

SC/67b/RP05

E - Workshop to address emerging issues related to underwater noise



INTERNATIONAL
WHALING COMMISSION

PROJECT PROPOSAL REQUEST

1. PROPOSAL TITLE

Workshop to address emerging issues related to underwater noise.

2. BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSAL AND ITS EXPECTED OUTCOME

The sub-committee on Environmental Concerns will address Anthropogenic Noise as a focus topic during the Scientific Committee meeting in 2020. A pre-meeting workshop is proposed for SC68b, to address emerging issues related to the management of underwater noise and its impacts on marine species.

There are now a number of international bodies working towards the inclusion of noise in ecosystem assessments and marine spatial planning. In fact, the European Commission Decision of May 2017 (2017/848) requires EU Member States to establish threshold values to ensure that levels of anthropogenic noise do not exceed levels that adversely affect populations of marine animals. However, appropriate noise thresholds, and the process by which appropriate thresholds may be determined, are not yet well defined. In addition, consideration of noise thresholds should be expanded to consider not just marine mammals, but fishes and invertebrates as well, such that noise budgets target all aspects of a functioning ecosystem. This salient issue may be ideal for directed attention in the SC68B meeting, but specific workshop plans will be developed during the intersessional period before SC68a.

3. RELEVANT IWC SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE GROUPS OR SUB-GROUPS

This workshop would contribute to the goals of the Sub-Committee on Environmental Concerns. Addressing issues related to Anthropogenic Noise is a standing item on the agenda, and will be a focused topic item in 2020.

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:

The IWC has recognized the concerns regarding the potential impacts of anthropogenic noise on marine life since 2004 (IWC SC/54), and the Committee has repeatedly expressed concern regarding the potential impacts on cetaceans (IWC SC/57, IWC SC/58, IWC SC/59, IWC SC/62, IWC SC/66).

At SC/67, the then-SWG on Environmental Concerns recommended specifically that priorities for actions to reduce exposure of cetaceans to anthropogenic noise be developed. Noise has been a standing issue on the agenda of the Sub-Committee on Environmental Concerns, and is slated to become a focus topic in 2020. Therefore, a pre-meeting workshop is proposed, to invite subject matter experts for a directed evaluation of priority noise topics.

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

Terms of Reference and specific outcomes will be identified during intersessional before SC/68a, and will be presented to the sub-committee on Environmental Concerns during the SC/68a meeting.

(C) METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH/WORK PLAN/ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS

5/2018-5/2019:

- Work with IWC intersessional email correspondence group to establish steering committee for SC68B workshop
- Identify priority topics for consideration
- Develop basic workshop plan

4/2019, SC/68a: Present plans for priority topic areas and workshop plan to the sub-committee on Environmental Concerns. Perhaps consider topic-focused SOCER report for SC/68b, to collate relevant noise-related literature.

4/2019-4/2020:

- Work with steering committee and email intersessional group to prepare detailed workshop plan; prepare relevant documents
- Finalize list of relevant experts for invitation to pre-meeting workshop in SC/68b
- Identify additional salient noise-related topics to be addressed during SC/68b

4/2020: Conduct pre-meeting workshop; update sub-committee on results, address additional salient noise-related topics during SC meeting.

(D) SUGGESTIONS FOR OUTREACH

Appropriate outreach materials will be determined based on final workshop plan.

--

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)
Email correspondence to establish steering committee, identify priority topics, and develop detailed workshop plan	Cholewiak et al.	5/18	4/19
Present update on workshop plan to sub-committee on Environmental Concerns	Cholewiak et al.	4/19	5/19
Email correspondence to finalize and invite IPs, prepare documents and information for workshop, identify participants	Steering Group	5/19	4/20

Expected outputs	Completion date (mm/yy)
Information in place to conduct workshop	By 4/20
Conduct workshop	SC/68b
Report on workshop results	SC/68b
Peer-reviewed publication	by following meeting

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
Danielle Cholewiak	United States	Chair of Steering Group
Steering Committee and Workshop Participants to be determined during the Intersessional Period before SC/68a		

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 GB pounds
(1) Salaries (by person)		
(2) Travel/subsistence (by person or est. total for IPs)	Travel for 5 IPs for pre-meeting workshop	12,000 (based on meeting in Bled)
(3) Services (by item)		
(4) Reusable equipment		
(5) Consumables		
(6) Shipping (by Item)		
(7) Insurance (by item)		
(8) Co-funding		
(9) Other		
Total		12,000

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?	
Do you have the appropriate permits (e.g. CITES) for the import/export of any samples?	

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).	
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		