

SC/67b/RP34

SH - Photo-identification information placards for naturalists and citizen scientists



INTERNATIONAL
WHALING COMMISSION



PROJECT PROPOSAL REQUEST

1. PROPOSAL TITLE

Photo-Identification Information Placards for Naturalists and Citizen Scientists

2. BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSAL AND ITS EXPECTED OUTCOME

Pre-cruise training and Reference placards describing examples of photo-identification subjects (large whales) will be developed for distribution to the tourist vessel industry in the South Georgia and Antarctic Peninsula region. Information will include primary ID features used for seven species likely to be encountered; right, blue, sei, fin, humpback, sperm and killer whales (key species). A Powerpoint presentation will be developed for distribution to naturalists working on tourist vessels, to orient them and their clients to the basics of whale identification photography. Minimal training is required for a considerable improvement to the quality of identification photographs that are collected by naturalists and citizen scientists and ultimately provided to the the established photo-ID catalogues from the region. A formal collaboration with the global photo-ID platform, HappyWhale will be established.

3. RELEVANT IWC SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE GROUPS OR SUB-GROUPS

SH and **PH** – Supports the potential increase in both amount and quality of photographic data submitted to photo-id catalogues from the Antarctic region that are used in population assessments by the IWC, particularly right whales, blue whales, fin whales, and humpback whales.

4. TYPE OF PROJECT (PLEASE TICK)

Research project	X
Modelling	
Workshop/meeting	
Database creation/maintenance	
Compilation work/editing (e.g. on whalewatching regulations, SOCER, etc.)	X
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:
<p>The development of a photo-identification guide for tourist vessel operators was recommended by the Scientific Committee during the 2018 meeting. Collecting photo-ID data from platforms of opportunity furthers the goals of the SH sub-committee toward population assessments by optimizing the gathering of relevant photographic data by citizen scientists.</p>
(B) SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OR TOR AND DELIVERABLES/OUTCOMES:
<p>Objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) To provide a short (~10 minute), Powerpoint presentation on key large whales species for photo-ID image collection to be distributed to naturalists aboard tourist vessels. (2) To produce key species photo-ID guide placards for the cruise, including information on; species-specific photo-ID features, general unique markings, health assessment features, minimum requirements for photo quality and a point contact for all species' photo-ID image contribution. <p>Deliverables:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Photo-ID guide placards for distribution (2) Powerpoint presentation for distribution
(C) METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH/WORK PLAN/ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS
<p>A short (~10 minute) powerpoint presentation and a double-sided, A4 placard on photo-identification guidelines for right, blue, sei, fin, humpback, sperm and killer whales will be developed by Taylor and reviewed by Jackson, Olson and Minton. Region-specific briefing notes on population structures of these 7 key species will be developed by Jackson and made available to naturalists on the cruise for reference. Final versions of the presentation and placards will be agreed upon prior to the pre-cruise training where Jackson will deliver the presentation. Placards will be colour-printed, laminated and available on the cruise for reference. Placards will include a single point contact (Ted Cheeseman at HappyWhale.com) for photographers to contribute images from the cruise. Cheeseman at HappyWhale incorporates sightings into a global web-based photo-identification platform (Cheeseman and Southerland, 2018) and informs contributors of matches made. A contract will be developed with Cheeseman for the purpose of this work to ensure that all images contributed will be forwarded on to relevant catalogue curators.</p> <p><u>References</u></p> <p>Cheeseman, T. and Southerland, K. 2018. Report to the International Whaling Commission SC/67b/PH/05</p>
(D) SUGGESTIONS FOR OUTREACH
<p><i>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.</i></p> <p>The photo-identification presentation and placards will be made available to the IWC Secretariat for publishing to their website and disseminating to interested organisations.</p>

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)
Develop photo-ID powerpoint presentation	Taylor	05/18	07/18
Deliver photo-ID powerpoint presentation	Jackson	08/18	08/18
Develop photo-ID placards	Taylor	05/18	07/18
Develop regional briefing notes	Jackson	05/18	07/18
Write a contract between BAS and HappyWhale	Jackson, Taylor	05/18	06/18
Report preparation	Taylor, Jackson, Olson, Minton	10/18	03/19

Expected outputs	Completion date (mm/yy)
Powerpoint presentation and placards on photo-ID guidelines for 7 key large whale species likely to be encountered by tourist vessels in South Georgia and Antarctic Peninsula regions	07/18
Regional briefing notes for 7 key species likely to be encountered during South Georgia research cruises to be used as reference by naturalists	07/18

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, Cambridge, UK	SC Convener
Paula Olson	Southwest Fisheries Science Center, La Jolla, CA, USA	SC Convener
Jessica Taylor	International Whaling Commission, UK	N/A
Gianna Minton		N/A

8. TOTAL BUDGET

Breakdown into: (1) salaries/wages (include name/position of each individual and breakdown of time and duties); (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)	Taylor, preparation of placards and lead preparing PPT	£1,000
(2) Travel/subsistence (by person or est. total for IPs)		
(3) Services (by item)		
(4) Reusable equipment		
(5) Consumables		
(6) Shipping (by Item)		
(7) Insurance (by item)		
(8) Co-funding	High-quality printing and laminating; provided J. Jackson	£200
(9) Other		
Total		£1,200

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).

Not applicable

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	
<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		