

SC/67b/RP17

HIM - Joint IWC IUCN workshop to evaluate how the data and process used to identify Important Marine Mammal Areas (IMMAs) can assist the IWC to identify areas of high risk for ship strike



INTERNATIONAL
WHALING COMMISSION

PROJECT PROPOSAL REQUEST

1. PROPOSAL TITLE

Please provide the title of the project or the name of the workshop/meeting.

Joint IWC-IUCN workshop to evaluate how the data and process used to identify Important Marine Mammal Areas (IMMAs) can assist the IWC to identify areas of high risk for ship strike

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 SC and SSSWG have agreed that the identification of “high risk areas” for ship strikes of cetaceans is a key step toward establishing mitigation actions, through voyage scheduling, re-routing or speed reduction. The joint IWC-UNEP workshop (Panama, 2014) noted that the IUCN’s proposed initiative to identify Important Marine Mammal Areas (IMMAs), would likely assist this effort. The SC has encouraged cooperation with the IUCN Task Force on this. The IUCN TF has completed three regional IMMA workshops, including the Mediterranean Sea. This proposed joint workshop will focus on identifying overlap between shipping and the IMMAs identified in the Mediterranean. The anticipated outcomes are:

- Develop criteria for categorization and prioritization of an IMMA, as a “high risk area”
- Evaluate Mediterranean IMMAs according to these criteria to examine the utility of this approach
- Test the utility of the regional approach suggested by the SSSWG
- Enhance engagement with other International partners with similar goals
- Report to IWC and IUCN

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 primary relevance is to the HIM Subcommittee of the SC. But the work could also be relevant to the E Subcommittee (particularly with respect to underwater noise). The proposed workshop will support the implementation of the IWC Strategic Plan to Mitigate the Impacts of Ship Strikes on Cetacean Populations, 2017-2022.

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:

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.

As stated above, the IWC Scientific Committee (SC) has agreed that the identification of “high risk areas” for ship strikes is a key step in developing mitigation actions (ref). The Ship Strike Standing Working Group (SSSWG) of the Conservation Committee, has also recognized the importance of identifying “high risk areas” in their Five Year Strategic Plan (ref). They have also recognized that the IUCN Task Force on Marine Mammal Protected Areas has undertaken an initiative to identify Important Marine Mammal Areas (IMMAs) around the World, and that the identification of these IMMAs would likely assist the IWC effort. The SC and the SSSWG have encouraged cooperation with the IUCN Task Force on this (ref). The IUCN Task Force has completed three regional IMMA workshops, including the Mediterranean Sea (October 2016), the South Pacific Islands (March 2017) and the North East Indian Ocean and South East Asian Seas (March 2018). The proposed joint workshop described here will focus on reviewing the IMMAs identified in the Mediterranean for their utility in identifying high risk areas for ship strikes. In doing so, the workshop will develop the criteria that would be applied to IMMAs in other Oceans, and perhaps any spatially identified significant marine mammal habitat as well (e.g. MMPAs, Critical Ceatcean Habitats, PSSAs, EBSAs....etc.)

The workshop will take place as a pre-meeting to the Fifth International Conference on Marine Mammal Protected Areas, 8-12 April, 2019, in Greece. This “attachment” allows both the workshop and the conference to take advantage of participants with relevant expertise. And it is a perfect venue from which to examine shipping and marine mammals in the Mediterranean Sea. It is proposed as a two day IWC style workshop, whose primary focus will be to:

- Develop criteria for categorization and prioritization of an IMMA, as an IWC “high risk area” for Ship Strikes
- Use those criteria to evaluate designated IMMAs in the Mediterranean Sea to determine the utility of this approach

- Test the utility of the regional approach suggested by the SSSWG (ref strategic plan)
- Enhance engagement with other International partners with similar goals as suggested by the SSSWG (ref strategic plan)

As time and participant expertise allows, as determined by the Steering Committee for the workshop, the agenda may also include:

- Reviewing appropriate mitigation strategies that might arise out of the determination of each high risk area identified, and the best avenue to accomplish those
- Explore the feasibility of using some of the criteria developed to evaluate other types of spatially explicit marine protected areas for marine mammals.

It is anticipated that the key outcomes and recommendations of the workshop will also be summarized for the ICMMPA5 session on shipping and MMPAs. And of course the report of the workshop will be submitted for discussion to IWC SC 68a and possibly the CC in Spring, 2019. It will also be provided to the WCPA and SSC of IUCN. The MMPA TF is a joint Task Force under the WCPA and SSC. Results of the workshop will also be disseminated to other IGOs (e.g. CMS, IMO) as appropriate.

(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 workshop will seek to bring experts together from the IWC SC, IUCN, ACCOBAMS, CMS, IMO, Pelagos Sanctuary and shipping industry if possible, in order to:

- Develop criteria for categorization and prioritization of an IMMA, or other spatially explicit area, as a "high risk area" for ship strikes
- Evaluate the IMMAs now identified in the Mediterranean Sea, in order to determine the utility of this approach
- Test the utility of the regional approach suggested by the SSSWG
- Enhance engagement with other International partners with similar goals (e.g. identifying high risk areas, and mitigating ship strikes there).

(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).

Both the Chair of the SSSWG (DeMaster) and SC HIM (Leaper) have agreed to serve on the Steering Committee for this workshop. Additionally two SC members who are also members

of the IUCN TF (Mattila and Panigada) will serve as the Steering Committee convenors. In addition, two key members of the IUCN TF working on the IMMA initiative (Notabartolo and Tetley) will join the steering committee, along with ICMMPA5 organizer (Alberini), and IWC Secretariat liaison to the IMO, (Ferriss).

As mentioned above, the location and dates for the workshop have been identified (6-7 April, 2019 in Greece). For the next step, the steering committee will finalize the terms of reference, develop an agenda and invited participants list, and assemble the documents and presentations needed. At a minimum, this will include the report of the Mediterranean Sea IMMA workshop, with underpinning data, the criteria document for nominating and identifying IMMAs, AIS data for at least one year for the region (Mediterranean Sea), and any IWC documents describing its process for identifying high risk areas. Those steering committee members that are attending IWC SC 67b, will meet briefly in Bled, in order to begin identifying the IWC materials and possible IPs that would be helpful. The convenors will communicate with the full steering committee to establish an agenda and participant list no later than the end of 2018.

Additional funding for this workshop will be sought from the Commission in September. The steering committee, working in cooperation with the ICMMPA5 organizers and steering committee, will seek additional funds from any interested countries, IGOs, NGOs or other entities (eg. Shipping companies).

(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.

Ship strikes in the Mediterranean Sea are a high profile issue, and many members of the steering committee have strong contacts with multiple Governments, IGOs and NGOs concerned with this topic. In addition a summary of the workshop will be presented during ICMMPA5, which is anticipated to draw 150-300 scientists, MMPA managers, policy-makers, industry and individuals interested in this topic. In addition, the IMO noted the work on IMMAs at MEPC72 in 2018 in the context of enhanced cooperation and partnerships.

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)
Partial Steering Committee meeting in Bled	IWC members	04/18	05/18
Full steering committee produce final ToR and draft Agenda	Steering Committee	05/18	07/18
Produce final agenda, IP list and final cost estimate	Steering Committee	10/18	12/18
Workshop	Panigada and Mattila	04/19	04/19
Report workshop summary to ICMMPA5	Chair	04/19	04/19
Produce workshop report to IWC SC 68a	Panigada	04/19	06/19

Expected outputs	Completion date (mm/yy)
------------------	-------------------------

Summary of key workshop findings	04/19
Workshop report to IWC SC 68a	05/19
Dissemination of workshop results to other relevant Organizations (e.g. CMS, IMO)	12/20
Implementation of specific recommendations by member nations	06/19-05/24

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
Simone Panigada	Tethys Research Institute and IUCN TF	Not connected
David Mattila	Center for Coastal Studies, IWC and IUCN TF	Secretariat
Russell Leaper	IFAW	SC convenor
Doug DeMaster	NOAA Fisheries and IUCN TF	CC SS SWG chair
Sarah Ferriss	IWC Secretariat	Secretariat
Giuseppe Notarbartolo	Tethys Research Institute and IUCN TF	Not connected
Mike Tetley	IUCN TF	Not connected
Amalia Alberini	Duke University, WWF Greece, Conference organizer	Not connected

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)	All time is "in kind" donation	0.0
(2) Travel/subsistence (by person or est. total for IPs)	Estimated at £1175/ IP x 8 =	9,400
(3) Services (by item)	Venue cost	500
(4) Reusable equipment		0
(5) Consumables		100
(6) Shipping (by Item)		
(7) Insurance (by item)		
(8) Co-funding		10,000
(9) Other		
Total		20,000

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).

No data collected. Workshop report is public

10. PERMITS (PLEASE TICK)

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

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		