SC/67b/RP19

IA - Second Workshop on the Comprehensive Assessment of North Pacific Humpback Whales

.

INTERNATIONAL
WHALING COMMISSION

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

Second Workshop on the Comprehensive Assessment of North Pacific Humpback Whales

2. BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSAL AND ITS EXPECTED OUTCOME

At SC67a, following discussion of the results of an assessment workshop held in April 2017, a Steering Group chaired by P. Clapham was established to facilitate a second North Pacific humpback whale assessment workshop, and to coordinate work required for this meeting. This meeting was not held prior to SC67b; this proposal is to hold this workshop prior to the 2019 meeting of the Scientific Committee, with a view to completing or significantly advancing the assessment.

3. RELEVANT IWC SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE GROUPS OR SUB-GROUPS

This relates to the work of the In-depth Assessments (IA) Subcommittee, and follows on from the first Workshop on the Comprehensive Assessment of North Pacific Humpback Whales that was held in Seattle in April 2017, and reported on at SC67a. The workshop will continue the work with a view to completing or significantly advancing the assessment, including the relevant population modelling.

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:

Initial consideration of an assessment of North Pacific humpback whales was undertaken at SC65b; this was followed by a workshop in Seattle in April 2017. The results of the workshop were presented at SC67a. The workshop made considerable progress with the work to develop conceptual stock structure hypotheses and to review the available information on other factors central to completing the Comprehensive Assessment, but additional work needs to be undertaken before an assessment can be considered

complete. The IA Subcommittee recommended that an intersessional Steering Group be established, with a view to conducting further work prior to a second workshop, to be held sometime before SC67b. However, insufficient progress was made between SC67a and SC67b to justify holding a second workshop; therefore, we now propose to defer the second workshop until after SC67b and comments received there. The Steering Group will continue (modified TOR listed below). Overall, the work proposed here is relevant to the Scientific Committee's mandate to conduct Comprehensive Assessments of whale stocks when sufficient information is judged to be available to undertake such an exercise; as was previously agreed, the availability of extensive new information on North Pacific humpbacks (notably from the multinational photo-id and biopsy study known as SPLASH) allows the SC to move forward with this assessment, and an updated (post-SPLASH) photo-id comparison to refine knowledge of population structure is proposed as one of the intersessional tasks prior to the next workshop.

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

Terms of Reference

Steering Group members agreed on the following Terms of Reference for the Steering Group:

1. consolidate and prioritise the stock structure hypotheses developed at the April 2017 Workshop from a modelling perspective and develop appropriate draft presence/absence and mixing matrices for consideration at the next Workshop;
2. facilitate the additional work on abundance estimates;
3. conduct an updated photo-id comparison for selected areas of the North Pacific to refine population structure;
4. finalise plans for the second Workshop in 2018 or 2019.

(C) METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH/WORK PLAN/ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS

The Steering Group will continue to work towards a second assessment meeting via email. With regard to the TOR above:

1. The Steering Group will undertake the prioritization noted;
2. Wade will work with others as necessary to update abundance estimates;
3. Clapham will approach catalogue holders with regard to an updated photo-id comparison;
4. Clapham will coordinate tasks to arrange a workshop; the Marine Mammal Laboratory in Seattle will offer to again host this meeting, likely in the second half of 2018 or early 2019.

(D) SUGGESTIONS FOR OUTREACH

N/A

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)
Email correspondence for Steering Group and related work	Clapham et al	05/18	04/19
Tasks required prior to workshop	Steering Group	05/18	04/19

Expected outputs	Completion date (mm/yy)
Information in place for a workshop prior to SC67b	By 11/18
Workshop	TBD

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
Phil Clapham (convener)	United States	Chair of Steering Group
Scott Baker	United States	SG member
Bob Brownell	United States	SG member
John Calambokidis	IP (US)	SG member
Greg Donovan	IWC	SG member
Yulia Ivashchenko	United States	SG member
Hidehiro Kato	IP (Japan)	SG member
Koji Matsuoka	IP (Japan)	SG member
Andre Punt	IP (US)	SG member
Jorge Urban	IP (Mexico)	SG member
Paul Wade	United States	SG member
Hideyoshi Yoshida	Japan	SG member
Alex Zerbini	IP (Brazil)	SG member

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)	Modeler (TBD): 80 hours x 40 pounds/hour	3040
(2) Travel/subsistence (by person or est. total for IPs)	Travel for IPs; number to be decided.	8000
(3) Services (by item)		0
(4) Reusable equipment		0
(5) Consumables		0
(6) Shipping (by Item)		0
(7) Insurance (by item)		0
(8) Co-funding		0
(9) Other		0
Total		11040

9. DATA ARCHIVING/SHARING

Results of the North Pacific humpback whale assessment will be archived with IWC.

10. PERMITS (PLEASE TICK)

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

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**
Relevance to Scientific Committee priorities				
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.				
Approach and methodology				
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		