



MARINE PROTECTED AREA (MPA) WORKSHOP REPORT

DE HOOP MARINE PROTECTED AREA – POTBERG November 2007

Content:

1. Commitments for MPA forum 2007 – agreed by all attendees
2. Minutes of MPA forum 2007
3. Appendices I & II



1. Commitments for MPA forum 2007

In closing the following commitments were made by the different involved organisation for MPA Forum 2008:

WWF

1. MPA training ECape 2008 ✓
2. Management plans: Stillbaai ✓, ELondon , Betty's bay ✓, Sunday's estuary ✓, Dwese Cwebe
3. Honda Marine – Equipment ✓
4. Interactive MPA forum website (email i.e. Dlist) ✓
 - Network of people keen to assist with management support group
 - Janette d T, Peter Chadwick
5. MPA awareness campaign for 2009 ✓
 - Workplan to be presented to organisations to gain buy-in (mid 2008)

SAEON

1. TMNP monitoring beginning 2008 ✓
2. Tstitsikamma monitoring continued ✓
3. Monitoring workshop end 2008 – postpone to 1st quarter 09
 - Co-ordinate monitoring at national scale
 - Data streamlines
 - Accreditation
 - Roll-out of coastal monitors
 - IUCN MPA monitoring guidelines
 - MPA managers to make monitoring commitments for workshop

DEAT

1. Management plans 2008 ✓
2. Finalise contracts ✓
3. Review the workplans ✓
4. Proclamation of Prince Edward Islands (in process) & Stillbaai 2008 ✓
5. Standard reporting schedule for monitoring MPAs (Liezal, Risha & N)
6. Generic media release with Recreational brochure to MPA managers
7. Consideration to integrate management of Islands

MPA managers commitments

1. MPA managers invite local stakeholders to next MPA forum ✓
2. Workplans and management plans due - include attendance to MPA forum in the workplan – in process
3. MPA managers to make monitoring commitments for SAEON workshop (end 2008) – held over
4. Senior Managers from the different conservation organisations were tasked with the responsibility of "selling" the idea of the MPA Awareness Campaigns to their Executive and members of their respective Boards, in

order to ensure full support for the campaign from top structures of the concerned organisations. The identified managers were:

- a. Dr A Oosthuizen –SANParks
- b. Peter Chadwick and Anton Wolfaard –CapeNature

Future MPA Forum approach

1. Feedback from each MPA manager – highlights main achievements, constraints and targets for next year – Dwesa/Cwebe MPA manager this eve
2. Annual meeting – possibly October ✓
3. Timing – 2/3 days agreed ✓
4. Venue: ECape – agreed ✓
5. More high level buy-in, send invite to top management. Get names from MPA managers ✓
6. Link to other initiatives: People and Parks and Expansion Strategy

2. Minutes of MPA forum 2007

PURPOSE OF THE WORKSHOP

Peter Chadwick (De Hoop MPA Manager) welcomed and thanked everyone for attending. This forum aims at developing a community of MPA managers; developing an understanding of the strategic needs; sharing of ideas and experience amongst managers.

WWF and the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism: Marine and Coastal Management (DEAT: MCM) have signed a three year Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). This MoU has allowed WWF to assist DEAT: MCM with the implementation of their mandate to ensure the establishment and effective management of a representative network of Marine Parks in South Africa. The revival of the MPA forum is as a result of this MoU.

The workshop was structured around a few defined themes:

- A. The role of MPA management plans in effective management
- B. Capacity building for effective management
- C. Biodiversity and general monitoring effectiveness
- D. Developing new corporate partnerships and support structures
- E. A national MPA awareness campaign
- F. Developing community benefits

These themes were workshopped by the attendees at the MPA forum and the key points of these discussions are captured below.

A. THE ROLE OF MPA MANAGEMENT PLANS IN EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT

Aim: To give further expression and expansion of the text in the gazette, including the need for the MPA, the objectives of the MPA, the regulatory measures contained in the gazette – and how and by whom these will be put into place (for each MPA).

- A management plan will generally be valid for a period of 5 years and expand on the generic key MPA “performance areas” of planning and consultation, awareness and education, surveillance and compliance, monitoring and research.
- The management plan will assign responsibilities for the above items.
- It will give an overview of the history, geography and biological importance of the area
- It will fully flesh out the practical implications of the zonation of activities, and where appropriate the socio-economic implications of zonation
- It will describe where resources and funding will come from, including potential new sources
- It will describe bodies (existing or new) that will be utilised to ensure community and stakeholder participation.
- It will address issues such as training and capacity building
- It should link to the Park Plan or Integrated Management Plan of the Park as a whole

Key requirements of an MPA Workplan

Aim: to ensure that the MPA is as well managed in practise as possible, based on the requirements of the gazette, MLRA and regulations and management plan (where available)

- Work plans are valid for one year and are key requirements of contracts (or implementation protocols) for MPA Management.
- Work plans describe operations and activities for which funding is provided
- Work plans contain a breakdown of how the available funding will be spent
- They may describe operational consultative channels in more detail than the management plan

It is proposed that MPA Work Plans contain the following five sections:

1. 1-2 pages of up-to-date context, in the form of reference to the gazette and management plan, priority challenges in the year addressed in each MPA
2. A section focussed on activities in the form of a spreadsheet matrix with activities such as "shore patrols" or "signage" on one axis, and planning details such as "where", "by whom", "how often", to what standard etc on the other axis. (Alternatively a number of matrices could be prepared for each site (or group of sites) where the MPA is large and varied in its requirements (eg,. St Lucia, Table Mountain)
3. A section on planned expenditure per category (eg. operational and administrative costs, staffing, capital) and subcategories therein
4. The work plans will also contain the agreed format for reporting on their progress
5. The need for standardisation of some areas, for example scientific monitoring, has been noted as a realistic future challenge.

STATUS REGARDING MPA MANAGEMENT PLANS IN THE DIFFERENT MPA's

MPA	STATUS	RESPONSIBLE
West Coast, Langebaan, Bird Island, 16 Mile Beach		SANParks
Table Mountain	Strategic Plan	SANParks & MCM
Helderberg	No	MCM/Metro
Betty's Bay	No	CapeNature & MCM/WWF ¹
De Hoop	Yes	CapeNature & MCM/WWF
Stillbaai		CapeNature & MCM/WWF
Goukamma	Yes	CapeNature & MCM/WWF
Robberg	Yes	CapeNature & MCM/WWF
Tsitsikamma	No	SANParks
Sardinia Bay	No	MCM/Metro
Bird Island/Addo	In preparation	SANParks & WWF
Dwesa-Cwebe	Compliance plan	ECPB & MCM/WWF
Hluleka	Compliance plan	ECPB & MCM/WWF
Pondoland	Yes (needs discussion)	ECPB & MCM/WWF
Trafalgar	Yes (needs revision)	ECPB & MCM/WWF
Aliwal Shoal		
Isimangaliso	IMP being developed	Isimanagaliso- Brownyn James

¹ MCM/WWF refers to the MoU between DEAT: MCM and WWF. Funds from DEAT:MCM are received by WWF to implement and facilitate these management plans.

B. CAPACITY BUILDING FOR EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT

Lack of capacity and resources were identified as major constraints to effective management.

The following concerns regarding capacity issues currently facing MPA management were identified. Possible solutions were also identified and captured below:

Key Issue/Concern	Possible response/action
INTERNAL ISSUES	
1. Long working hours with lack of funding to make provision for overtime payments.	Introduce a creative system of flexi-working hours. Approach MCM and organizations such as WWF for funding.
2. Lack of capacity (one man stations) as well as recruitment of staff from terrestrial to marine environments and vice versa	Can exchange skills and knowledge within the different MPA, through MPA staff exchange programmes. The MPA forum will also be used as a tool to engage different MPA managers, and facilitate in the sharing of ideas, knowledge and where possible resources.
3. Lack of training in areas such as skipper licenses and scuba diving due to lack of staff will (fear, disinterest etc) and lack of funding.	More efforts need to be made to secure funding for such training activities. Outside funders to be approached where possible e.g. WWF. Important to recruit staff members that have passion and love for the marine environment who will be willing to partake in activities such as diving and driving of boats.
4. Lack of important management equipment such as boats and vehicles.	Explore possibilities of acquiring forfeited assets and exchanging of equipment. Managers were also advised to include such requirements into their operational budgets. WWF mentioned possibilities of working closely with Honda-Marine to make the process of acquiring equipment such as boats simpler and more cost effective.
5. Lack of sufficient support of MPA management activities within top structures of the different Conservation Organizations.	MPA/Senior managers within these organizations need to cultivate support for MPAs within their top structures.
6. Once-off training sessions with no follow-up	Managers and facilitators should ensure that training is continuous and that it will be used in the field or in the office situation.
EXTERNAL ISSUES	
7. Poor prosecution results at courts due to prosecutors unwillingness to commit to marine related crimes or/and lack of knowledge regarding marine related crimes.	Prosecutors should receive training regarding this. Managers of MPAs should also build strong relations and maintain open communication lines with prosecutors to ensure that they are always kept in the loop with regards to their court cases. Field trips to MPAs

	should also be encouraged so that prosecutors and the justice community at large get a better understanding of the marine and coastal environment as well as MPAs.
--	--

Further discussion points include:

- The MPA training was seen to be very helpful in sharing of ideas, gaining knowledge, discussion of stakeholder issues and interaction amongst colleagues.
- It was suggested that an MPA group be established with a hub of information related to MPAs – stakeholders could refer to this hub for any Q&A's related to MPAs.
- The language barrier needs to be resolved because some of MPA training attendees cannot understand and speak English.

C. BIODIVERSITY AND GENERAL MONITORING EFFECTIVENESS

Two key elements identified for Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) of MPAs:

1. Utilise MPAs as a tool to monitor the broader state of biodiversity, or state of our oceans - long term changes e.g. Climate Change. This is the primary role which SAEON will play i.e. they will host a centralised data base.
2. Utilise monitoring to check whether you're meeting specific objectives for your MPA – this is a measure of MPA effectiveness.

The following principles were agreed to regarding biodiversity monitoring processes:

- Monitoring should be effective to users
- Relate to object of management plans
- Management plan should have achievable targets and indicators to assist with monitoring
- Measurable targets within specific programmes e.g. enforcement
- Continue and improve or establish baseline data collection
- Managers/ecologists should refer to the IUCN monitoring guide for more information.

It was noted that there should be clear value and understanding on our MPAs. There is a need to assess whether MPAs fulfil their objectives or not.

- Albrecht Gotz from SAEON advised on a long term funding project to further develop monitoring in MPAs. However, he noted that funding was a constraint for monitoring projects.
- Link between SANParks and SAEON - SANParks aims to develop their own monitoring procedures/systems. Looking at interactions among government, biodiversity and monitoring issues.

The following points were discussed during the break-out discussion sessions:

GENERAL MONITORING IN MPA's- WHAT TO MONITOR?

What to monitor?	Indicators
Tourism + users ▪ Defining groups	▪ Numbers per group over time ▪ Demographics- foreign/local age

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comments + complaints (more active approach, where did you hear of?) ▪ Voluntarily opinion surveys (tool)
Compliance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minimum arrests vs maximum arrests = efficacy (decrease due to enforce or awareness efforts?) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transgressions (observed + prosecuted) ▪ Effort of staff monitoring (no. of patrols, resources used...) ▪ Successful/ failed prosecutions ▪ Permit sales
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Efficacy of interpretation information supplied ▪ Recreational monitors (coast care TMNP examples) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ School visits to reserve ▪ Articles in papers ▪ Transgressions reported by public ▪ Self-initiated visits by groups/ schools ▪ Outside tourism facility advertising MPA
Effort of staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Monthly report/production sheet ▪ Compare to work plan ▪ Use patrol reports to measure specific effort
Quality of data collected	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Primarily species ▪ User groups priority according to management plan objectives
Statistics from all reserves for high level reports	High level reports

Existing Monitoring Programmes of MPAs included the following:

Monitoring at St Lucia MPA:

What to monitor?	Who's responsibility	Funds
Surf-zone fish	Bruce Mann	ORI
Coral Reef	Mike Schleyer	ORI
Physical Oceanography	Mike Roberts	MCM
Reef Biodiversity (voluntary)	Kerry Sink	EKZN Wildlife/Isimangiliso
Intertidal and subsistence use	Jean Harris	EKZN Wildlife
Estuary: Bird and Fish		EKZN Wildlife

Monitoring at West Coast National Park:

What to monitor?	Who's responsibility	Funds
Fish catches	MCM	MCM
Linefish/juvenile fish	MCM	MCM
Seal/seabird interaction	MCM	MCM
Oceanography	MCM	MCM
Seabirds	MCM	MCM
Pollution	EM group, consultants	TRANSNET
Wader counts	SANParks/clubs/MCM/ADU	NEGLIGABLE ADU/SANParks

Monitoring at the Addo MPA:

What to monitor?	Who's responsibility	Funds
Estuaries Reef Fish Inverts (Intertidal) Plankton Soft sediment Temperature and currents	SAEON	Short term: SAEON Long term: SANParks
Seabird monitoring	MCM & SANParks	MCM & SANParks
Abalone monitoring	SAEON & SANParks	NRF & MCM
Reserve determination of Sunday's river	IECM	SANParks
Impacts of Coega	?	?
Linefish timeline	Bayworld (Smale)	Bayworld

Monitoring at the Tsitsikamma MPA:

What to monitor?	Who's responsibility	Funds
Shore angling	Paul Cowley	MCM
Intertidal/subtidal inverts & fish	SAEON	Short term: SAEON Long term: SANParks
Temperature & current	Mike Roberts: MCM	MCM
Proposed: monitor recreational fish	SANParks	SANParks

Monitoring at the De Hoop MPA:

What to monitor?	Who's responsibility	Funds
Shore angling/surf zone fish	MCM	MCM
Intertidal surveys	CapeNature	CapeNature/MCM
Whales	Peter Best	Various/Iziko Museum
Aerial biodiversity	CapeNature	CapeNature/MCM
Birds (Penguins)	CapeNature	CapeNature/MCM
Plastic Pollution	MCM	MCM
Mortalities	CapeNature	CapeNature/MCM

Monitoring at the De Hoop MPA:

What to monitor?	Who's responsibility	Funds
Shore angling/surf zone fish	MCM	MCM
Coastal monitors recreational use	SANParks/Coastcare	Coastcare/WWF
White Sharks	Sharks spotters	City of CT/WWF
Penguins	ADU/MCM	ADU/MCM
Abalone Crayfish Water quality	MCM	MCM
Oceanography	UCT	UCT
Proposed: Intertidal/subtidal inverts & fish	SAEON	Short term: SAEON Long term: SANParks

Way forward:

- Identify key monitoring programmes
- Data flow from management to specialist or analyst
- Database to be standardized
- Develop management effectiveness tracking tool
- Liesel appointed to take responsibility of the database establishment
- Annual analysis as a motivation tool
- Annual analysis between reserves

D. DEVELOPING NEW CORPORATE PARTNERSHIPS AND SUPPORT STRUCTURES

The following Organisations, State Departments, Industries were identified as potential partners and support structures.

- WWF-SA
- SAPS
- SANDF
- AFU
- Industry
- Organs of State
- Scorpions
- Municipalities
- Conservancies
- Honorary FCO's
- Scientific Observers
- Community conservation groups
- General Public

E. A NATIONAL MPA AWARENESS CAMPAIGN

There was a general consensus that our MPAs need to be show cased to the South African public as well as internationally. The following key points capture the discussion:

- Ways in which Islands can be incorporated into MPA awareness campaigns have to be explored, as they (islands) are often overlooked and there is very little known about them by the general public.
- Must look at the crucial spin-offs in the management partnerships- the public is willing to participate but not given opportunities
- Need to acquire buy-in from managers for this campaign – promotional material for MPAs developed i.e. DVD's, brochures, posters.
- The lack of organisational support for marine conservation. Restriction of film-makers due to high fees required for access – result in a big loss of an educational value of MPAs.
- Dr Nel, Dr Attwood, Dr Branch and Mr Peschak should put forward a plan of action document which will be distributed to MPA managers.
- A campaign is planned for 2009, especially to educate and create awareness around MPA's (2009 Year of the MPA Campaign). Ideas around educational materials were provided e.g. website, radio, MPA generic stories, workshops with stakeholders, publication of book, TV etc. It was also noted that approaches to creating awareness around MPAs will be unique to each area and MPA due to cultural, language, political, socio-economic factors. Inland

provinces are also to be targeted during this campaign, as they also derive some benefits from the coast and they also visit the coast.

F. DEVELOPING COMMUNITY BENEFITS

Managers from the different MPAs agreed that it was imperative to create benefits for communities adjacent MPAs. This will not only improve the lives of the concerned communities, but also to gain their support for MPAs.

3. APPDICES I & II

APPENDIX I

LIST AND SUMMARIES OF PRESENTATIONS THAT WERE GIVEN DURING THE COURSE OF THE WORKSHOP

- PRESENTATION 1: Key objectives of WWF-SA in supporting MPA management by Dr Nel (WWF)
- PRESENTATION 2: State of Protected Areas Management in SA. – Text of presentation at MPA Managers Forum (26-28 Nov 2007) and also submitted to the People and Parks meeting (not presented though) by Dr Alan Boyd (MCM)

There are a number of national planning processes on the go that apply to all protected areas, terrestrial and aquatic, and these should be noted before focusing on Marine PAs. These include the "National Protected Area Expansion Strategy' (NPAES) which is being developed by the Biodiversity and Conservation branch within DEAT which includes marine protected areas. This would take forward the expansion part of the National Biodiversity Framework document and the National Spatial Biodiversity Assessment. A well-attended workshop was held in Cape Town in August 2007 on the Marine component of the strategy – and a report on this was compiled and can be emailed to persons on request. This meeting noted the recent developments and their outputs in various areas, such as in KZN (Sea-Plan) and the Agulhas Bioregion study which indicate what detail is available for planning. In addition Kerry Sink of SANBI is coordinating a planning process for Offshore MPAs.

Secondly, the "People and Parks" forum aims to make sure that communities living in parks, or adjacent to them, whether they are land-owners in terms of successful land claims or not, enjoy direct benefits from the Parks. The idea is not that this "be done for them" but rather that it "be done together with them". There are obviously differences in priority between initiatives such as People and Parks and the NPAES, and one of the ways of resolving them is through various co-management approaches.

Moving on to MPAs only now, there have been substantial developments in making MPA management a funded mandate for the Agencies concerned. This is a significant development and we now have four of our planned "big five" contracts in place – with iSimangaliso, Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife, EC Parks Board, and Cape Nature covering 11 of our 19 MPAs. We still await signature with SANParks – although DEAT support is being given on an interim basis for services rendered. Then there are the two smaller MPAs of Helderberg and Sardinia Bay, which will probably see contracts for partial support being entered into with Metros. A review of key challenges facing the various MPAs was then presented.

- PRESENTATION 3: The latest science in the contribution of marine protected areas (MPAs) to fishery management by Dr Colin Attwood (UCT)

International news. A recent focus of fisheries research is the disproportionately large role of big fish in the production of recruits. Research over the last ten years on many fish species show that (1) large fish produce more eggs (per gram of fish) than small fish, (2) spawn more times over the season, (3) produce larger eggs with a higher fat content and (4) produce fitter larvae. The larvae are fitter because they are endowed with more fat to last them whilst they search for their own, exogenous food supply. Some of these trends have been found in locally in silverfish and white stumpnose. Large fish are the first to disappear when a stock is exploited. Marine protected areas are regarded as the most effective means of conserving old fish.

Fishing is an agent of selection, typically causing fish to mature earlier and grow slower. This effect has been proven experimentally and has been demonstrated for a few northern hemisphere species of fish. The response partly compensates for the removal of large, spawning fish, and is not reversible over the short term. MPAs are a possible mechanism to allow for the restoration of natural selection pressures for large fish and late-maturation. MPAs may also be used to preserve genetic diversity.

Recently the use of MPAs in fisheries has also been criticised. MPAs may displace fishing effort, such that the recoveries we see in MPAs are counter-balanced by exceptionally heavy pressure been placed in adjacent areas, leading to little or no net benefit. Such may be the case where fisheries are quota or effort controlled. Actual evidence of improved fishing caused by MPAs is hard to find – this is mostly because it is very difficult to set up the proper Before-After-Control-Impact design, and to replicate this sufficiently, because of the large size of MPAs, the long time periods required to detect recovery, and the difficulty of locating comparable sites. Fishery benefits are frequently predicted by modelling. MPAs will also create challenges for stock assessment, by altering the distribution of resources, and preventing access to certain fractions of the stock.

Local scientific findings. Studies on a number of fish species illustrate the various ways in which MPAs benefit fisheries and conservation.

White steenbras increased at Koppie Alleen in the De Hoop MPA after the first seven years after closure, but thereafter it has continued to decline in concert with the abundance at Lekkerwater, which was never exploited. White steenbras at De Hoop is substantially more abundant than at other sites. These results suggest that the MPA can conserve juvenile white steenbras but that the MPA alone cannot halt the decline in this migratory species. Its demise is a combination of estuarine degradation and over-fishing on the post-recruits.

White stumpnose is another species with a complex movement pattern. It undertakes a short migration prior to the spawning season, but for the rest of the year it displays station-keeping behaviour. Although the MPA at Langebaan protects only a small portion of the lagoon, white stumpnose use this area frequently. The MPA substantially reduces fishing mortality, and is probably the reason why the Langebaan population is able to sustain an intensive fishery. Other white stumpnose fisheries have collapsed.

Elf is an example of a migratory species which has changed behaviour in a MPA. At De Hoop a resident population of elf has emerged. The selective advantage of

remaining in the sanctuary outweighs the advantage of migrating to KwaZulu-Natal. The result of residency is that an over-wintering population has emerged and increased in the MPA. Evidence is based on catch rates, seasonality, size-structure and recapture frequencies.

Finally, some research has focussed on the role of MPAs in linefish stock assessment, which is presently in a diabolical state. Despite being described variously as over-exploited, collapsed, protected and threatened, linefish are not being adequately assessed. Some important species have only been assessed once or twice, making it difficult if not impossible to infer trends. In some cases the assessment is two decades out of date. MPAs can be used as a basis for comparative assessment, where initial base-line values are not available.

- PRESENTATION 4: Capacity building and way forward by Aaniyah Omaidien (WWF)

All of the major South African MPAs staff completed the WWF Rhodes MPA training. This includes approximately 120 people from SANParks, CapeNature, The City of Cape Town, DEAT: MCM, local community members etc.

WWF is in the process of accrediting the course through the THETA, and the possibility of accreditation in retrospect is being explored. Further training particularly in the Eastern Cape is a priority for the future.

Lawrence Sisitka has been working closely with WIOMSA and the South African MPA training has largely influenced the WIOMSA MPA training course which will be advertised and nominations called upon during 2008.

- PRESENTATION 5: Marine Protected Area Management mandates and operational arrangements by Dr Alan Boyd (DEAT: MCM)

The primary documentation which authorises how an MPA is to be managed is the gazette (Government Notice) by which it was declared. That Notice declares the MPA as required by the Marine Living Resources Act, 1998 (Act No. 18 of 1998). It contains the objectives of the MPA, definitions of terms where needed, boundaries of the MPA and zonation. (e.g. where fishing may not take place).

MPAs are managed to a large extent and particularly as regards compliance, on the basis of the gazette together with Section 43 and other relevant provisions of the Marine Living Resources Act. MLRA regulations, relating to bag limits, gear and all other compliance matters for recreational and subsistence fishers who fish in controlled zones in MPAs apply in those areas unless specific regulations relating to MPAs provide for further limitations. This would also apply to rules and measures regulating non-consumptive use.

In addition legal contracts can mandate an agency such as SANParks or CapeNature to carry out a range of management tasks within an MPA or set of MPAs. The agency would be mandated in keeping with the requirement under the Protected Areas Act that where marine and terrestrial protected areas share common boundaries, the same authority should manage them both.

Management plans have been formally prepared for a small number of MPAs and basically seek to describe how the MPA should be managed in the light of all the above regulations. They aim to be a useful guide to actions and only would become binding if and when the Department (MCM) formally signs off on them. They aim to ensure that the MPA is as well managed in practise based on the requirements of the gazette, MLRA and regulations and management plan (where available). The contracts referred to above also require annual workplans for each MPA which are valid for one year and describe the activities and funding. Although not the right way in theory, in practise the recent experience gained in developing and applying workplans will definitely lead to better and more relevant management plans.

- PRESENTATION 6: Monitoring in MPAs- Tsitsikamma and other sites by Dr Ali Göltz (SAEON). No summary available.
- PRESENTATION 7: Civil society and their role in marine conservation by Dr Kerry Sink (WWF/SANBI). No summary available.
- PRESENTATION 8: Legislative Background to Compliance and Enforcement in Marine Protected Areas- summary of a presentation delivered at the Marine Protected Area Forum (DEAT & WWF). No summary available.
- PRESENTATION 9: Practical compliance challenges by Mr Pinky Gqirana of MCM No summary available.
- PRESENTATION 10: Showcasing South Africa's MPAs by Thomas Peschak. Photographic showcase. No summary required.
- PRESENTATION 11: Co-management approaches to conservation, frameworks and case studies by Coral Bijoux (Isimangaliso). No summary available.

APPENDIX II

ATTENDANCE REGISTER

SURNAME, INITIAL & ORGANISATION	CONTACT NUMBER	E-MAIL ADDRESS
1. Dr Boyd (MCM)	021 402 3307	ajboyd@deat.gov.za
2. Ms R. Persad (MCM)	021 402 3537	rpersad@deat.gov.za
3. Ms N. Mpongoma (MCM)	021 402 3413	nmpongoma@deat.gov.za
4. Ms L. Swart (MCM)		lswart@deat.gov.za
5. Ms L. Janson (MCM)		ljanson@deat.gov.za
6. Mr P Goosen (MCM)		pgoosen@deat.gov.za
7. Mr P. Gqirana (MCM)		pgqirana@deat.gov.za
8. Dr D. Nel (WWF-SA)	082 891 1038	dnel@wwf.org.za
9. Ms A. Omadien (WWF-SA)		aomadien@wwf.org.za
10. Ms S. Paul (WWF-SA)		spaul@wwf.org.za
11. Mr T. Peschak (WWF-SA)		
12. Dr C. Attwood (UCT/WWF-SA Advisor)	021 650 3612	Colin.Attwood@uct.ac.za
13. Dr K. Sink (SANBI/WWF-SA Advisor)	082 831 0536	skink@mweb.co.za
14. Mr P. Chadwick (CapeNature)		peter@capenature.co.za
15. Mr A. McDonald (CapeNature)		Amacdona@capenature.co.za
16. Mr K. Spencer (CapeNature)		keith@capenature.co.za
17. Mr A. Woolfaard (CapeNature)		awoolfaardt@capenature.co.za
18. Ms L. Waller (CapeNature)		Lwaller@capenature.co.za
19. Dr A. Oosthuizen (SANParks)	083 540 8200	A.oosthuizen@sanparks.org
20. Mr P. Sieben (SANParks)		pauls@sanparks.org
21. Dr A. Götz (SAEON)		Albrecht@saeon.ac.za
22. Ms T. Gumede (EKZNW)		gumedet@kznwildlife.com
23. Dr P. Snyman		psnijman@mweb.co.za
24. Mr P. Hartley (Isimangaliso)	035 590 1633	hartelypete@gmail.com
25. Ms C. Bijoux (Isimangaliso)		coral@isimangaliso.com
26. Mr J. du Toit (CCT)		Jacques.Dutoit@capetown.gov.za
27. Ms J. du Toit		jdutoit@capebiosphere.co.za
28. M. Kostauli (ECPB)	079 496 7971	mzwabantu@ecparksboard.co.za
29. Nick Scholtz (Lower Breede Cons)	028 537 1296	
30. A. Louw (Lower Breede Cons)	084 550 5809	nikilouw@mweb.co.za
31. Deon Geldenhuys (CapeNature)	028 314 0062	dgoldenhuys@capenature.co.za
32. Jean du Plessis (CapeNature)	082 496 2522	jdp@telkomsa.net
33. Stiaan Conradie (Lower Breede Cons)	082 825 6172	lbrconservancy@telkomsa.net
34. Nickel Fortuin (CapeNature)	028 542 1114	nfortuin@capenature.co.za
35. Sindiswa Nobula (CapeNature)	028 542 1114	snobula@capenature.co.za
36. Lesley Ann Williams (CapeNature)	028 542 1114	
37. Lwazi Ngewu (CapeNature)	028 542 1114	
38. August Hess (CapeNature)	028 542 1114	

39. Willem Dowrey(CapeNature)	028 542 1114	
40. David Davids(CapeNature)	028 542 1114	
41. Nathan St. Clair-Laing(TMNP)	021 706 5656	
42. Kyle Kelly(TMNP)	072 724 2315	
43. Cheryl Samantha Owen (Independent)	079 719 7040	csowen@ifrica.com
44. Rhett Hiseman(CapeNature)	082 771 9107	rhiseman@telkom.net
45. Sam Ndlovu (KZN Wildlife)		sndlovu@kznwildlife.com
46. Eben Lourens(CapeNature)	044 533 2125	robkeur@mweb.co.za