

SC/67b/RP04

E - Production of annual State of the Cetacean Environment Report (SOCER) for the Scientific Committee and Commission (2019 and 2020)



INTERNATIONAL
WHALING COMMISSION



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.

Production of annual State of the Cetacean Environment Report (SOCER) for the Scientific Committee and Commission (2019 and 2020)

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.

This proposal encompasses the production of SOCER for 2019 and 2020, which would, in its succession of regional focuses, be on the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific Ocean, respectively. It would, in both years, also present key current global developments that are affecting the cetacean environment. It will also contain a glossary of technical terms used and species names. A 5-year compendium spanning all regions is also being produced.

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.

At SC, the SOCER is presented and discussed in the Sub-Committee on Environmental Concerns, but, because it addresses the conditions and major events in the marine environment, provides a broad framework for the work of all groups. It is also designed for (and at the express wish of, i.e., IWC Resolution) Commissioners and the general public.

4. TYPE OF PROJECT (PLEASE TICK)

Research project	
Modelling	
Workshop/meeting	
Database creation/maintenance	
Compilation work/editing (e.g. on whalewatching regulations, SOCER, etc.)	XXX
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 SOCER is being produced in response to several resolutions of the IWC, including 1997-7 and 1998-5, directing the SC to provide regular updates on environmental matters that affect cetaceans. Resolution 2000-7 welcomed the concept of SOCER and requested the annual submission of the report. SOCER summarizes key peer-reviewed papers and articles published in the respective, preceding 2-3 years. It is presented in a cycle involving 5 world regions and each one includes a global section. A 5-year compendium is also being produced in time for IWC/67 in Brazil and SOCER will have a dedicated webpage on the IWC website. The compendium will also be sent to Contracting Governments as a circular.

(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 authors of SOCER will provide a document for inclusion in the annual SC reports of 2019 and 2020 and for the IWC website.

(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.

Literature search: database of David Janiger (Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, California), web searches, .pdfs sent by SC members and others, full search through the journals *Marine Pollution, Science, and Nature*. Each paper is summarized with a lay audience in mind (so abstracts are not used).

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).

(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.

SOCER is broadly accessible on the IWC website and could be made available to NGOs and others at Commission meetings. Note that SOCER is also designed to be read by non-scientists, including Commissioners. The profile of SOCER is also being improved by compiling a compendium of the full 5-yr cycle (i.e., all global regions), creating a dedicated page on the IWC website and distributing to all Contracting Governments a circular containing the SOCER compendium as an attachment.

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)
Search of databases	Parsons	~3-4 mths from start of SC mtg	~2 wks before start of SC mtg
Review of journals	Stachowitsch, Parsons	"	"
Drafting of individual entries	Stachowitsch, Parsons, Rose	"	"
Editing of full document	Rose, Stachowitsch	"	"

Expected outputs	Completion date (mm/yy)
SOCER SC document	~1 wk before start of SC mtg

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
Naomi A. Rose	Animal Welfare Institute	SC member (invited participant)
E.C.M. Parsons	Univ. Marine Biological Station Millport	SC convener (invited participant)
Michael Stachowitsch	Univ. of Vienna, Austria	SC head of delegation

8. TOTAL BUDGET

Breakdown into: (1) salaries/wages (include name/position of each individual and breakdown of time and duties); (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 GB pounds
(1) Salaries (by person)	2019: 3 authors @ 1333 pounds 2020: 3 authors @ 1333 pounds	4000 4000
(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		8000

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).

Not applicable

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:

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).	It fulfils the Commissioners' request for regular updates of the cetacean environment and is a rapid opportunity for researchers and others to update their knowledge about the seas in which they work and especially in seas with which they are not familiar.
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		
<i>Value for Money</i>				
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		