

## MPA EFFECTIVENESS WORKSHOP REPORT

Pine Lodge Conference Centre, Port Elizabeth, 27 October 2016

### Background

The workshop was preceded by a presentation from Dr Kirkman on 25 October 2016 during the MPA Forum at the Dolphin Leap Conference Centre, Port Elizabeth [Kirkman SP, Duncan J, Adams R, Holness S “Marine protected areas in South Africa: why, who and how?”].

The presentation introduced the project and its aims, namely (i) Determine extent to which SA’s existing MPAs and MPA network meet goals/objectives; (ii) Provide advice relevant to improving MPA planning, monitoring and evaluation of effectiveness to enable adaptive management.

A summary of the specific objectives for all the MPAs (drawn from gazettes and management plans) was presented. It was shown that generally, the MPA objectives were consistent with national-level MPA goals as could be determined from legislation and policy, and could be categorised in the broad goals of (i) Protection (biodiversity, habitat); (ii) Fisheries management; (iii) Utilisation; (iv) Research and monitoring; (v) Education; (vi) Cultural heritage; (vii) Governance.

However, many of the specific objectives were shown to be unclear and difficult to evaluate effectiveness against. This formed the backdrop of the workshop, where MPA authorities, scientists and other stakeholders were brought to debate and provide input into how we should go about determining goals, objectives and associated indicators to measure effectiveness against.

### Introductions

The workshop was introduced and facilitated by Mr John Duncan (WWF) assisted by Dr Kirkman (DEA) and Mr Robin Adams (WWF). Notes were captured by Ms Sally Sivewright (DEA) and Ms Imogen Weidemann (DEA). The attendance register for the workshop (Annex 1) and the agenda (Annex 2) for the forum are attached.

### Goals vs objectives

#### *Hierarchical approach*

It was agreed that effectiveness could be assessed both at the level of the network and individual MPAs, and both are important in their own right. I.e. a hierarchical approach is necessary, including effectiveness of the network and of individual MPA. It was agreed that higher level objectives (goals) are informed by legislation and policy. These currently include: Protection, Fisheries Management, Utilisation, Research and Monitoring, Education (Objective: Provide sites where field-based education can be undertaken), Cultural Heritage (Objective: Protect cultural heritage) and Governance (Objective: Diminish conflict from competing uses of areas). It was also agreed that individual MPAs

require specific objectives that are informed by the goals and that concrete and settled objectives were needed to bring certainty to the sector and assist in validation of MPAs. These should be included in management plans and would speak to higher level goals that are gazetted.

### *Weighting of objectives*

Weighting of objectives in assessing effectiveness was not a supported idea because weighting could be misconstrued as bias. I.e. one group of objectives (e.g. community/ stakeholder) should not be weighted as more important than another (e.g. biodiversity). However, there should at least be structures in place to support the objectives, explicitly state the key roles of the MPA, and measure/evaluate success of MPA (baseline survey and follow-up). The size of MPAs needs to be taken into account, i.e. small MPA such as Betty's Bay with few attributes should not be compared with a large MPA with more attributes such as Pondoland, rather each should be evaluated in terms of achievement of their own objectives.

## **The way forward**

### *Partnerships*

Partnerships for the project are being developed between DEA, SANBI, WWF and Coastal and Marine Research (NMMU) for the project. DEA's National Marine Biodiversity Scientific Working Group (NMBSWG) is the reference group for the project. A task team is being developed under the NMBSWG to support the project.

### *Review*

A review is being conducted by Stephen Kirkman and Samantha Petersen of local and global literature looking at how goals and objectives for MPAs are set, how effectiveness of MPAs are measured against these including determining of indicators, targets and methodological approaches of evaluation, and application with regard to the South African situation.

---

### *Follow up workshop and document*

A further workshop shall be held in February or March 2017. Prior to this a discussion document shall be circulated, based on the above draft review and taking into account comments and suggestion from the workshop on 27 October. The document draft goals, objectives, indicators and targets, and possible methodologies for assessment, which shall be work-shopped.

The goal would be to work towards a clear cohesive national level plan, which could be a supplemental guideline document to the Protected Areas Act.