IUCN World Parks Congress

Durban, 8–17 September 2003

Workshop Rapporteur Coversheet

Workshop Details

Session Title (in full)	How is your MPA doing ?
Stream	Evaluating Management Effectiveness
Cross-cutting Theme	Marine
Date	12 September 03
Time	0900-1200

Chairs	Chair	Co-chair
Name (in full)	Charles (Bud) Ehler	Watson Lani
Affiliation	Vice Chair WCPA-Marine/NOAA-NOS International	NOAA
Contact during Congress	Hilton Hotel	Royal Hotel
Contact post-congress	NOAA/national ocean Service/ International program Office 1315 East West Highway N/IP Silver spring, MD 20910 USA	NOAA/National Ocean Service/ International program Office 1315 East West Highway N/IP Silver spring, MD 20910 USA Email: lani.Watson@noaa.gov

Organisers	1	2
Name (in full)	"as above"	"as above"
Affiliation		
Contact during Congress		
Contact post-congress		

Rapporteurs	Workshop Rapporteur	Assistant
Name (in full)	Scott Suridge	
Affiliation	Parks Australia	
Contact during Congress	Hilton Hotel	
Contact post-congress	Email: scott.suridge@ea.gov.au Address: Parks Australia, Booderee National Park, Village Road, Jervis Bay Territory, Australia, 2540 Ph (02) 44421006	

IUCN World Parks Congress

Durban, 8–17 September 2003

OVERVIEW

Aims: This session is the first of a two-part series that examines methods and experiences in evaluating management effectiveness in marine Protected areas (MPAs), given the unique challenges of managing natural resources in the marine environment. The first part of the session presents and shares lessons from the MPAs that field tested a range of indictors.

Number of participants: 75
Diversity of participants: Very
Number and format of breakout groups: one of two sessions

Summary of main issues discussed:

Presenter 1
Measuring MPA Effectiveness- The Challenges, Approaches and Lessons Learned. Charles (Bud) Ehler, NOAA
-Draft guidelines for measuring mngt effectiveness
-Guidebook how is your MPA going
-Global Rec- 2002 WSSD
-Challenges for MPA Community
-Diversity of MPAs
-Measuring MPA Effectiveness
        -output
        -processes
        -outcomes of mngt (Key issue)
-What can we do?
        -methods that have operational application
        -feedback into planning (adapt mngt)
-Adaptive mngt

Presenter 2
Measuring Outcomes of MPA Management: How is your MPA Doing? The WCPA/WWF Management Effectiveness Guidebook. Lani Watson NOAA.
-MPA – Mngt Effect Initiative
- Goal Objectives
-Dev the indicators
        -Venezuela Workshop 2001 35 MPA experts
-Indicator outline
- MPAs participating across the globe
- some characteristics of those MPAs
-working draft guidebook
-pilot sites training w/shop Sept 2002
-REVISING THE GUIDE BOOK
-Results from field testing reports
        -Biophysical – most expensive
        -socio econ next
- Challenges
        -lack of capacity
        -lack of resources
-Future implementation

-guide book found to be useful
- Recommendations
-suggestions to the draft
- 4 step processes in Guide book
  -    Goals obj and indicators

Representatives from 6 marine protected areas at different countries around the world presented their experiences from evaluating their management effectiveness using standardised methodology. They reported their commitment to continue to learn and adapt their management into the future in order to improve on their impact and achieve their stated goals and objectives.

Presenter 3
Galapagos Island Marine Reserve Demonstration Case. Manuel Bravo, Galapagos National Park, Ecuador.
-Why Galapagos took part
        -evaluate effective mngt
        -practise adaptive mngt
        -to obtain info and data
-GIMR goal
-Overview of GIMR
        -WH site
        -strong link between terrestrial and marine environs
        -many endemic species
        -pop 20,000, tourism & fishing industries most significant
-Decision making process
        -one joint mngt council
        -decisions by consensus
-How was this project incorporated?
-Biophysical indicator
        -type and level of fishing effort (B8)
-Governance indicator (G3)
-Socio-economic Indicator (S14)
-What did we do?
-Major challenges of indicators
        -Bio-too much information analysis
        -Gov- too many meetings
-Major benefits
-Key Lessons learned
        -fisheries
        -governance
        -education & communication
-Next steps
        -staff changes require knowledge transfer
        -data and knowledge mngt
        -partners have incorporated needs into funding proposals
-How can we internalise the process
        -impliment a sub program of evaluation and monitoring
-Adaptive mngt is the better way of to improve MPA
-The effective implementation of the guide book will enhance skills of MPA staff

Presenter 4

Miramare Marine Protected Area Demonstration case. Marco Costantini, Miramare Marine Protected Area.

-Reasons for participating as a pilot site
        -did not have an evaluation process, now we have one.

-Miramare overview
        -major ecological features

-Goals and objectives

-How project incorporated into existing programs

-Selected indicators from guidelines
        -eg bio-1,7,11, socio-8/9, 12, 13, 15, 16, gov-2,3,10,12

-what was needed to apply the guidebook

-Major challenges of the Indicator evaluation
        -Focal species abundance data should be enriched by ethological studies
        -with bio some variables outside of park control
        -socio and gov indicators tested in low visitor period

-How results will be used
        -changed mngt practises due to knowledge gained
        -improved us of scientific date and sharing of this data

Presenter 5

Lenger Island Demonstration Case. Eugene Joseph, Marine Program Manager, Conservation Society of Pohnpei.

-Overview of Mafia Island Marine Park, Tanzania
        -subsistence farming area
        -25 staff
        -high human pop

-MPA goals and objectives
        -consistent with multiple use area
        -1-6 common in all MP in Tanzania
        -7 & 8 specific to MIMP

-Why assess mngt effectiveness in MI
        -improve performance
        -supplement existing monitoring
        -accountability

-List of indicators used
        -noticeable how indicators matched objectives

-Personnel Effort
        -large effort from staff & community

-Main outputs

-Major Challenges and Lessons learned
        -Bio-many focal species not good measures of mngt effectiveness
        -species range issues
        -measures sensitivity of sampling techniques
        -be prepared to do a lot of replicate sample
        -hire staff with expertise (need to capacity build so community can carry out requirements
        -need to maintain routine effort, with god procedures for reporting essential
        -time consuming
        -need a dedicated monitoring officer
        -applying results not in guidebook

-use results to start refining quantitative targets, helps to define success for objectives
-innovative solutions to mngt (eg other case studies)
-Was it worth it? YES

Presenter 6
Biophysical, Socio-economic, and Governance Indicators to Enhance Management. John Parks, Nancy Dahl-Taconi, Antonio Arauso and Marivel Dygico.
-How the MPA guidebook is used.
-4 steps to follow
-The many influences on an MPA
-The indicators n=42
-Generic indicator outline
-Bio n=10
-Guidebook shows which indicators overlap with which goals
-Banc D'Arguin national Park, Mauritania
      -give tools to managers
      -try to prove mngt effectiveness
      -complicated for several reasons, expensive, problems with migrating species, in and outside park issues
      -positives- brought community together, allows managers to communicate effort, system was very useful to BDNP
-Socio-economic indicators n=16
-Tubbataha Reef National Marine Park, Philippines
      -WH site
      -process very useful, matched objectives to indicators, helped staff measure success/activities, which adde to sense of pride for filed workers.
      -using indicators to communicate with local authorities
      -able to adapt to situations as they arrive
-Indicators changed as a result of feedback
-Governance Indicators n=16
      -4 focus on stakeholder involvement
-Bunaken National Park, Indonesia (from Community involvement perspective)
      -commonality amongst MPAs
      -decentralised
      -capacity issues in regions
      -if parks have management plans then objectives within are too vague
      -discussed with community what is effective management?
      -discussed information with stakeholders
      -process was transparent and participatory
-Indicators- benefits and sharing of tourism activities
-Investigating government issues very important to Community stakeholders
-Important to know
      -what we want to know
      -how are we going o use it
-The case studies showed how the indicators cross a range of areas are important in the process.

CONCLUSION

Main Findings:

- In particular the workshop participants felt that matching appropriate indicators against relevant goals and objectives was a useful part of the overall process.
- Case studies illustrated how across a range of conditions, countries and approaches, the indicators were universally useful.
- The process allowed management teams to identify and streamline the types and amounts of information collected in order to be more useful for decision-making processes.
- Participants shared methods on MPA specific issues or challenges, such as tourism impacts on the marine environment.
- The process was found to galvanise support and interest around the MPA, de-politicising and building multi stakeholder support for the future continuation of the MPA.
- Most importantly, the sites reported and discussion concluded that through the management effectiveness valuation process used, the MPA success and conservation impact could be improved on and adapted for future application.

RECOMMENDATIONS, OUTPUT AND FOLLOW-UP ACTION

- Dedicate a single member of their staff to coordinate and lead on the management effectiveness evaluation process as an adaptive management officer.
- Agreement that the standardised process put forward was a good start and should be improved on and expanded into the future by WCPA.
- There was concern expressed with respect to the need to build in the cost of doing an evaluation on a regular basis and therefore for MPAs to systematically and deliberately earmark the necessary financial and human resources to do so.
- The workshop concluded that there was a need for the WCPA- marine to further expand on and continue the support and involvement of global MPAs to do management effectiveness evaluations in the future, and continue to provide a forum for MPAs to seek advice and peer exposure from one another in doing such work.

PAPERS SUBMITTED

Measuring MPA Effectiveness- The Challenges, Approaches and Lessons Learned. EHLER Charles (Bud), NOAA

Measuring Outcomes of MPA Management: How is your MPA Doing? The WCPA/WWF Management Effectiveness Guidebook. WATSON Lani, NOAA.

Galapagos Island Marine Reserve Demonstration Case. BRAVO Manuel, Galapagos National Park, Ecuador.

Miramare Marine Protected Area Demonstration case. COSTANTINI Marco, Miramare Marine Protected Area.

Lenger Island Demonstration Case. JOSEPH Eugene, Marine Program Manager, Conservation Society of Pohnpei.

Mafia Island Demonstration Case. KAZIMOTO Sylvester & RUBENS Jason, Mafia Island Marine Park & WWF Tanzania.

Biophysical, Socio-economic, and Governance Indicators to Enhance Management. PARKS John, DAHL-TACONI Nancy, ARAUSO Antonio and DYGICO Marivel.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION
Lani Watson
NOAA/National Ocean Service/
International Program Office
1315 East West Highway N/IP
Silver spring, MD 20910 USA
Email: Lani.Watson@noaa.gov