. species to be taken and sample size by study area and year (and targeted component of population if applicable);</li> <li>d. summary of effect of catches on targeted stock(s);</li> <li>e. summary of co-operative research provisions.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of objectives of the programme:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. statement objectives have been quantified to the extent possible;</li> <li>b. objectives are arranged into two or three categories, as appropriate: 'Primary', 'Secondary' and 'Ancillary';</li> <li>c. statement regarding relationships amongst objectives (where applicable);</li> <li>d. statement for each objective as to whether it requires lethal sampling, non-lethal methods or a combination of both (note that the justification is provided under Section 3);</li> <li>e. a brief explanation of the value of at least each primary objective in the context of these broad categories:                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. improvement in the conservation and management of whale stocks,</li> <li>ii. improvement in the conservation and management of other living marine resources or the ecosystem of which the whale stocks are an integral part; and/or,</li> <li>iii. testing of hypotheses not directly related to the management of living marine resources; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>f. for e(i) and e(ii), at least for each primary objective, information (quantitative where possible) on the contribution made to <i>inter alia</i>:                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. past recommendations of the Scientific Committee;</li> <li>ii. the completion of the Comprehensive Assessment or in progress or future in-depth assessments;</li> <li>iii. the carrying out of <i>Implementations</i> or <i>Implementation Reviews</i> of the RMP or AWMP;</li> <li>iv. improved understanding of other priority issues as identified in the Scientific Committee Rules of Procedure or in its reports; and</li> <li>v. recommendations of other intergovernmental organisations.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>3. STUDY AREA(S), SAMPLE SIZE AND SAMPLING DESIGN</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For each objective:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Explanation (quantitative where possible) that the objectives of the study can be achieved by the methods proposed;</li> <li>○ Specification of the appropriate study areas;</li> <li>○ Specification of the quantities of interest (e.g. parameters used in models) that need to be determined to achieve the objective where applicable;</li> <li>○ Specification of the sources of uncertainty in the estimation of each quantity of interest and which of these are functions of sample size (including consideration of methods e.g. lethal and non-lethal techniques);</li> <li>○ Explanation of the calculations used to determine the optimal sampling design and sample size.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A summary of the overall justification (this may include logistical as well as scientific considerations and should focus on key parameters necessary to meet objectives) for: final study area, sampling design and sample size (explanation provided on how considerations by objective were integrated into the final overall sampling design and sample size).</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>4. ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL EFFECT OF CATCHES</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide by species/area:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ a summary of what is known concerning stock structure;</li> <li>○ the estimated abundance of the species/stocks, including methods used and an assessment of uncertainty, with a note as to whether the estimates have previously been considered by the Scientific Committee;</li> <li>○ provision of the results of a simulation study on the effects of the permit takes on the stock that takes into account uncertainty and projects: (1) for the expected life of the permit (i.e. <math>n</math> years); and (2) for situations where the proposal is assumed to continue for: (a) a further <math>n</math> years; (b) a further <math>2n</math> years; and (c) some longer period of years since the start of the proposal.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>5. FIELD AND ANALYTICAL METHODS</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of field methods (by species/stock):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ sampling protocol for lethal and non-lethal aspects of the proposal including number, time-frame, area (including protocol to deal with predictable difficulties e.g. prolonged poor weather);</li> <li>○ an assessment of why non-lethal methods, methods associated with any ongoing commercial whaling, or analyses of past data have been considered to be insufficient;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• description of laboratory methods;</li> <li>• description of analytical methods (for novel techniques details may be provided in an Annex to allow full evaluation):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ characterisation of assumptions, key parameters, methods to deal with uncertainty, statistical power;</li> <li>○ an assessment of why non-lethal methods, methods associated with any ongoing commercial whaling, or analyses of past data have been considered to be insufficient;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• description of use of data from other projects or programmes.</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>6. LOGISTICS AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of intermediate targets to allow for adequate review of progress relative to objectives.</li> <li>• Description of overall project management including personnel and logistic resources.</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>CO-OPERATIVE RESEARCH</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment of the degree to which the programme will coordinate its activities with related research projects:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ assessment of whether the degree of coordination is sufficient to ensure field and analytical methods were appropriate and best practice to achieve the stated objectives;</li> <li>○ whether the degree of coordination is sufficient to avoid unnecessary duplication;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A note on the provisions for co-operative research:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ field studies;</li> <li>○ analytical studies.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A summary evaluation of the proposed programme in the light of Annex P.</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>ANNEXES</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field protocols (and if relevant how these compare with IWC guidelines).</li> <li>• Laboratory protocols (and if relevant how these compare with IWC guidelines).</li> <li>• Analytical details for new approaches or models (including formulae for estimating parameters of interest and how uncertainty was dealt with).</li> <li>• A list (by objective) of collaborating institutes, expert, projects or external data sources.</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Appendix 2

## PAST OR EXPECTED EXPERT ('ANNEX P') WORKSHOPS TO REVIEW NEW, ONGOING OR COMPLETED SPECIAL PERMIT PROGRAMMES

Table 1

Past or expected Expert ('Annex P') Workshops to review new, ongoing or completed special permit programmes.

Subject	Status	Proposed dates	References
JARPN II (ongoing programme)	Completed in 2009	N/A	IWC (2010a; 2010b)
Icelandic (final review)	Completed in 2012	N/A	IWC (2014a)
JARPA II (ongoing programme)	Completed in 2014	N/A	IWC (2015)
JARPN II (ongoing programme)	Completed in 2016	N/A	IWC (2014b)
NEWREP-A	Completed in 2015	N/A	IWC (2016)
NEWREP-NP	Expected in 2017	Early 2017	

**References**

- International Whaling Commission. 2010a. Report of the Expert Workshop to Review the Ongoing JARPN II Programme, 26-30 January 2009, Yokohama, Japan. *J. Cetacean Res. Manage. (Suppl.)* 11(2):405-50.
- International Whaling Commission. 2010b. Report of the Scientific Committee. *J. Cetacean Res. Manage. (Suppl.)* 11(2):1-98.
- International Whaling Commission. 2014a. Report of the Expert Workshop to Review the Icelandic Special Permit Research Programme, 18-22 February 2013, Reykjavik, Iceland. *J. Cetacean Res. Manage. (Suppl.)* 15:455-88.
- International Whaling Commission. 2014b. Research Proposal for Special Permits: Proposal to hold an IWC Workshop for the Periodic Review of JARPN II. Paper SC/65b/SPRP01 presented to the IWC Scientific Committee, May 2014, Bled, Slovenia (unpublished). 2pp. [Paper available from the Office of this Journal].
- International Whaling Commission. 2015. Report of the Expert Workshop to Review the Japanese JARPA II Special Permit Research Programme, 24-28 February 2014, Tokyo, Japan. *J. Cetacean Res. Manage. (Suppl.)* 16:369-409.
- International Whaling Commission. 2016. Report of the Expert Panel to Review the Proposal by Japan for NEWREP-A, 7-10 February 2015, Tokyo, Japan. *J. Cetacean Res. Manage. (Suppl.)* 17:507-54.