

SC/67b/RP01

ASI - IWC-POWER cruises in 2019 and 2020 including a specialist workshop in 2019 and a planning meeting in 2020



INTERNATIONAL
WHALING COMMISSION



PROJECT PROPOSAL REQUEST

1. PROPOSAL TITLE

IWC-POWER cruises in 2019 and 2020 including a specialist workshop in 2019 and a planning meeting in 2020

2. BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSAL AND ITS EXPECTED OUTCOME

The Committee has 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, including areas that have not been surveyed for decades. Objectives have been developed for the overall plan and requested funding will allow for the continuing work 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 for two years as it has in the past. The IWC contribution is for: (1) IWC researchers and equipment; (2) to allow the Committee's Technical Advisory Group to meet to review the multi-year results thus far and develop the plans for the next phase of POWER based on the results obtained from Phase I; and (3) to enable analyses to be completed prior to the 2020 Annual Meeting.

3. RELEVANT IWC SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE GROUPS OR SUB-GROUPS

IA, NH, RMP, E, ASI, SD

4. TYPE OF PROJECT (PLEASE TICK)

| | |
|---|---|
| Research project | X |
| 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:

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. The reports and planning meetings for the programme are available online

(B) SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OR TOR AND DELIVERABLES/OUTCOMES:

Objectives:
(1) complete the initial phase of the Committee- approved IWC-POWER programme (Cruise in 2019 in Russian part of the Bering Sea
(2) hold expert workshops to review results of the programme thus far and develop the medium-term strategy that has been approved in outline
(3) develop plan for the 2020 cruise based upon the recommendation of the Workshop
(4) Cruise reports following IWC-guidelines

(C) METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH/WORK PLAN/ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS

The 2019 cruise plans (SC/67b/Rep04) have already been endorsed by the Committee and a Steering Group established
The Technical Advisory Group (TAG) Workshops will be run by the IWC-POWER Steering Group
The 2020 cruise plans will be developed at the 2019 TAG workshop and submitted to the Scientific Committee

| |
|--|
| (D) SUGGESTIONS FOR OUTREACH |
| <i>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</i> |

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) |
|---------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| TAG workshop | Kitakado | October or November 2018 | 5 days |
| Cruise in 2019 | Matsuoka | 20 July 2019 approx. | 20 Sept. approx |
| Workshop in 2019 | Kitakado | October or November 2018 | 3 days |
| Cruise in 2020 | Matsuoka | Summer 2020 | Summer 2020 |

| Expected outputs | Completion date (mm/yy) |
|------------------|-------------------------|
| Cruise report | Present at SC68a |
| Workshop report | Present at SC68a |
| Cruise report | Present at SC68b |
| | |

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 |
|-----------|-------------|--------------------------|
| Donovan | IWC | |
| Matsuoka | ICR, Japan | |
| Bannister | IP | |
| Clapham | NOAA, USA | |
| Palka | NOAA, USA | |
| Kitakado | Japan | |
| Kato | IP, Japan | |
| Brownell | NOAA, USA | |

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 GBP (2019) | Cost in GBP (2020) |
|--|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| (1) Salaries (by person) | | | |
| (2) Travel/subsistence (by person or est. total for IPs) | | | |
| (3) Services (by item) | | | |
| (4) Reusable equipment | | | |
| (5) Consumables | | | |
| (6) Shipping (by Item) | | | |
| (7) Insurance (by item) | | | |
| (8) Co-funding | | | |
| (9) Other | | | |
| Total | | £32,500 | £32,500 |

See Appendix 1 for details

9. DATA ARCHIVING/SHARING

All data archived at the IWC Secretariat

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:

Table 1. Preliminary cruise budget for 2019 & 2020 cruises (value in UK pound)

| 2019 | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--------|-----------|-----------|-------|-------------|---------------|
| Item | Grant | Travel | Insurance | Shipboard | Shore | Bank charge | Total |
| Cruise | | | | | | | |
| Cruise Leader (Japan) | 0 | 0 | 100 | 831 | 550 | 30 | 1,500 |
| Scientist 1 (US) | 0 | 0 | 100 | 831 | 550 | 30 | 1,500 |
| Scientist 2 | 6,200 | 1,700 | 100 | 831 | 550 | 30 | 9,500 |
| Scientist 3 | 6,200 | 1,700 | 100 | 831 | 550 | 30 | 9,500 |
| Sub-total | | | | | | | 22,000 |
| Equipment / Communications / Transpotations | | | | | | | |
| Repair/maintenance | | | | | | | |
| Logging & mapping system, Larsen-guns (4), Cameras (3) | | | | | | | 1,600 |
| Expendables (Ammunition x 250, darts x 25, etc.) | | | | | | | 1,400 |
| Official communications (via Inmarsat) | | | | | | | 1,200 |
| Transportations of IWC data | | | | | | | 300 |
| Sub-total | | | | | | | 4,500 |
| Expert workshop (TAG) and planning | | | | | | | |
| TAG (Technical advisory group) 4 days | | | | | | | |
| Planning (1 days) | | | | | | | |
| Special volume meeting (2 days) | | | | | | | |
| Travel and subsistence for each 4 participants: | | | | | | | 6,000 |
| Sub-total | | | | | | | 6,000 |
| Annual meeting | | | | | | | |
| Cruise leader travel and subsistence | | | | | | | 0 |
| Total | | | | | | | 32,500 |
| 2020 | | | | | | | |
| Item | Grant | Travel | Insurance | Shipboard | Shore | Bank charge | Total |
| Cruise | | | | | | | |
| Cruise Leader (Japan) | 0 | 0 | 100 | 831 | 550 | 30 | 1,500 |
| Scientist 1 (US) | 0 | 0 | 100 | 831 | 550 | 30 | 1,500 |
| Scientist 2 | 6,200 | 1,700 | 100 | 831 | 550 | 30 | 9,500 |
| Scientist 3 | 6,200 | 1,700 | 100 | 831 | 550 | 30 | 9,500 |
| Sub-total | | | | | | | 22,000 |
| Equipment / Communications / Transpotations | | | | | | | |
| Repair/maintenance | | | | | | | |
| Logging & mapping system, Larsen-guns (4), Cameras (4) | | | | | | | 1,600 |
| Expendables (Ammunition x 250, darts x 25, etc.) | | | | | | | 1,400 |
| Official communications (via Inmarsat) | | | | | | | 1,200 |
| Transportations of IWC data | | | | | | | 300 |
| Sub-total | | | | | | | 4,500 |
| Meeting for 2020 cruise | | | | | | | |
| TAG (Technical advisory group) 3 days | | | | | | | |
| Planning (2days) | | | | | | | |
| Travel and subsistence for each 4 participants: | | | | | | | 6,000 |
| Sub-total | | | | | | | 6,000 |
| Annual meeting | | | | | | | |
| Cruise leader travel and subsistence | | | | | | | 0 |
| Total | | | | | | | 32,500 |

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 | | |