

# SC/67b/RP29

---

## SH - Southern right whale catch series workshop



INTERNATIONAL  
WHALING COMMISSION



## PROJECT PROPOSAL REQUEST

### 1. PROPOSAL TITLE

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

Southern right whale catch series workshop

### 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 last review of southern right whale catches at the circumpolar level was conducted by Reeves for the 1998 IWC right whale workshop (IWC 2001). A global assessment of southern right whale population recovery was conducted by Butterworth using this dataset, which estimated (with a correction for whales struck-but-lost) 150,375 takes worldwide, peaking in the 1830s (IWC 2001). Since that time additional data have become available from various sources, including the Census of Marine Life initiative to digitize and extract data from American whaling logbooks (Smith et al. 2012), an in-depth investigation into the New Zealand right whale catch series (Carroll et al. 2014) building on the work done by Dawbin (1986), and collation of a substantial archive of British voyage records by Chatwin. While data on American whaleship catch locations and numbers has been steadily growing with the recent interrogation of these archives, the British voyage records and regional impacts in the South Seas have to date been a significant data gap. French right whaling voyages were last summarised by Du Pasquier (1986) and have not been updated since this time. Work by Reeves and Smith on struck but lost rates using logbook reports has been able to distinguish coastal and offshore struck but lost levels (e.g., Carroll et al. 2014), allowing better discernment of the exploitation impact of these different whaling types.

A new review of available catch data for measuring regional takes of southern right whales is therefore overdue and the availability of new sources suggests that it is timely to do this. The expected outcome of this workshop is updated regional estimates of southern right whale catches, which can be used to conduct regional assessments of southern right whale past exploitation and develop population trajectories to measure past abundance and current recovery levels.

### 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.*

This work is relevant to SH. A priority item on the SH agenda is to conduct regional assessments of southern right whale recovery levels and population trajectories. Catch history data is required in order to do this. Pre-modern catch data is challenging to gather as it was patchily recorded and often expressed in terms of barrel numbers or whalebone weights.

#### 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.*

Conducting regional southern right whale assessments is a current priority for the SC. The timeline for work to achieve this is given in Appendix 4 of Annex H (IWC, in press). The time-frame for gathering catch series data was estimated to be medium-term due to the challenge of measuring catches from voyage logs and import/export records.

Since the last assessment of southern right whale catches (at the 1998 southern right whale workshop, IWC 2001), substantial new data are available which can inform regional catch series. These include the New Bedford Whaling Museum's logbook and journal database, British Southern Whale fishery voyage compilation, and the American Offshore Whaling Voyage (AOWV) database.

For **New Zealand**, an updated catch series was compiled by Carroll et al. (2014) and may be further updated by the voyage logs available in the British Southern Whale fishery log. Work by Tim Smith and colleagues on analysis of the AOWV database has provided additional offshore catch data across the Southern Hemisphere, which could potentially update catch estimates for **Australia**, the **Chile/Peru** region and the **South Atlantic**. For the South Atlantic, the University of Barcelona have been compiling an exploitation history for right whales using logbook data. This should conclude in 2019. We are also aware of some work that has been done to reconstruct regional catches off Namibia (Roux et al. 2013). Reconciliation of these different efforts to build a comprehensive picture of southern right whale exploitation patterns is important and a necessary step for reconstructing regional catch histories and measuring the trajectory of exploitation for each right whale population.

## REFERENCES

- Carroll EL, Jackson JA, Paton D, Smith TD. 2014. Two Intense Decades of 19th Century Whaling Precipitated Rapid Decline of Right Whales around New Zealand and East Australia. *PLoS One* 9:e93789.
- IWC. in press. Annex H: Report of the Sub-Committee on Other Southern Hemisphere Whale Stocks. *J. Cetcean Res. Manage. (Supp.)* 19.
- IWC. 2001. Report of the Workshop on the Comprehensive Assessment of Right Whales: A Worldwide Comparison. *J. Cetacean Res. Manage. (Special Issue)* 2:1-60.
- Roux J-P, Braby RJ, Best PB. 2015. Does disappearance mean extirpation? The case of right whales off Namibia. *Mar. Mamm. Sci.* 31:1132-1152.

## (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.*

### Workshop Terms of Reference

To:

- (i) update our estimate of global southern right whale catches,
- (ii) identify key data gaps,
- (iii) discuss methods for filling in gaps in the data series,
- (iv) measure struck but lost rates for different whaling eras and types.

## (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).*

### Prior to the workshop

An intersessional working group consisting of SC and non SC members will be initiated to discuss available data and develop a workplan to interrogate the newly available voyage databases to gather right whale catch data. A two year process is required in order to maximise the benefit of the catch series workshop.

### Workshop plan

The workshop is proposed to take place as a pre-meeting of the Scientific Committee in 2020 in order to save costs on participant travel, as some workshop members are also SC members. Twelve participants are envisaged, to cover the range of people working on pre-modern right whale catches and voyage databases internationally.

The workshop is planned to take place over three days, with the first day assigned for presentation and review of documents and recent research, and the subsequent two days dedicated towards (ii) finalising catch series, (iii) methods for filling data gaps, and (iv) measurement of struck and lost rates.

## (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.

Social media activities, and news stories around past whaling could be generated around this project. The British Antarctic Survey media unit has an excellent track record of generating and propagating news stories and can assist with spreading news of this activity.

## 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)
Gathering details of available datasets	Carroll & Jackson	1/6/18	May 2019
Workshop as pre-meeting of IWC SC 68b	Carroll & Jackson	SC meeting date TBD 2020, pre-meeting (May 2020)	May 2020
Preparation of SC report and summary of catch series	All participants (Carroll and Jackson to lead organisation)	May 2020	May 2020
Update of IWC catch database	Allison		June 2020
Incorporation into regional right whale assessments	SH sub-committee	May 2020	May 2022

Expected outputs	Completion date (mm/yy)
SC Workshop report	May 2020
Updated regional catch series for southern right whales to IWC catch database	June 2020
Downstream inclusion in regional right whale assessments	June 2020-2022

## 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
Jennifer Jackson	British Antarctic Survey, SH convenor	Co-proponent
Emma Carroll	University of St Andrews	Co-proponent

## 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 2018/19	2019/20
(1) Salaries (by person)			
(2) Travel/subsistence (by person or est. total for IPs)	Travel costs for up to 10 participants to attend. Accommodation for four nights at £150/night. Subsistence at £60/day for 10 participants for 3 days.		£15,800
(3) Services (by item)			
(4) Reusable equipment			
(5) Consumables			
(6) Shipping (by Item)			
(7) Insurance (by item)			
(8) Co-funding			
(9) Other			
<b>Total</b>			

## 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](mailto:secretariat@iwc.int)).

All catch series data will be submitted to the IWC Catch Database where it will be available on request to all interested parties.

## 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		
<b>Note:</b> 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	<b>IF YES</b> , are analyses provided on simulations of the effects using different time-frames for the project if applicable?	1 - No 2 - Partially 3 - Yes		
<b>Note:</b> 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.				
<b>Project team and Project management</b>				



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		
<b>Value for Money</b>				
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		