

SC/67b/RP27

WW - Modelling whale watching impacts



INTERNATIONAL
WHALING COMMISSION



PROJECT PROPOSAL REQUEST

1. PROPOSAL TITLE

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

Modelling Whale Watching Impacts

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.

There is little research on the potential mid- and long-term impacts of whale watching on cetacean populations. This is due to the complexity of the required modelling approaches, lack of clarity regarding the data needed to inform them, and the need to identify locations suitable for data collection. Without addressing these issues understanding the potential mid- and long-term impacts of whale watching is not possible. The workshop will bring together modellers and field researchers to achieve the following outcomes:

- Identify existing modelling approaches that could be used to understand the potential mid- and long-term impacts of whale watching, and determine whether new approaches are required
- Determine which data currently being collected are suitable for answering questions regarding the mid- and long-term impacts of whale watching, and what new data are required
- Determine the feasibility of data collection, and identify locations where this has already been done or could be achieved

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.


Whale watching – the focus of the workshop is to address the need to understand the mid- and long-term impact of whale watching on cetacean populations

Small Cetaceans – many of the species impacted by whale watching vessels are small cetaceans. In addition, whale watching may be particularly harmful to small, closed populations that are already at risk.

HIM – there is the potential for ship strikes to occur with whale watching vessels, particularly at high speeds

Environmental Concerns – the noise generated by whale watching vessels has the potential to impact the targeted cetaceans, as well as other species that might be found in the area

4. TYPE OF PROJECT (PLEASE TICK)

Research project	
Modelling	
Workshop/meeting	
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.

The IWC has considered the issue of whale watching since 1975 and first established a sub-committee on the topic in 1988. There has been a strong focus on the promotion of sustainable whale watching, as well as guidance for operators in the form of best practices. In addition, the subcommittee has regularly recognized the importance of understanding the impacts of whale watching on cetacean populations, in both short-term and long-term. To help address this issue, in 2013 the subcommittee formed the Intersessional Working Group on the Modelling and Assessment of Whalewatching Impacts (MAWI) with the goal of defining the key research questions, identifying locations where these questions might be addressed, and encouraging the uptake of current modelling approaches for data analysis.

This proposal is in support of the IWC’s Strategic Plan for Whale watching. In particular, under Objective 1 by:

- Identifying whether the data currently collected at whale watching locations are sufficient to inform the modelling approaches needed to understand the mid- and long-term effects of whale watching
- Considering an integrated research program to better understand the potential impacts of whale watching.

(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 Terms of Reference for this workshop are to determine the different ways to model the potential impacts of whale watching, the data needed to inform these models, and the locations where this data exist, or collection may be feasible. This can only be achieved via collaboration between modellers, statisticians and field researchers. To make progress in our understanding of the potential mid- and long-term impacts of whale watching, the

workshop will focus the research dialogue on those existing modelling approaches that may be appropriate, and whether current data collection approaches are sufficient to assess the problem. The expected outcomes of the workshop includes:

- Identify existing modelling approaches that could be used to understand the potential mid- and long-term impacts of whale watching, and determine whether new approaches are required
- Determine which data currently being collected are suitable for answering questions regarding the mid- and long-term impacts of whale watching, and what new data are required
- Determine the feasibility of data collection, and identify locations where this has already been done or could be achieved

(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).

Work Plan

- Convene a steering group
- Draft an agenda for a 2-day workshop
- Identify potential workshop participants (10-15 individuals)
- Agree upon a date and location for the workshop
- Invite workshop participants
- Confirm attendance and handle administrative details
- Conduct the workshop
- Draft a report and review with workshops participants
- Present the report to the IWC
- Write-up the workshop report for publication

In order for the workshop to take place, there needs to be broad support from the IWC, beyond the monetary. To be successful, the workshop attendees need to be a reflection of modellers, statisticians and field researchers from around the globe. For reasons of influence and political choice some individuals may not choose to attend if the IWC does not take an active role in supporting the convening of the workshop.

(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.

Five suggestions for outreach include: 1) a summary paper in an open access journal, 2) a lay summary for the whale watching handbook, 3) popular articles for strategic publication, 4) conference presentations and 5) Social media.

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)
Convene a Steering Group Draft Agenda	L. New	10/18	10/18
Identify workshop participants	Steering Group	10/18	10/18
Invite workshop participants	L. New	01/19	01/19
Confirm attendance and handle administrative details	L. New	03/19	05/19
Conduct the workshop and draft report	Steering group	12/19	01/20
Present the report to the IWC SC	L. New	06/20	06/20

Expected outputs	Completion date (mm/yy)
Submit a write-up of Workshop results for scientific publication	08/20
Present Workshop results at the Biennial Marine Mammal Conference	12/21

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
Leslie New	Washington State University	WW co-chair
Paul Forestell	Pacific Whale Foundation	
Mel Cosentino	Wild Earth Foundation	
E.C.M. Parsons	George Mason Univeristy	E co-chair
Courtney Smith	NOAA	
Javier Rodriguez	PROMAR	

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 costs and subsistence for 8 IPs and the workshop convener and rapporteur	£1800 / person
(3) Services (by item)	Venue and AV	£2000
(4) Reusable equipment		
(5) Consumables		
(6) Shipping (by Item)		
(7) Insurance (by item)		
(8) Co-funding		
(9) Other		
Total		£20000

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).

All results from the workshop will be made available as a report to the 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?	
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		
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		