

1

A New Future for Marine Conservation

SEASCAPES



Proceedings of the Annual Seascapes Strategy Workshop

KRI ISLAND, PAPUA, INDONESIA
AUGUST 13–18, 2007



CONSERVATION
INTERNATIONAL

ABOUT CI AND CI'S MARINE PROGRAMS

About Conservation International

Conservation International (CI) believes that the Earth's natural heritage must be maintained if future generations are to thrive spiritually, culturally, and economically. Our mission is to conserve the Earth's living heritage, our global biodiversity, and to demonstrate that human societies are able to live harmoniously with nature.

About Conservation International's Marine Program

Conservation International (CI) began marine conservation work in 1987 with the establishment of the ongoing program in the Gulf of California, Mexico. The marine portfolio expanded through the marine rapid assessment program (marine RAP) to explore and document marine biological diversity. A milestone in the development of CI's marine program was the Defying Ocean's End conference in Los Cabos, Mexico in 2003. Since then, CI's marine program has grown exponentially through the Global Marine Species Assessment (GMSA), in collaboration with IUCN and other partners, the Marine Management Area Science Program (MMAS), the Seascapes Program, regional marine programs, the Sea Turtle Flagship Program and through efforts to establish a Global Marine Partnership Fund (GMPF). Strategy and innovation are two hallmarks of CI's marine program and our efforts rest firmly on CI's strategic pillars of science, partnership and human well-being. We use science to set our priorities through the GMSA which aims to determine the conservation status of 20,000 marine species by 2010 and hence allow for a global marine hotspot analysis and for the definition of marine Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs). We also use science to improve our work and to inform management through the MMAS Program. Over 30 scientific studies will be completed within the next couple of years and will greatly increase our understanding of how natural and human systems interact and how we can optimize marine managed area success. CI facilitates marine species, habitat and corridor conservation through regional marine programs and the Seascapes Program. Our next benchmark will be the establishment of a Global Marine Partnership Fund which will allow for a great expansion of marine conservation efforts in priority Seascapes around the world. CI's marine program is integrated throughout the organization with components in all Divisions, in our Centers for Biodiversity Conservation (CBCs) and regional offices, and in an expanding number of countries and regions where we work.

About Conservation International's Seascape Program

CI's Seascapes Program promotes comprehensive marine management at a scale that significantly advances current marine protected area management regimes. The Seascape vision includes enhancing the stewardship of the abundance and diversity of fish and other marine wildlife in the Seascapes as well as using the experience and example of the Seascapes to reinforce and enhance the legal and policy authorities for marine conservation. Successfully addressing the global threats to marine biodiversity will require planning and implementing Seascapes - significantly larger management regimes that spread across regions and ecosystems, ensure sustainable resource use, and maintain the ecosystem services and functions upon which we depend. In the Future for Life Campaign, CI commits to engage in five Seascapes in marine biodiversity priority regions of the world. So far, CI's Seascape Program has major investments in Bird's Head Seascape, the Eastern Tropical Pacific Seascape and the Sulu-Sulawesi Seascape. CI and other organizations are now actively promoting large marine management areas to expand conservation and marine stewardship and to encourage large scale investments at national and international levels.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This publication and the workshop it describes were made possible with the generous support of the Walton Family Foundation, through Conservation International. Special thanks to Bill Fischelis for serving as facilitator, to Amalia Firman for recording the presentations and discussions, to Niquole Esters, Frazer McGilvray and Laurencia Citra for logistical arrangements and assistance and to Ginny Farmer for compiling and editing these proceedings.

Cover photograph: Manta Ray in Raja Ampat, Bird's Head Seascape, Indonesia. Taken by Sterling Zumbrunn

Suggested Citation: Conservation International. 2007. Proceedings of the Annual Seascapes Strategy Workshop, held August 13-18, 2007, in Kri Island, Papua, Indonesia. Conservation International, Arlington, VA, USA.

Table of Contents

About CI and CI's Marine Programs	
Acknowledgements	
List of workshop participants	ii
Preface	iii
Background and Introduction	iv
Planning, Project Management and Partnerships	1
Governance	7
Enforcement	9
Reporting and Database Management	13
Private Sector Engagement/Market-Based Initiatives	15
Species Conservation	19
Sustainable Financing	21
Seascape Definition	23
The Future of Seascape	25
Identification and Development of New Seascapes	27
Marine Protected Area Creation	29
Management Effectiveness Monitoring	35
Indigenous and Traditional Peoples Initiative	39
Global Marine Partnership Fund	39
Marine Communications	41

LIST OF WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

Moonyeen Alava
Marine Species Specialist
CI Philippines

Lisa Bailey
Marine Communications Manager
Global Communications

Deb Bass
Marine Specialist
Melanesia CBC

Rob Bensted-Smith
Executive Director
Andes CBC

Leah Bunce
Senior Director
Marine Management Areas Science
Program

Theresa Buppert
Technical Advisor
Indigenous and Traditional Peoples
Initiative

María Claudia Díazgranados
Marine Program Coordinator
CI Colombia

Guilherme Dutra
Marine Program Director
CI Brazil

Graham Edgar
Natural Sciences Advisor

Mark Erdmann
Senior Advisor
CI Indonesia

Niquole Esters
Research Associate
Regional Marine Strategies

Amalia Firman
Marine Communication
Specialist
CI Indonesia

Bill Fischelis
Facilitator
CI Philippines

Scott Henderson
Director of Marine
Conservation
Andes/Eastern Tropical Pacific

Chris Jameson
Manager
Global Marine Partnership
Fund

Chris Margules
Executive Director
Melanesia CBC

Frazer McGilvray
Senior Manager
Regional Marine Strategies

Roger McManus
Vice President of Marine
Programs

Ketut Sarjana Putra
Marine Director
CI Indonesia

Marco Quesada
Project Coordinator
CI Costa Rica

Milidel Quibilan
Marine Areas Specialist
CI Philippines

Atty. Ferdinand Quicho
Executive Director
First Philippines Conservation
Inc.

Manuel Ramírez
Senior Director
Southern MesoAmerica

Philippe Razafinjatovo
Marine Program Coordinator
CI Madagascar

Sebastian Troëng
Senior Director
Regional Marine Strategies

Sheila Vergara
Senior Marine Biodiversity
Specialist
CI Philippines

Preface


The Seascapes Program represents a new future for conservation in marine biodiversity priority regions of the world. The vision of a Seascape as a large marine managed region in which government authorities, private organizations and other stakeholders cooperate to conserve the diversity and abundance of marine life, and to promote human well-being, is ambitious and aims to push the limits of what is possible in the realm of marine conservation. It is clear that bold action is needed to reverse the current trends in the marine environment, with the ongoing declines in populations and species, degradation of habitats and ecosystems and loss of diversity and ecosystem services. Conservation International and our marine team have been privileged by being given the opportunity to pursue such an audacious concept and to put it into practice. The first and largest environmental grant from the Walton Family Foundation has made possible the work in three Seascapes – Bird’s Head, Eastern Tropical Pacific, and the Sulu-Sulawesi Seascapes.

With the privilege comes responsibility and as you will read these proceedings you will see that CI’s marine team takes the Seascapes Program very seriously. We are committed to learning from our experience in implementing the Seascapes Program and to sharing this experience with our many partners and with all those who are interested in large scale marine management. We will continue to adjust our strategies and approaches in the Seascapes to make sure we maximize marine conservation outcomes.

The Seascapes Program has fully embraced CI’s strategic pillars of science, partnership and human well-being. I would particularly like to highlight the progress made in building strong partnerships in the Seascapes. Partnership is a smart way of doing conservation – it builds capacity in the civil society to ensure conservation outcomes are sustained beyond the period of CI investment and it allows for conservation successes to be multiplied by our many partners. The central role of partnerships in the Seascapes can be highlighted by the fact that there are more than 100 partner organizations and institutions involved in implementing the three Seascapes. One example of our commitment to partnerships is in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Seascape where 60% of the funds we have raised have gone directly to our partners through grants and other support.

The Annual Seascapes Strategy Workshop is a good example of how we continuously review and share lessons learned in order to improve our work. These proceedings reflect the wisdom of many highly committed people working in three Seascapes and provide guidance for how we should select other regions in which to engage to meet CI’s *Future of Life* Campaign goal of engaging in five Seascapes around the world.

I would like to thank the professional and extremely dedicated team of marine conservationists working in the three Seascapes – both CI staff and our many partners. Together we will change the future for marine conservation and through publications such as this share the experience so it can be replicated in many other marine priority regions on the planet.



Peter Seligmann, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer

Background and Introduction

The aim of the 2007 Seascapes Workshop was to identify and communicate the successes and lessons learned by the Seascapes; to determine the essential elements of the Seascapes Program over the next five years and to develop a clear path forward, both for the improvement of existing Seascapes and for the initiation of new Seascapes; and to address key issues such as measuring management effectiveness, communication, reporting and database management, sustainable financing, partnerships and private sector participation. This document represents the final report of the workshop.

Opening Remarks by Roger McManus

Roger McManus welcomed the participants to the meeting, and spoke about how he hoped we could achieve all the work we have before us in the coming week, especially given the spectacular location we found ourselves in. He gave a brief introduction to the issues to be addressed and briefed participants on his recent discussions with the Walton Family Foundation and the creation of CI's Marine Advisory Council.

Regarding discussions with the Walton Family Foundation, Roger mentioned that they would like to see a better matrix for easy understanding and tracking of the Seascapes Program, particularly highlighting the successes that each Seascape has achieved. The foundation board members would also like to see the program develop more market-based initiatives.

CI President and CEO, Peter Seligmann, has initiated the establishment of a Marine Advisory Council with a focus on corporate engagement in marine conservation. He has asked Bill Wrigley of the Wrigley Company and Greg Stone with the New England Aquarium to serve as co-chairs of the group, with Roger McManus leading CI staff support. Development of the group is proceeding and we anticipate its launch in 2008.

Roger wished the participants a successful and fruitful meeting, and turned the floor back to the facilitator.

Planning, Project Management & Partnerships

Introductory remarks: Scott Henderson

Background:

In planning for the future of the Seascape strategy, it is critical to examine past successes and challenges, and to identify the components that comprise a successful project. Learning from past iterations is central to adaptive management.

Aims:

- ▶ Identify the challenges and necessary modifications to Seascape planning;
- ▶ Identify the challenges and necessary modifications to Seascape management and implementation;
- ▶ Discuss barriers to involvement by other NGOs; and
- ▶ Examine CI's role as implementer versus grantor.

Synthesis:

To effectively plan, manage and implement Seascapes, we need to be clear about our aims. For this reason, it is necessary to revisit the consensus definition of a Seascape: Seascapes are large multiple-use marine areas, defined scientifically and strategically, in which government authorities, private organizations and other stakeholders cooperate to conserve the diversity and abundance of marine life, and to promote human well-being. Seascapes typically have high biological diversity, ecological and economic connectivity, and aesthetic and cultural values. Seascapes may include government-authorized protected areas for addressing special management needs, and provide an opportunity for government agencies to coordinate their efforts voluntarily to secure more effective regional management programs.

Within this definition, CI may play a variety of important roles: we may serve as a catalyst in initially proposing and promoting the Seascape concept; we serve as a facilitator, making links between actors and facilitating key processes; we provide guidance and technical support; we implement projects; and we raise and disperse funds.

What are we trying to accomplish when we plan? On one hand we are charting a course, but we are also creating an enabling environment. The way we plan has a direct impact on how well we manage and implement that plan. Key elements in a thorough plan include:

- ▶ Lines of action;
- ▶ Timelines;
- ▶ Roles and responsibilities;
- ▶ Budgets;
- ▶ Results measures; and
- ▶ Reporting terms.

Creating a good plan will involve analyzing the problem, developing a strategy, optimizing the level of detail and complexity, building-in flexibility, establishing milestones and an appropriate level of ambition. A high level of participation is also key, as often, the more heads we have around the table, the better the results. Similarly, the planning process can help us increase ownership through consultation and consensus.

As project managers, we have a dual commitment. We are trying to implement the plan, and trying to achieve results. Often, but not always, these commitments are the same. Some times, in order to achieve the desired results, we need to deviate from the plan. In such cases, flexibility is critical. Additional elements vital to effective implementation include generating support, solving problems, showing results through reporting, and maintaining the team's energy, will, persistence and commitment to overcome barriers and do something new.

Seascope managers face a variety of challenges in the planning and implementation of large scale marine conservation. Large geographic scale is an inherent challenge in the Seascope program. Even the smallest Seascope covers an extensive area, presenting challenges to communication, coordination and implementation. Similarly, the thematic range of any Seascope is daunting. We are trying to implement a governance system that is operating on a regional scale across the full range of stakeholders and all of the issues that have to be dealt with to achieve marine effective conservation. Finally, partner diversity poses the challenges of overcoming the barriers to greater NGO involvement and interfacing with governments at the local, regional and national levels.

Following this introduction to the key components and challenges of planning and implementing Seascopes, we proceeded to identify the components of each Seascope that have led to success. The following summarizes the components of success for each of the three Seascopes.

Sulu-Sulawesi Seascope (SSS):

- ▶ Utilized a consultative process at multiple scales (local, provincial, national, and regional) during CI Seascope planning;
- ▶ Took a multi-stakeholder approach, consulting all stakeholders in all Marine Biodiversity Conservation Corridors, and deriving the need for management from this consultative process;
- ▶ Developed strategies for both the overall Seascope and for each corridor;
- ▶ Supports all ten objectives of the Sulu-Sulawesi Marine Ecoregion (SSME) conservation plan facilitated by WWF, and avoiding conflicts with existing efforts;
- ▶ Employed two modes of implementation: granting and CI led activities;
- ▶ Collaborated with other NGOs (particularly in Indonesia), finding a niche for CI in places where other NGOs are already present and implementing conservation;

- ▶ Government hosted the initial events instead of CI, bringing more local government actors to the table; and
- ▶ Focuses on shallow coastal reefs and less on the deep ocean.

Eastern Tropical Pacific Seascape (ETPS):

- ▶ Succeeded in building coalitions and partnerships at the site level (especially in Mesoamerica, less in Galapagos);
- ▶ Collaborated with principal actors at the site level, building strong commitment to the Seascape Program;
- ▶ CI connected well with existing national processes, although we should have conducted more analysis regarding what was going on in marine governance in all four countries. Even though we had not planned it, during implementation we were able to learn about and to respect existing mandates so governments were comfortable with this process;
- ▶ Built relationships with every government, and then built up into regional coordination;
- ▶ ETPS concept is not owned by CI. Governments of four of the countries were talking about the need for joint management for several years before CI came in. ETPS is a government led initiative;
- ▶ Overcame initial resentment by empowering partners, and creating networks in the region (communications, tourism, MPA managers, turtles, sharks and ecological monitoring researchers);
- ▶ Currently opening new doors, talking with private sector groups in constructive ways;
- ▶ Communicated constructively, offering help;
- ▶ Built in low hanging fruit to show quick success and grow support.
- ▶ Understood organizations' strengths and weaknesses;
- ▶ Large area management, like Seascapes, is not an exclusively bottom up process. Multi-nation Seascapes may be different from single nation Seascapes in this respect;
- ▶ Public and private organizations have started doing things that reflect the Seascape vision;
- ▶ Must think strategically about who needs to be engaged when, not necessarily approaching the person at the top first; and
- ▶ Established a degree of credibility at each level.

Papuan Bird's Head Seascape (BHS):

- ▶ Obtained buy-in from other NGOs;
- ▶ Engaged in Ecosystem Based Management at the regional level;
- ▶ Identified management units within the Seascape;
- ▶ Approached and obtained buy-in at a higher (provincial) level first;
- ▶ Clearly acknowledged the extent of Seascape resources and focus;
- ▶ Focused on sustainability and connectivity;

- ▶ Empowered partners within different sectors, and at different scales;
- ▶ Maintained a consistent message; and
- ▶ Worked incrementally. We worked in Raja Ampat first, and now other areas want to become part of the program. Based on the lessons we have learned with the first few regencies, we (those involved in the initial Seascope sites) will set rules for new regencies to become part of the club.

Although all three Seascapes have experienced success as a result of the above mentioned key components, we have all faced challenges as well. After identifying the components of a successful Seascope, we identified the primary challenges and discussed how each has been, or might be, addressed.

Challenge: Initially private sectors hesitated to work with CI because of how CI was perceived internationally (CI's global message).

Possible solutions:

- ▶ ETPS is now involving non-conservation key actors and non-traditional partners that were not involved in the beginning; and
- ▶ Start with stakeholder analysis: identify those who are involved.

Challenge: CI's communication materials suggested an imposing agenda, which created resistance.

Possible solutions:

- ▶ Build in low hanging fruit to show quick success; and
- ▶ Be aware of what you are going to do next.

Challenge: Initiating a Seascope in a new area with no previous institutional presence will pose additional challenges to coalition building.

Challenge: Generating collaboration and joint action between various governments has been a challenge in the multi-national Seascopes.

Possible solutions:

- ▶ Think strategically about who needs to be engaged when, not necessarily starting from the top, but establishing credibility at each level; and
- ▶ Involve the stakeholders at the beginning of the project.

Challenge: Involving stakeholders at different scales (local, national, regional) and from different sectors (tourism, fishery, environment, and others).

Challenge: Difficult to sell biological ideas to private sectors that focus more on profits.

Challenge: Geographically impossible to involve all stakeholders.

Possible solutions:

- ▶ Promote as Ecosystem Based Management (EBM) concept to partners and apply the concept at a regional level;
- ▶ Need buy-in from the highest level of authority (governor);
- ▶ Utilize political momentum to introduce the ideas of large scale marine management which will be accepted by the provincial government;
- ▶ In the Bird's Head Seascape, CI focused on Raja Ampat in the beginning, and now other regencies such as Triton Bay support the concept;
- ▶ Need to approach multi level hierarchies in the country (national, province and district).
- ▶ Some policy needs to be influenced at the national level;
- ▶ Present MPA to community as a protected area that is managed by them;
- ▶ Utilize national agenda to get the support from the national government;
- ▶ Key driving force in Bird's Head Seascape: empowerment at provincial and community levels; and
- ▶ Empowerment can be applied to other/new Seascapes at all scales and with all sectors.

Challenge: Facilitation versus implementation. Partners are not keen when they think that CI is claiming success after only providing funds.

Possible solutions:

- ▶ Provide technical assistance or consultancy in addition to funds;
- ▶ Provide intellectual contributions;
- ▶ Be part of the conservation processes; and
- ▶ For large NGOs, we should perhaps not provide grants, but focus more on partnerships.

Key recommendations:

- ▶ Document relevant non-traditional partners and stakeholders for the benefit of future Seascapes;
- ▶ Focus on low hanging fruit to create early successes;
- ▶ Transform the conservation leadership and invest in people to generate sustainability.
- ▶ Maintain flexibility and apply adaptive management;
- ▶ Develop strategic and 'simple' communication focusing on the Seascape concept and impacts; and
- ▶ Empowerment is key. Particularly when looking at multi-national Seascapes, it is important to introduce the Seascape concept as empowering the individual nations, rather than disempowering. Participating nations do not lose authority, but by working together they will gain more control over and be able to better manage their resources.

Governance

Introductory remarks: Atty. Ferdinand Quicho

Background:

Qualities that typify good governance include: participation, vision, consensus, equity, inclusiveness, transparency, responsiveness, effectiveness, and accountability. Improving regional governance is critical to the success of Seascapes, and all Seascapes face challenges in facilitating good governance.

Aims:

- ▶ Recognize accomplishments related to improved governance;
- ▶ Identify challenges at each level of governance;
- ▶ Discuss lessons learned; and
- ▶ Determine how to sell the Seascape concept to governments.

Synthesis:

Governance is: stakeholders come together to accomplish desired results, make decisions and direct collective efforts. It involves the decision-making processes of stakeholders at all levels, in which government plays a critical role. Governance incorporates not only laws, policies and programs, but also customs, traditions and culture, in order to improve the socio-economic conditions of the communities that depend on the resources in question. Good governance requires partnerships from the local to the Seascape level. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) defines coastal governance as:

The processes and institutions by which coastal areas are managed by public authorities in association with communities, industries, NGOs and other stakeholders through national, sub-national and international laws, policies and programs, as well as through customs, tradition, and culture in order to improve the socio-economic conditions of the communities that depend on these areas and their living resources.

Improving regional governance is critical to the success of Seascapes, and all Seascapes face challenges in facilitating good governance. Management regimes and structures must be appropriate at every level. Ensuring proper participation and engagement is often difficult. Building relationships and credibility is necessary, as is making participation meaningful and effective through empowerment. Within the context of decentralized government, it may be challenging to clarify the roles and authorities at each level, and to ensure a consistent vision. Often there are overlapping jurisdictions which reduce accountability.

Changing government regimes frequently present challenges with respect to the durability of laws, representation among other stakeholders, and ensuring sustainability.

Good governance should be viewed as a process, not depending on individuals or the political environment. We need to focus on creating resilient governance systems, and reducing the room for maneuver by individuals, in order to increase durability.

Specific challenges faced by each of the Seascapes include:

- ▶ Government was not eager to be led by NGOs (SSS);
- ▶ Political history influences relationships and willingness of government cooperation in multi-country Seascapes (SSS);
- ▶ Although there is effective bi-country collaboration between Malaysia and Philippines and between Indonesia and Philippines, there is limited cooperation between Malaysia and Indonesia (SSS);
- ▶ In multi-national Seascapes, there is no overarching authority over the entire Seascope. We have to approach each individual nation to make any regional decisions, working at the national level with a goodwill agreement that allows us to do some things regionally (ETPS and SSS);
- ▶ Requiring more governance capacity early in the Seascope development process (ETPS);
- ▶ Transparency is an extremely sensitive issue – particularly for the national navies (ETPS); and
- ▶ How do we accelerate Seascope governance (BHS, ETPS and SSS)?

After identifying the primary challenges, we discussed possible means of addressing these challenges and the lessons that have been learned with respect to improving governance in the initial phase of the Seascapes Program. The discussion resulted in the following list of recommendations.

- ▶ The first need is to understand government structure and analyze marine management laws;
- ▶ Good legal analysis, set milestones, and a framework to move forward is needed;
- ▶ A person to be in charge of managing multi-stakeholder/inter-institutional activities (i.e. patrols) is needed;
- ▶ The collaborative effort incorporates transparency;
- ▶ The goal in terms of governance, and how we will evaluate progress must be defined.
- ▶ Institutionalize good governance - ensure that the institutions understand authority and legislation;
- ▶ Build up the practical cooperation bit by bit, creating confidence, while not worrying about formal cooperation;
- ▶ Build on what you can agree on, it is a long process; and
- ▶ Building trust is key.

Recognizing the need to develop means of evaluating governance progress, the we next discussed possible indicators. Analysis of the legal and policy framework – the laws, conventions, agreements and the judicial system as a whole – will provide a good basis

Key ● – extensive progress ● - some progress ○ - little progress {blank} – no progress	Legal and Policy Framework	Institution Framework and Capacity	Economic Viability	Socio-politic Viability	Knowledge Available and Flow	Sustainable Finance	Overall %
	Laws, Conventions, Agreements, Judicial system	Mandates, Capacity, Relations	Development plans, Community development, Markets	Ownership, Transparency, Commitment, Value, Private Sector	Multi-discipline, Adaptive management	\$ stream for management	
ETPS	○	○	○	○	○		10
High Seas				○			0
Costa Rica EEZ	●	○	○	●	●		20
Panama EEZ	○	○	○	○	○		10
Colombia EEZ	●	○	○	●	●	○	20
Ecuador EEZ	○	○		○	○		10
Coco	●	●	●	●	●	○	60
Malpelo	●	●	●	●	●	●	80
Galapagos	●	●	○	○	●	●	50
Coiba	●	●	●	●	●	○	60
Gorgona	●	●	●	●	○	○	40

against which to measure progress. Governance should also be evaluated with respect to the institutional framework (the mandates of the institutions), the economic viability (whether policies are consistent with economic development plans and community economic aspirations), social and political viability (private sector participation and ownership), science (multidisciplinary scientific knowledge is available for decision making), and sustainable financing (there is a revenue stream to finance the governance system).

The above matrix describes the progress made for each of these indicators at the regional, national and site levels for the Eastern Tropical Pacific Seascape. It is evident that more progress has been made at the site level than at the national and Seascape levels for most indicators. At the national level, the primary area of progress has been in the Legal and Policy Framework category, with some improvement in the Knowledge Available and Flow category.

The Bird's Head Seascape noted a similar trend in governance improvement with more successes at the site level. The BHS is focusing on different aspects of governance at each level. At the provincial level the focus is on empowerment to coordinate all regencies. At the village level the Seascape is promoting empowerment to reclaim traditional rights. At the regency level the push is connectivity. However, it was felt that it is premature to discuss improved governance in the BHS, as they have only been working on the Seascape for 2.5 years.

While the level of effort at the national and regional levels have equaled that at the site level, progress can be seen at the site level earlier. It will take more time to get results at the larger scale.

Key recommendations:

Governance in next 5 years:

- ▶ Good knowledge of stakeholders at all levels - stakeholder mapping is important;
- ▶ Private sector collaboration should be increased;
- ▶ Develop indicators to measure governance at all levels (site, national, regional);

-
- ▶ Strengthen governance capacity;
 - ▶ Continue work with government institutions; clarify roles, understand what is in place, and where there are gaps;
 - ▶ Improve existing legislation; and
 - ▶ Understand international agreements and conventions and use them as opportunities.

Governance for new Seascapes:

- ▶ Understand the system: legal framework, institutions, cultural practices, and other components;
- ▶ Frame the Seascape as an opportunity for empowerment, and avoid the notion of disempowerment;
- ▶ Look beyond traditional partners;
- ▶ Be sure not to underestimate time, and cost overtime especially at higher levels of governance;
- ▶ Build credibility and constituency; and
- ▶ Focus on areas with the capacity to begin Seascape-like regional cooperation now. There is no need to declare they are Seascapes, but they can begin func-

Enforcement

Introductory remarks: Atty. Ferdinand Quicho

Background:

All three Seascapes face similar challenges in ensuring effective enforcement of laws and regulations and promoting compliance. Extensive resources are required for enforcement, particularly for large marine protected areas. Improved enforcement depends in a large part on the increased capacity of those Seascape partners with appropriate authority for law enforcement. Identifying opportunities for cost effective enforcement improvements is critical to the ongoing success of the Seascapes.

Aims:

- ▶ Identify accomplishments and challenges in enforcement;
- ▶ Discuss the lessons learned to date with regard to enforcement within Seascapes; and
- ▶ Provide recommendations for the strengthening of law enforcement.

Synthesis:

Enforcement involves ensuring the effective, efficient, successful implementation of laws, rules and regulations, with special focus on ensuring compliance. There are six major components of law enforcement. First, there are the law enforcers. In the Philippines, there are very few law enforcers on the ground, resulting in a reliance on volunteer enforcers (called the Bantay Dagat) from among the community. These deputized volunteers receive some assistance from government, which leads to political selections. Thus there is a high rate of enforcer turn-over every few years as new political leaders are elected, increasing the level of investment required. The additional components of law enforcement are: the subjects of the enforcement, the legal and policy framework, law enforcement mechanisms, enforcement operation, and the imposition of sanctions.

The challenges to enforcement in the Philippines include insufficient enforcement capacity, overlapping mandates that leave no one accountable, and a paucity of political will. Lack of knowledge about the rules leads to decreased compliance, as does uncertainty of punishment. Many environmental laws lack clarity and are not enforceable. Finally, enforcement requires equipment, which is often lacking.

Bird's Head Seascape is working with The Nature Conservancy (TNC) and the government on enforcement because the Seascape encompasses such a large area with very few people. In the border areas particularly, there is relatively rampant poaching, including shark finning, cyanide fishing, bomb fishing, and other illegal activities. Enforcement with a traditional patrol boat system is not cost effective due to the great distances to these border areas. Instead we have invested in our first floating ranger station and hope to add an entire fleet of these liveboard stations. TNC and CI shared the cost of the first station.

In Indonesia there is the common problem of corruption. To deal with this, we have created joint patrol teams comprised of police officers, fisheries officers, and community members, who lend credibility to the patrols. Additional support is provided through community patrols in the community-based MPAs. Recent weekend workshops conducted with enforcement authorities, particularly the high justices, to show the impacts of bomb fishing, have been highly successful. Almost universally, judge education has led to significant improvement in enforcement.

In Sulu-Sulawesi Seascape we have provided funds to support the community enforcer groups, the Bantay Dagat, but have found this mode of collaboration to be unsustainable; when the money runs out, the level of enforcement declines. Additionally, there is a need to provide training for improved enforcement procedures, such as boarding procedures, collaboration, and reporting mechanisms. The next step is moving towards trans-boundary enforcement across the Treaty of Paris line. We also need to focus more on improving compliance, changing attitudes and building capacity.

The Eastern Tropical Pacific Seascape has focused on four key steps of enforcement: establishing and communicating rules, detecting infractions, apprehending infractors, and

judicial processing. At each of these steps, we have taken five lines of action: research (understanding what is and is not working), providing training, providing technical assistance, providing infrastructure, and education. Additionally we have contributed to the creation of alternative livelihoods.

ETPS has made its biggest investment in infrastructure. It is particularly productive to invest in infrastructure in areas where there is the political will and the capacity to use it. We recently funded the refurbishment of a boat on the coast of Colombia to patrol the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) in association with the new fisheries zoning system. We are focusing on finding new ways to improve detection, and are seriously looking at big radars, boats, and Vessel Monitoring Systems (VMS). VMS in particular is a real opportunity to scale up from site to whole nation level and that can become standard across countries. Additionally, ETPS has supported the development of environmental policies, provided training in enforcement procedures and conducted judicial education workshops.

Following the discussion of each Seascope's lessons learned and accomplishments, we discussed the role of CI in enforcement, questioning whether it is a cost effective means of increasing compliance. It was suggested that we focus more on providing information and education, although BHS mentioned that community education is not cheap either. Finally, it was suggested that we invest more on providing technical assistance in the development of effective laws which can be easily implemented.

Key recommendations:

Enforcement in the next 5 years:

- ▶ Enforcement work should continue through direct implementation and support of government;
- ▶ Cost effectiveness should be improved;
- ▶ Increase focus on compliance as the key to enforcement;
- ▶ Explore more cost effective methods of enforcement: e.g. global positioning-systems, joint patrols, and education;
- ▶ Provide training on compliance and enforcement;
- ▶ Support joint enforcement work with communities; and
- ▶ Enforcement efforts should be conducted in tandem with community education although it is not cheap.

Enforcement for new Seascapes:

- ▶ Define goals of enforcement;
- ▶ Demonstrate impacts of destructive fishing practices;
- ▶ Define role and responsibilities of joint patrols;
- ▶ Focus on capacity building, compliance, and education at different levels of enforcement system; and
- ▶ Facilitate the development of laws which support governance.

Reporting and Database Management

Introductory remarks: Frazer McGilvray

Background:

Reporting and database management is an integral part of keeping abreast of development in all three of the Seascapes. Under the current arrangements with the Walton Family Foundations, six-monthly reports are written and compiled by the Seascope leads and Regional Marine Strategies department in CI-HQ. Workplan databases are held in CI-HQ and updated by the Seascope leads as necessary. During the first 2 years of reporting, we noticed that there is a great deal of repetition in the way the bi-annual report was structured, and the way the database management was carried out left a lot to be desired. This session allowed us to discuss how best to restructure the reports to avoid unnecessary repetition, the necessary level of input and support from Regional Marine Strategies department, and also how best to manage the updating and storing of the databases, thus creating a powerful system that works best for all involved and leading to good management of the Seascapes Program.

Aims:

- ▶ Answer the following questions:
- ▶ What do we streamline?;
- ▶ How do we streamline?;
- ▶ Which sections are redundant?; and
- ▶ How do we cut down the size of the reports?

Synthesis:

We currently use Access for database management, and it is poorly managed. The Seascapes send us their narratives and then we cut and paste it into Access, which is very time consuming. All of the Regional Program Division (RPD) databases, including the Seascapes, will be put online during FY2008. Bird's Head Seascope will be exempt from that until there are improvements in connectivity. The Center for Biodiversity Conservation (CBC) database is already online, but it is virtually unusable, and it could take a few more months to work out the database design issues. The perceived advantage of having the databases online is that it is technologically better if everyone uses the same system. In complex regions, there will be only one master version of the database, and you can control who has the ability to edit various portions. Additionally it facilitates the connectivity between programmatic planning and all the other aspects of the CI information system, such as budgets and the Grants Enterprise Management (GEM) system.

Within our current reporting framework there is a high degree of redundancy. The donor would like us to cut back the repetitions. The factual part of the reporting should be more concise, while the analytical part (why are things going the way they are going, and what should be done about it) should be more profound.

The following are the suggested changes we discussed:

- ▶ Our reporting narrative should address the results level rather than focusing on the deliverable level. This would enhance the analytical discussion in the report;
- ▶ "Progress report by outcome, output and activity" takes up nearly two-thirds of

the report and could be cut. This content already exists in two other sections (the Executive Summary and one other section);

- ▶ The need for a background section was questioned, as the donors are familiar with the Seascapes. However, we do need some background that ties the most recent accomplishments in with those reported in the previous report. We can cut back the physical description and initial conditions of the site, and redefine the Background section;
- ▶ We need to include: executive summary, where we were, where we are, why, and what next;
- ▶ The report should be something that is useful to us as well as to the donors;
- ▶ Retain key successes and challenges by outcome and output section as the “where we are” section;
- ▶ The fourth section (“why”) should address lessons learned as a discussion or analysis section;
- ▶ Suggest that whatever sections we decide on including in the report should be created as query buttons on the online database;
- ▶ Analysis in the “why” section might be arranged more by theme (such as research, education, enforcement) rather than by outcome or output;
- ▶ May need to capture what we think the content of each section is going to be, so that the donors will know where to look for the information they want;
- ▶ In third section (“where we are”), we may include some details regarding how successes and challenges will be addressed, while the fourth section (“why” or “analysis and adaptation”) will contain much more strategic analysis and the adaptation of the program in response to that analysis;
- ▶ The sixth section will be the appendices, including the automated work plan report.
- ▶ We also need a “where we are going” section, this might be included in the “analysis and adaptation” section;
- ▶ The question was raised as to whether we should change the frequency of reporting? We generally agreed that with the scaled down version of the report, a six month frequency is acceptable; and
- ▶ Resolved to speak with donors regarding what other documents we should be producing to be helpful, particularly through the renewal process.

Key recommendations:

We determined to apply the following framework to the bi-annual report, with a small committee to decide the description of each section:

1. Executive summary;
2. Where were we (successes);
3. Where are we (key successes and challenges by outcomes and outputs);
4. Analytical section and adaptation and next steps;
5. Financials;
6. Appendix;
7. Work plan database; and
8. Map.

Private Sector Involvement/Market-based Initiatives

Introductory remarks: Frazer McGilvray

Background:

In addition to partnering with private sector actors as potential sources of funding, increased engagement could be an effective way to change behavior of key industries. We have not had as much success as we would have liked in involving the private sector. Exploring the possibilities for increasing private sector involvement will not only enhance the existing Seascapes but will provide valuable guidance for future Seascapes.

Aims:

- ▶ Identify the potential market based initiatives that are currently available; and
- ▶ Discuss how the various Seascapes engage the private sector, either directly or indirectly through partners.

Synthesis:

To begin the discussion, we identified all of the potentially relevant sectors that should be engaged at some level in the Seascope process. An analysis of the private sector is a good start, looking at whether we are approaching the sectors in the most optimal way. The following industries were mentioned:

- ▶ Industrial fishing:
 - ▶ Downstream industries, such as the food industry, approaching the supply side;
- ▶ Aquaculture:
 - ▶ Aquaculture of seaweed;
 - ▶ Aquaculture of pearl oysters;
 - ▶ Aquaculture of rabbit fish;
- ▶ Sport fishing;
- ▶ Tourism:
 - ▶ Ecotourism;
- ▶ Hydrocarbon / Oil and gas;
- ▶ Refinery construction;
- ▶ Coastal development / housing development; and
- ▶ Shipping.

We then discussed the differences between market based initiatives and private sector involvement. Market based initiatives are focused more on how to design the market place so that it results in a softer impact for more money. Market based mechanisms are just one of the ways of engaging the private sector, and is particularly useful when the goal is to change behavior rather than extract money from the industries. In most cases, changing behavior is our priority.

One of the challenges to market based initiatives in the Seascope regions is that the market is not in the Seascapes. To a certain extent there are two markets, the international market and the domestic market. Affecting the domestic markets is difficult in the

countries in which we work because it requires the luxury of choices in food purchases.

There are two levels to changing behavior of markets. We are limited in our ability to change the behavior of industry, but changing the behavior of individual villagers is a very different matter. Particularly in the Bird's Head and Sulu-Sulawesi Seascapes, changing behavior of individual villagers is entirely possible.

Following this general discussion of industries and types of engagement, we broke into discussion groups to explore the possibilities and challenges involved in engaging each of the following sectors: industrial fishing, coastal development, tourism and hydrocarbon / oil and gas. Each group addressed the following questions:

- ▶ What are the industries?;
- ▶ What are the potentials?;
- ▶ Where are the obstacles?;
- ▶ How do partners manage to do this work?;
- ▶ What are the potential market-based initiatives?; and
- ▶ How do Seascapes engage?

Industrial Fisheries: In talking about the fishery sector, we include industrial, artisanal, aquaculture, and sport fishing. Each Seascape contains a unique composition of industries. In Bird's Head Seascape, the primary fisheries industries were identified as the live fish trade (both aquarium and food fish), pearl farmers, and sport fishing operations. In the Eastern Tropical Pacific Seascape, the primary industries are industrial tuna, shrimpers and shrimp farmers, mahi mahi semi-industrial and sport fishing. The primary industries affecting the Sulu-Sulawesi Seascape were identified as the industrial pelagic industry, pearl farmers, live fish trade (aquarium and food fish, both illegal), and sport fishing.

The primary obstacle to engaging the fisheries sector is close-mindedness on the part of conservation organizations; we do not understand the fisheries sector and do not want to work with them. Likewise, the fisheries industry does not want to deal with us, they see few benefits in getting involved with us, they do not know what our motives are and they distrust us. We are culturally different and have little contact within our professional circles. There appears to be little overlap in our concerns, priorities and interest. Added to these obstacles is the inadequate integration between authorities. Within governments, fisheries and environment departments often do not work together, and because we work with environment departments, we lack an opening to fisheries departments. In Indonesia, however, we deal with the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, demonstrating that this obstacle is not universal across all Seascapes.

Several other NGOs are actively engaged with the fisheries industry. World Wildlife Fund in particular is engaging on the industry's own terms on WWF priorities, such as by-catch reduction without limiting fish catch. WWF provides direct grants to the sector, engages regularly in the main fishing fora, and promotes certification schemes.

CoopeSolidar, in ETPS, works very closely with fishers in promotion of responsible fishing practices at the co-managed MPA level. The Coastal Conservation Education Foundation of the Philippines also engages the fishing industry. Finally, a number of NGOs attend international seafood shows and get to know the actors in that way.

We identified best practices and certification schemes as the two main potential market based initiatives. There might be the possibility, if it does not duplicate existing efforts, of developing a Seascape logo certification for fish caught in Seascapes managed with the active participation and support of the fishing sector. The development of best practices to reduce costs and increase quality could help the fishing industry to reduce costs and improve the quality of their product without giving them more access to markets. Finally, we should look at the possibility of promoting a tax on the fishing industry to support MPA creation and management.

Seascapes might improve engagement by attending all of the primary industry meetings, engaging with CI's other programs internally, engaging more closely with fisheries departments at local and national levels, partnering with organizations that are already effectively engaged, providing grants for issues of mutual interest to the fishing industry and conservation sector, and targeting Wal-Mart as a market to work with its providers such as Star-Kist. In order to effectively engage the fisheries sector, we should have a program dedicated to such an effort.

Tourism: Surprisingly, tourism is not always an ally for our values and causes. In many areas where there are few opportunities the major value of tourism is its provision of employment. In spite of these challenges, we identified a number of possibilities for increasing engagement with the tourism sector.

Verde Ventures, in particular, could play a significant role in the Seascapes by supporting micro-loans for ecotourism businesses. There may, however, be partnership limitations because Verde Ventures is also a CI entity. Regardless, it was recommended that there be further investigation into the possibility of a focused program by Verde Ventures within the Seascapes, and exploration of which businesses would be beneficial to the Seascapes' goals.

Additional potential for engagement lies in using destination sites to build up membership donor lists for local NGOs in the Seascape. It may be productive to engage the tour book industry to promote sustainability by recommending responsible tourism businesses. Finally there is potential for the tourism industry to become a strong lobbying power for environmental conservation within the national frameworks. Seascapes should persuade and work with the tourism sector to become an effective conservation lobbying group.

Although there is extensive experience, there has been mixed feelings about the development and promotion of best practices as a tool. Neither CI nor partners have particular-

ly strong records of working with the tourism industry in the Seascapes, and increased engagement would likely require bringing in additional expertise.

There is some doubt that tourism is a primary mover of economics in underdeveloped places, such as Indonesia. It is often difficult to keep tourism revenues in the community or country of the tourism, especially in areas where there is a focus on high-end tourism. In Indonesia, this challenge is addressed by taking a balanced approach in promoting a mix of large-scale tourism and small-scale tourism. The key to making the island concession model work is to get in at an early stage to influence the terms of the negotiation. There is no inherent relationship between being high market and not returning benefits.

Oil and Gas: There are three levels for engagement with the oil and gas industries: during the exploration stage, during drilling, and post drilling. The upstream level of engagement, during the exploration stage, was identified as carrying most potential for conservation action. Oil and gas industries might be engaged by supporting or assisting in environmental assessments and promoting compliance to national policies where they are exploring. There is also the possibility of promoting the adoption of a flagship species to support conservation efforts. We might promote the adoption of best practices, develop a constructive line of communication, and facilitate a common understanding of biodiversity with respect to industry. Sulu-Sulawesi Seascape is exploring the possibility of instituting tradable pollution permits and coastal payments for environmental services. Such an initiative would require oil and gas companies to give the government a certain amount of money per barrel, which is then dedicated to conservation. Finally, engagement with the Department of Energy lays the groundwork for communications with the oil and gas industry.

Changes in government and the low level of knowledge are some of the primary obstacles to engagement.

Coastal Development: The players in the coastal development sector include land developers, national and local governments, and the tourism sector. The real driver behind coastal development is urbanization – migration to coastal areas. The potential for engagement in this sector is very high, particularly by invoking resilience factors and the vulnerability to sea level rise and coastal and environmental hazards.

The primary obstacle to engaging the development sector is the short-sightedness of many of the players. Land developers often do not have an interest in the area once the land or property is sold. There might also be an absence of enabling policies. Some countries might already have national policies establishing setbacks, but this is not necessarily the norm in Seascape countries. Finally, there is a high demand for coastal properties.

In order to overcome these challenges, we should move towards coastal resilience and

show the long term benefits to coastal developers. This may require modelers to develop scenarios. We might provide incentives for compliance and should partner directly with local governments on this issue.

Key recommendations:

- ▶ Private sector growth trajectories, value chain analyses and links to markets should be researched and identified to define contacts, partners and pressure points for generating change (including public policy). Links to US markets may be particularly useful as CI may be able to leverage contacts to generate funding and promote best practices;
- ▶ New Seascapes should evaluate CI expertise available at headquarters and identify best ways to incorporate them in Seascape workplans;
- ▶ Governance and relevant agencies for regulating private sector in Seascape should be reviewed to identify the best way to approach private sector work;
- ▶ Examine predicted impacts from climate change and define links to coastal development (e.g. sea level rise and increased frequency of storms) to identify opportunities and pressure points to influence coastal development;
- ▶ Engage oil and gas companies early in the exploration process to promote compliance with environmental standards and best practices;
- ▶ Explore the possibility of creating a fishery position within the new Seascapes in regions where the fishing industry has a major impact on the success of the Seascape;
- ▶ Analyze tourism potential in Seascapes to inform future discussions with Verde Ventures or other possible donors;
- ▶ Consider the potential for payments for environmental services by the oil and gas industry; and
- ▶ Establish a small group to generate next steps for private sector engagement.

Species Conservation

Introductory remarks: Frazer McGilvray

Background:

Currently, species focused conservation has tended to focus on large charismatic megafauna within each Seascape, and there is little 'cross-Seascape' interaction. Given certain species occur in all Seascapes, it was proposed to have a discussion on how a more 'inter-Seascape' approach may be looked at, and how this type of approach may be structured. A discussion was also needed on what species each of the Seascapes could focus their conservation efforts on during the second phase of the program.

Aims:

- ▶ Identify the species that we are currently working on;
- ▶ Identify what species we want to work on in the next five years; and
- ▶ Determine where we want to work on these priority species.

Synthesis:

Seascape priorities in the next five years should focus on species with a high leveraging message, flagship species, keystone species, and species showing a good level of connectivity. Sea turtles and sharks are of particular interest, as they fall into all of the above priority categories.

Because we were talking about the next five years, the discussion was not limited to the existing three Seascapes as they are right now. The group aimed to determine the areas we need to protect, promoting consultation between management agencies not only across Seascapes but also internationally.

Currently, work is being conducted on sea turtles in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Seascape, and continued tagging of sea turtles around ETPS is desired in order to monitor the movements of the animals at certain times of the year. Work with local conservation initiatives to protect nesting beaches is also an important effort to continue.

It is thought that sharks should be moved up the priority list within the three Seascapes, particularly in Bird's Head and Sulu-Sulawesi Seascapes. Sharks should also be a priority topic for where we are looking to expand into other Seascapes with respect to site selection. Future work on sharks should focus on communicating the role of sharks in the BHS ecosystem, studying the threats to sharks in BHS, and the possibility of using shark tourism in ETPS to increase conservation funding. It was also suggested that we promote a shark-free harvest campaign for the Seascapes.

Several commercially important species, such as mangrove crabs, sea cucumbers and tuna, are of interest due to the potential for tying improved habitat management to economic benefits. In addition to these important species, the group discussed the species that participants would particularly like to work on, including corals, marine mammals in ETPS and Indonesia, and the vaquita in the Gulf of California, Mexico.

There is some concern regarding species which have conservation value or are on the verge of extinction, but do not necessarily draw donor appeal, as well as range restricted or endemic species. There are a number of species that we have not taken into consideration that would be more aligned with national and local priorities. Site based management is more effective because communities are not necessarily interested in the global conservation status of species. However, we need a balance between responding to local community interest or donor appeal, and conservation priorities.

Monitoring needs should also inform the selection of species on which to focus. Our species work should focus on what we need to know to determine whether our efforts are succeeding. For example, we may want to monitor the condition of species that are particularly vulnerable or resilient to climate change, so that we can observe whether large scale marine management is working.

The creation of research networks to support and communicate species work within and between Seascapes is a useful tool. In ETPS, the regional shark network built a community out of dispersed existing efforts in the region. The network creation was successful in part because we focused on what the group really wanted to do – tagging. The group has now diversified to address landings, communications, and observers. Hiring a regional expert provided scientific coherence and ensured consistency of methods. It is recommended that we expand networks to work among Seascapes as well as within Seascapes.

There are some challenges to putting these networks together. In addition to bringing together like minded people together to work on an issue, you also need to bring together non-like minded people to encompass diverse opinions. Engaging fisheries or industrial partners requires more effort.

Key Recommendations:

Seascope priorities in the next five years should focus on species with a high leveraging message, flagship species, keystone species, and species showing a good level of connectivity. Other issues that we should consider when setting priorities include: monitoring needs, restricted range or endemic species, and commercially important species.

Sustainable Financing

Introductory remarks: Scott Henderson

Background:

Sustainable financing means having enough money on hand to do the things you need to do – otherwise we risk spending as much time fundraising as fund-using. In terms of continuity of programs, sustainable financing allows us to be strategic over the long term. The discussion of sustainability is two-pronged, and should focus on both the sustainability of the efforts within the Seascapes, as well as the funding of the Seascapes Program as a whole.

Aims:

- ▶ Identify successful examples of sustainable finance;
- ▶ Discuss the barriers and means of overcoming them;

-
- ▶ Identify relevant sectors and actors;
 - ▶ Recognize the risks of focusing on endowments; and
 - ▶ Determine the information required for sustainable finance strategies.

Synthesis:

We have had some successes at the site level with respect to sustainable funding, but have experienced less success at the national and regional level. It is important to optimize our management models at whatever scale we are working before seeking additional funds.

There are a number of possible funding sources, including donor organizations, permit fees, user fees, long term in-kind donations, government line-item allocations, entrance fees, concessions, fines, surcharges, taxes, sales and services, and biodiversity offset payments. The most sustainable funding other than endowments comes from private donors and membership based systems.

The challenges to sustainable financing include potential donor concerns about management efficiency and transparency, conflicting interests in government, the need for critical mass, user resistance to fines, profit reduction and private sector resistance, and the difficulty of identifying beneficiaries of ecosystem services. Sustainable financing is often not as attractive to donors because it is not very flashy, and many donors want to see direct and speedy results.

Some methods for overcoming these challenges include:

- ▶ Appeal to long-term thinking;
- ▶ Establish multi-institutional management boards and review systems;
- ▶ Demonstrate economic and social benefits of conservation investments;
- ▶ Establish matching system and 'awards' for early movers;
- ▶ Mobilize other sectors; and
- ▶ Employ the name and shame / carrots and sticks method.

There are sustainable financing activities underway in all three of the existing Seascape. The Sulu-Sulawesi Seascape has developed a fine-based system for vessel groundings in Tubbataha. The Bird's Head Seascape has implemented an entrance fee system in Raja Ampat and has worked to incorporate language in the fisheries law that allows the fish landing tax revenues to be directed back to fund MPAs. The Eastern Tropical Pacific Seascape has facilitated the creation of the Malpelo Trust Fund. Additional efforts in ETPS include the Coiba entrance fee system and private sector contributions by Aviatur, the largest tour operator in Colombia. The Land and Water Conservation Fund in the United States represents a successful non-Seascape sustainable financing solution that might be replicated.

While endowments are by definition sustainable, there are risks associated with this mechanism. It is necessary to review the relative benefits of long-term investment with

comparatively little annual return versus the opportunity to spend the money immediately to work on valuation, optimization, and developing other revenue generating mechanisms. There is a risk of developing complacency in seeking funding. It is also important to ensure the absorptive capacity of beneficiaries; to make sure that programs have the ability to productively spend the funds that are available, particularly when large royalty or tax revenues are to be directed towards conservation.

With respect to the sustainability of the Seascapes Program as a whole, we need to be clear with donors on our role as 'glue' in the long-term strategy and how we will support the creation of future 'glue' (regional coordination mechanisms). It is important that we proceed with a unified way to discuss the future of the Seascapes Program and that we establish new revenue streams for marine conservation. Finally, we should ensure reinvestment in existing Seascapes before creating new Seascapes.

Key recommendations:

Based on the discussed possibilities and challenges, the group developed the following set of guiding principles:

- ▶ Quantify ecosystem values provided by marine management to justify investments;
- ▶ Optimize and accurately cost the system before trying to fund it;
- ▶ Build costs of stewardship into development, economic planning and appropriations;
- ▶ Beneficiaries should pay for management (internalize management costs); and
- ▶ Private donors are the most reliable funding source.

Seascape Definition

Introductory remarks: Roger McManus

Background:

To effectively plan, manage and implement Seascapes, we need to be clear on our aims. For this reason, it is necessary to revisit the consensus definition of a Seascape:

Seascapes are large multiple-use marine areas, defined scientifically and strategically, in which government authorities, private organizations and other stakeholders cooperate to conserve the diversity and abundance of marine life, and to promote human well-being. Seascapes typically have high biological diversity, ecological and economic connectivity, and aesthetic and cultural values. Seascapes may include government-authorized protected areas for addressing special management needs, and provide an opportunity for government agencies to coordinate their efforts voluntarily to secure more effective regional management programs.

Aims:

- ▶ Discuss the adequacy of the existing Seascape definition; and
- ▶ Determine whether new or additional definitions are needed.

Synthesis:

It is important to acknowledge that Seascape is not a brand, but a concept for managing marine resources at a large scale. Although Seascape is the term we use, it is the concept that is important; the conversation about large-scale collaborative management, rather than isolated regulatory systems. Seascapes are not bio-geographically defined like TNC's and WWF's eco-regions. The boundaries of Seascapes are drawn to facilitate large scale management units, which may or may not correspond to existing eco-regions.

Each of the Seascapes has had to deal with the issue of terminology and existing programs. The solution has to be unique to each location, but it is important to be flexible and tolerant with partners. Any place we work there will be at least a few existing mechanisms for collaboration. There should be an emphasis on what governments have already adopted, particularly regarding sustainability issues. For instance, there is no sole owner of the Sulu-Sulawesi Marine Eco-region. The Eco-region planning process was facilitated by WWF and is the product of the governments within the Eco-region. The Sulu-Sulawesi Seascape contributes to one of the objectives of this eco-regional plan.

Seascapes define places which humans can relate to, create a bonding to, and facilitate the emergence of a management structure. Seascapes facilitate the creation of governance at a supra eco-region scale, developing links and connections between and among every management hierarchy.

The accepted definition of a Seascape is useful and captures all the necessary components, but it is rather long, which can lead to misunderstandings. For communication purposes, the definition needs to be lighter, and in order to communicate the concept to stakeholders it needs to be 'translated' based on the conditions in each Seascape.

In general, the Seascape concept is accepted, and partners, such as TNC, use the term. In the Eastern Tropical Pacific Seascape the concept aligns well with the Corredor Marino, and the Seascape terminology is not used directly in communicating with partners. Sulu-Sulawesi Seascape is content with the current definition but regularly provides further explanation to stakeholders. The term is accepted by the government in the Bird's Head Seascape, but WWF consistently does not use the Seascape terminology.

Key decisions:

- ▶ We will return to the issue of whether we want to come up with a separate marketing definition of Seascape at an appropriate time.

The Future of Seascapes

Introductory remarks: Bill Fischelis

Background:

Conservation International is currently engaged in three Seascapes. The two years experience of implementing three Seascapes has generated a good understanding of the critical components of a functional Seascape. These insights, which vary among Seascapes due to their differences in size, location, composition and severity of threats to marine biodiversity and ecosystem services, should guide our developing vision and plans for the further strengthening of CI's Seascapes Program over the coming years.

Aims:

- ▶ Identify the essential elements of each Seascape for the next 5 years;
- ▶ Discuss the evolving role of CI in each Seascape; and
- ▶ Consider how we might measure and verify progress with respect to essential elements in each Seascape.

Synthesis:

Participants discussed the essential elements of Seascapes for the next 5 years, including:

- ▶ Make a more systematic effort to construct the governance system for the three existing Seascapes at different geographic scales;
- ▶ Create an enabling framework of laws, regulations, policies and plans, which facilitates conservation and minimizes threats to the Seascape;
- ▶ Place a greater emphasis on the economics of Seascapes, because their sustainability depends in part on making them part of the economic efforts of the regions where we work;
- ▶ Ensure that we are putting a concerted effort towards defining sustainable financing mechanisms for the Seascapes;
- ▶ Improve system and metrics for measuring our implementation progress at different scales, including in-situ monitoring (ecological and socio-economic/governance);
- ▶ Ensure delivery of concrete results in addition to attention to long-term planning and processes;
- ▶ Better align conservation goals with global goals (2012), conventions and treaties;
- ▶ Broaden support and buy-in for Seascapes by improving focus on private sector interests and needs;
- ▶ Ensure adequate institutional framework and capacity, including personnel, in infrastructure and equipment, to embrace both authorities and participating stakeholders and to build alliances amongst them;
- ▶ Increase attention to coastal community interests and needs;
- ▶ Ensure effective science and increased use of science in management decision-making;
- ▶ Generate monitoring data and use the knowledge gained to guide and adapt policies and practices;

-
- ▶ Consolidate existing MPAs according to their specific needs;
 - ▶ Continue attention to priority conservation species, especially those requiring regional efforts;
 - ▶ Increase attention to capacity-building and communication;
 - ▶ Use consultative processes to identify stakeholders, to identify stakeholder interests and to generate buy-in from the stakeholders;
 - ▶ Demonstrate CI's efforts to achieve conservation goals;
 - ▶ Empower the stakeholders thru trainings and interaction;
 - ▶ Flexibility is essential;
 - ▶ Plan 'exit strategy'– CI will have changing role through time, as stakeholders take increasing responsibility; and
 - ▶ Consider, where feasible without impacting existing efforts, paying increased attention to emerging threats such as climate change, invasive species and watershed issues.

We then discussed the evolving role of CI in Seascapes, recognizing that our role may change depending of the maturity of the program, and that local partners and governments may take on more of our coordinating role or increasingly provide the impetus for management. Although our role may not change much in the next three years, our role may be down-sized in the final two years of the next five-year plan. The degree to which our role changes will depend in part on the scope of funding renewal: a three year renewal results in our role remaining similar to the present, while a five year renewal will allow a reduction in direct implementation and increased attention to transferring leadership.

It will be important to institutionalize the Seascape concept into government and partner agendas, and to promote increasing ownership and accountability by other actors, as well as adapt our role in response to those changes. Existing Seascapes may serve as part of a planning advisory group in areas where other Seascapes are being considered. Despite CI's evolving role, we will continue our work in creating and maintaining enabling political environments and supporting internal and external communications regarding Seascapes implementation successes and lessons learned.

In order to ensure the sustainability of Seascape programs, we must address not only the financial sustainability, but also the political viability, institutional capacity, economic viability, and information base and flow. Seascapes should assess their efforts with respect to each of these aspects of sustainability.

When measuring the progress of Seascapes, the following aspects should be evaluated:

- ▶ Outcomes monitoring:
 - ▶ Species conditions;
 - ▶ MPA management effectiveness; and

- ▶ Increased focus on impact indicators, which tend to depend on forces outside our own control, but that address our core aims. In focusing on impact indicators, we need to be explicit about the risks and assumptions upon which those impact indicators depend.

- ▶ Seascape sustainability:

- ▶ Standard good governance indicators at each scale, ensuring rigorous, if qualitative, measurement; and
- ▶ Baseline required.

- ▶ Programmatic monitoring:

- ▶ Establish milestones, results and deliverables for important project levels; and
- ▶ Focus on process deliverables - which are within our control, as opposed to impact deliverables.

Measuring success should remain a framework, as described above, with limited detail. The more prescriptive we are regarding how success is measured, the less realistic the results. This is particularly true when success measurements are applied to multiple sites with differing conditions and objectives, as is the case with the Seascapes. With detailed deliverables, it is very easy to see what you do not do, but with results, you can indicate what you did in order to achieve the results. We should focus more on results or milestones than on specific deliverables. This would allow us to be accurate in terms of measuring consolidation and sustainability.

Key recommendations:

- ▶ Strengthen and link good governance among the local, national and Seascape levels within each Seascape;
- ▶ Place greater emphasis on economics in the next three years of Seascape implementation;
- ▶ For a functional and sustainable Seascape to emerge it is critical to empower Seascape stakeholders thru training, collaboration, exchanges and joint planning;
- ▶ It is essential that we are flexible in our approach to implementing Seascapes, that we adjust our strategies based on successes and emerging opportunities, and that we can demonstrate that we learn from our experience;
- ▶ Focus increased attention on measuring Seascape success by establishing milestones, results and deliverables for important components of our work at the species, site and Seascape level; and
- ▶ CI's role in each Seascape will change over time as stakeholders take increasing responsibility for Seascape implementation. A clear exit strategy should be planned based on the rate of progress and on existing and anticipated funding support.

Identification and Development of New Seascapes

Introductory remarks: Bill Fischelis

Background:

CI has a *Future of Life* campaign commitment of engaging in five Seascapes around the world and has to date committed to three Seascapes. For strategic, transparency and effectiveness reasons, we need to be clear what constitutes a Seascape and what criteria we use to define the Seascapes in which CI engages. The selection of Seascapes for CI involvement is also a central issue for CI's regional marine programs who have expressed interest in knowing what they can do to become one of the remaining Seascapes of the *Future of Life* campaign commitment. At an organizational level, CI needs to know how to determine the locations for new Seascapes which will most contribute to marine biodiversity conservation outcomes and how to generate opportunities which can benefit CI's marine programs.

Aims:

- ▶ Develop criteria for selecting new Seascapes; and
- ▶ Discuss lessons learned in the start-up of Seascapes Programs.

Synthesis:

Based on the definition, places may be selected both scientifically and strategically. When the Global Marine Species Assessment (GMSA) is complete, scientific considerations will be informed by the GMSA identified marine hotspots. Until we have those results we will have to settle for some other scientific criteria. From a very pragmatic perspective, there is the view that if a marine area becomes a Seascape, there will suddenly be large amounts of funding available. However, in the past and likely in the future, it is the other way around: areas that have secured large scale funding can then become a Seascape. When we come across large amounts of funding for a particular region, it is highly likely that the region will be one of the next Seascapes. If we have the ability to influence where that money is spent, we will put it towards a region that is highly important from a marine biodiversity perspective as well as strategically sound, preferably with a governance system already in place.

In addition to funding availability and biodiversity richness, we need to consider the political stability and social acceptance that exist in the region. We should not underestimate the risks of accepting funding and trying to engage in a Seascape in an area where we might fail to secure significant marine conservation outcomes. This may tarnish the whole Seascape concept. It may be important to walk away from the table in such areas. If there is potential for initiating a Seascape in one region and if such an engagement will have the potential to leverage additional funding for other sites and regions, then such opportunities should be considered.

Seascapes may be one of the best approaches to large scale marine management, but success is dependant on having the necessary funding. The Seascape approach is inherently expensive and requires a significant level of input. Calling an area a Seascape

does not make it more fundable. We need to be wary of the pressure to call other marine managed areas Seascapes without applying the accompanying criteria and level of investment. It is important to communicate that there is nothing wrong with not being a Seascape. It is an excellent model, but it cannot happen everywhere given the level of funding required.

In the selection of new Seascape sites, the following pre-conditions should be considered:

- ▶ Conservation value; and
- ▶ Biological importance, connectivity.
- ▶ Inherent conditions:
 - ▶ Enabling legal/policy framework;
 - ▶ Adequate institutional framework and capacity;
 - ▶ Enabling economic conditions and planning framework;
 - ▶ Potentially supportive communities, sectors, governments;
 - ▶ Adequate knowledge generation and flow; and
 - ▶ Potential to generate ongoing funding.
- ▶ What we can do:
 - ▶ Available funding to get off the ground (Seascape framework requires substantial funds, and we should not create Seascapes where there are not sufficient funds available); and
 - ▶ CI presence or comparable promoter/facilitator/coordinator organization.
- ▶ Extended impact:
 - ▶ Potential for impact beyond the area.

Reviewing the experiences of the three existing Seascapes, participants generated the following list of recommendations for the start up of new Seascapes:

- ▶ Before implementation:
 - ▶ Undertake comprehensive analysis of main actors and institutions, to allow informed decisions regarding who to engage and when;
 - ▶ Consult with key actors and sectors (communities, private sector, governmental actors, and partner organizations), acknowledging that not everyone will be on board, and that should not stand in the way of starting up a Seascape;
 - ▶ Ensure simple, clear messages regarding what Seascapes are and are not;
 - ▶ Build key alliances in advance;
 - ▶ Ensure internal capacity to manage partnerships and the project;
 - ▶ Avoid creating unrealistic expectations;
 - ▶ Undertake joint planning;
 - ▶ Create a sense of urgency; and

- ▶ Establish baseline conditions and adequate monitoring framework.
- ▶ Implementation:
 - ▶ Make strategic investments first;
 - ▶ Seek community involvement;
 - ▶ Ensure simple, clear messages regarding what Seascapes are and are not;
 - ▶ Focus attention on flagship connectivity species;
 - ▶ Ensure one-on-one time with key actors, especially at the national level;
 - ▶ Give recognition to key implementers (e.g. authorities); and
 - ▶ Have a clear, but flexible, overall strategy.

Key recommendations:

In identifying and developing new Seascapes in which CI should engage, the following broad questions should be answered:

- ▶ Is the region of global marine biodiversity importance and is there demonstrated connectivity (scientific selection criteria)?;
- ▶ Are the inherent conditions of the region favorable for Seascape development (relates to strategic selection criteria)?;
- ▶ Can CI make a difference in the region by using the Seascape approach (relates to pragmatic selection criteria)?; and
- ▶ Are there opportunities and benefits beyond the region if it is selected as a Seascape?

Marine Protected Area Creation

Introductory remarks: Mark Erdmann

Background:

Marine Protected Area (MPA) creation is both an art and a science. This discussion is relevant regardless of whether we are working in a Seascape or another model of marine conservation. MPAs are one of the primary tools of marine conservation programs. The issues addressed in this session are at the basic level of actually creating, gazetted, and implementing MPAs, as opposed to the broader discussion of what constitutes a Seascape.

Aims:

- ▶ Collect a range of experiences and perspectives on MPA creation from CI Marine staff; and
- ▶ If possible, consolidate views into key lessons learned and recommendations for CI internal use.

Synthesis:

In tackling the issues surrounding MPA creation, we broke into groups to discuss the following questions:

- ▶ Is it better to advocate individual MPAs or Networks of MPAs to governments and stakeholders? Why?;
- ▶ What are the most important scientific studies to conduct in order to robustly site a new MPA or MPA network;
- ▶ Should we set standardized minimum requirements for new MPA designation, such as minimum size, minimum percent no-take, minimum level of stakeholder support, or are these issues too context-dependent to allow standardization?;
- ▶ When should we be opportunistic in MPA creation and when should we be more conservative? When do the risks of opportunistic MPA designation outweigh the benefits?; and
- ▶ When should we pursue conservation incentive agreements as a strategy for new MPA designations? What are the potential dangers of this approach? Are there successful examples of this approach for MPAs?

MPAs versus MPA network: Regarding whether to advocate for the creation of individual MPAs or networks of MPAs, we generally felt that MPA networks are optimal. Networks are preferable for both biological and strategic reasons. They offer greater coverage, address connectivity, and build in insurance against disaster. Networks are good for promoting buy-in at national levels, promoting collaboration between communities, governments and stakeholders, and for building multi-national efforts. Network creation, when possible, is faster than independent creation of a similar set of individual MPAs, and there are incremental cost and effort advantages. Network creation involves a greater level of social and political pressure and may generate a greater level of understanding because more resources are being devoted to MPAs.

However, it will often make more sense to advocate the creation of individual MPAs and then build towards a network as an emergent property of the process. In some situations, MPA networks may not make sense geographically, or we may not have the science needed to intelligently inform the network designation process. Networks require considerably more funding and capacity at one time but funds and capacity can be diluted over time in the creation of multiple independent MPAs. Political will or stakeholder support may be lacking, and networks may be too ambitious a concept to convey to the stakeholders. All of these requirements take time, and jumping in with a network discourse may undermine the whole idea of conservation and responsible management.

MPA designation should not be contingent on the creation of a network. Individual MPAs

should be pursued if it is a new idea in an area, as smaller areas result in easier implementation. Individual MPAs should be used as pilots for future sites. In cases where there is one single governance system applied in separate areas, network creation can work. But it is different where we are working in multiple countries or with varying governance structures and stakeholders. It is best to address the issue on a case-by-case basis, even if the final goal is a network.

Requisite scientific studies: It is important to do enough research prior to MPA or Network designation, but there are limits. There must be both social science and natural science studies conducted. The studies or information mentioned as most relevant and necessary included the following:

- ▶ Social Science:
 - ▶ Governance conditions;
 - ▶ Economic valuations;
 - ▶ Resource use patterns and trends;
 - ▶ Cultural roles; and
 - ▶ Potential for protected areas to generate income.
- ▶ Natural science:
 - ▶ RAP / biodiversity surveys (confirms that an area has biological value, identifies spatial gaps in knowledge, and generates stakeholder interest);
 - ▶ Habitat mapping, including critical habitats;
 - ▶ Genetic connectivity analyses;
 - ▶ Inventory;
 - ▶ Lifecycles;
 - ▶ Connectivity/dispersal/genetics;
 - ▶ Threat status; and
 - ▶ Resilience.

We additionally identified the following studies as important, resources and time permitting: connectivity, genetic links, larval flow, migration patterns, and resilience studies. It was noted that the necessary studies may vary depending on the reason for MPA establishment, and that terrestrial issues that may impact the MPA should also be addressed. It is important that local capacity is built in conjunction with the above mentioned research.

Minimum standards for MPA designation: The discussion on this issue was varied, but the general consensus was that while bigger is usually better, requirements are context-dependant, and CI should support MPA designation at any scale possible. We should promote bigger MPAs, within the management capacity and funding limitations of the site. The size and shape of an MPA should be adequate to produce meaningful conservation results in each particular context. Some participants recommended the development of a minimum size based on scientific standards, noting that TNC has such a standard. In response, it was suggested that CI's uniqueness lies in its flexibility, and that it is not our role to set standards. Flexibility will ensure that we can work anywhere, and

will allow us to continue to provide advice regarding what is more or less viable based on the capacity of the authorities to manage those MPAs. It might be useful, however, to develop more elaborate guidelines about factors that field managers should take into account, or a synthesis of the literature regarding issues such as percentage no-take and minimum size.

No-take areas should be a fundamental part of MPAs, but the issue should not be forced if doing so would derail the MPA designation process. Several participants argued that an MPA without any no-take areas is just fisheries management and should not qualify as an MPA.

It is important that key stakeholder groups are not in opposition to the MPA designation, but setting a minimum level of stakeholder support is neither feasible nor transferable between sites. Although networks are ideal, it should not be required that an MPA be part of a network upon creation. While standardized physical parameters might not be practical, management standards could be developed. MPAs must have clearly defined and viable objectives, and the cost of an MPA should be roughly equivalent to its role in a larger network, where applicable.

Opportunistic versus conservative: The determination of whether to take advantage of an opportunistic MPA designation depends on the situation. We must assess whether accelerated MPA creation would carry more risk than a slower constituency building process. On the other hand, it is possible that the concept will lose stakeholder support or enthusiasm if we do not take advantage of opportunities. Taking advantage of opportunistic MPAs to create quick success could build support for more strategic MPAs later.

We must ensure that there is the capacity to manage and fund the MPA before taking advantage of such an opportunity. It is necessary to ensure that the MPA can deliver the results promised during its quick creation, and that objectives will be achieved. The costs and benefits of each opportunity must be considered.

It was suggested that any new MPA is progress, questioning whether a bad designation was ever proven to be worthless. Any decision to declare a protected area, however, closes off other opportunities, particularly from the institutional perspective of trying to maximize the conservation value per dollar. It was also argued that care must be taken that these decisions do not trample on people's rights. On the other hand, there may be an argument for being more opportunistic in the marine realm than in the terrestrial realm because most of the terrestrial realm already has management structures of some sort, whereas most of the marine realm is currently unmanaged.

Conservation incentive agreements: Conservation incentive agreements, it was generally thought, should not be part of the initial MPA designation. Conservation incentive agreements could be useful where established user rights exist and where agreements are used for social justice (in areas where stakeholders feel they will be disadvantaged by

the new MPA). Promotion of MPAs should be grounded in the benefits of the MPA itself, rather than in the need for additional incentives. When necessary, incentives should be linked to regulations and should ensure unique access to the resource. Incentives should be approached as a business proposition rather than a bribe, and strong trust must be established. Incentives need to be negotiated carefully with the appropriate decision makers. Subsidy creation should be avoided.

The risks of conservation incentive agreements include the creation of disagreeable precedents, the creation of undesirable incentives, and creating dependence on the incentives. When incentives are used, communities may protect the resources for exclusively economic reasons, and protection will end when the funds end. Incentives may introduce migration within an industry to take advantage of these incentives. New 'fishermen' appear when it becomes known that there will be a buyout of fishing rights, and the incentive may actually increase pressure on the resource in the short term and increase the costs of the buyout. Additionally, long-term investment requirements may grow if it is not controlled. Social jealousy is a big concern. When MPAs are initially promoted as a benefit for communities, and then incentives are introduced for some communities but not others, it becomes contentious.

Several successful examples of conservation incentive agreements were mentioned, including alternative livelihoods for trade fishermen in Sulu-Sulawesi Seascape, Papua Dive giving 10 Euro in cash and commodities for each visit to a nearby village, and user fees in Raja Ampat. In Melanesia incentive agreements are critical because resources are owned by the locals. None of these conservation agreements, however, were a result of MPA creation. Successful examples of fisheries buyouts are hard to find, so we should look at the terrestrial examples and figure out how to adapt them. In terrestrial realms, trust funds and endowments are being set up to fund conservation incentive agreements, and there is strong potential for doing this in Melanesia.

Key recommendations:

- ▶ MPA creation and management is one, very important, tool to achieve marine conservation outcomes;
- ▶ While MPA networks are regarded as preferable to independent MPAs, MPA designation should not be exclusively contingent on the creation of, or integration into, a network;
- ▶ Prior to MPA or network designation both social science and natural science studies should be conducted, including but not limited to:
 - ▶ Governance conditions;
 - ▶ Economic valuations;
 - ▶ Resource use patterns and trends;
 - ▶ Cultural roles;
 - ▶ Potential for protected areas to generate income;
 - ▶ RAP / biodiversity surveys;
 - ▶ Habitat mapping; and

▶ Threat status.

- ▶ CI should not set minimum standards for MPA designation but rather maintain flexibility and continue to provide advice regarding what is more or less viable based on the capacity of relevant authorities to manage those MPAs;
- ▶ The determination of whether to take advantage of an opportunistic MPA designation depends very much on each situation; and
- ▶ Conservation incentive agreements might be useful in certain regions and circumstances, however, they must be carefully negotiated with the appropriate decision makers to ensure no adverse impacts.

Management Effectiveness Monitoring

Introductory remarks: Leah Bunce

Background:

In order to ensure that creating new protected areas did not take priority over consolidating and improving efforts in existing MPAs, we suggested adding a second component to our campaign goal: CI will improve management in existing MPAs. This raised the question of what constitutes improved management and how we will measure and report our progress. What does CI need to know to improve its investments in MPAs?

Aims:

- ▶ Discuss management effectiveness monitoring approaches;
- ▶ Identify key indicators for the evaluation of CI marine initiatives; and
- ▶ Develop next steps regarding the creation of a CI effectiveness evaluation system.

Synthesis:

There are essentially two ways to approach evaluating MPA management. One approach is to focus on outcomes, which is the basis for the “How is your MPA doing?” guidebook¹. This guidebook provides a framework for examining how an MPA meets its original objectives such as: ecological (status of endangered species, species richness, and fish population levels), socioeconomic objectives (improved livelihoods, improved equity of

¹Pomeroy, R.S., Parks, J.E. and Watson, L.M. (2004). *How is your MPA doing? A Guidebook of Natural and Social Indicators for Evaluating Marine Protected Area Management Effectiveness*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.

benefits, increased environmental awareness), and governance objectives (community empowerment, sufficient authority). Outcomes, however, are just one component of the MPA process.

A second method takes a more holistic approach. An example of this approach was developed by Marc Hocking in 2000 in the IUCN Protected Area Framework², which looks at the following:

- Where are we now (looking at factors like: state of abundance, water quality, invasive species);
- Stage of planning (where do we want to be, what is the planning process, objectives, management plan);
- Inputs (research, staff, budget);
- Process (how do we go about doing this, is there stakeholder participation, outreach, staff training, enforcement); and
- Outcomes (as above).

There are a number of tools that are out there and they range in detail from “How is your MPA doing?” which is very detailed although it focuses only on outcomes, to the much simpler World Bank Score Card, which is a check list designed to be done in a few hours. The CI Outcomes Monitoring team is working on developing outcome monitoring indicators, and has proposed conducting a workshop to develop indicators specific to marine issues. Governance indicators have been developed already. The MMAS Management Effectiveness Monitoring Program uses variables for monitoring in all four nodes – Belize, Brazil, Eastern Tropical Pacific Seascape and Fiji. Finally, hired by TNC to do a review of these tools, Mark Stern has compiled all of the indicators from the different tools into one document³.

Given this background of the existing effectiveness evaluation tools, the participants broke into groups to discuss the following questions:

- ▶ What are the existing and institutionalized systems?;
- ▶ What do we want to know?;
- ▶ What indicators are critical?; and
- ▶ How do we best ensure CI outcomes/indicators are represented in management plan objectives?

²Hocking, M., Stolton, S. and Dudley, N. (2000). *Evaluating Effectiveness: A Framework for Assessing the Management of Protected Areas*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.

³Stern, Marc J. (2006). *Measuring Conservation Effectiveness in the Marine Environment: A Review of Evaluation Techniques and Recommendations for Moving Forward*. The Nature Conservancy. <http://conserveonline.org/workspaces/patools/resources/pame/pamedocs/stern2006>

Existing systems to track MPA effectiveness: We discussed two regions in which there are current efforts to track MPA effectiveness: the Philippines and within the Eastern Tropical Pacific Seascape. In the Philippines there is a system based on CCEF developed by Alan White. It includes both process and outcome indicators, is fairly detailed and requires about three months to complete. The evaluation includes both quantitative and qualitative feedback, and the top three MPAs in the country each year receive awards. Colombia conducts a very detailed evaluation system which focuses on integrity and is carried out every six months. A full system was recently developed in the Galapagos, and ETPS has additionally applied the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) 34 question system for all relevant MPAs.

What we want to know: Before determining what we want to know, we need to determine who we mean by 'we'. That varies depending on scale. At the CI level, we want to know whether or not our investments in MPAs are working. Globally and for CI's purposes, outcome indicators, focusing on ecological indicators, should be more important when selecting indicators to measure MPA management success. It is also important to include the outcomes that we value, for instance those relating to management objectives. The CI level monitoring must be very simple and should be done in parallel with national level monitoring. For this reason the scorecard, complemented by more site-specific monitoring of socioeconomic, ecological and governance impacts, would be the most useful tool at the global or CI level.

At the national level, because they have to answer to a constituency, they may be more focused on socioeconomic indicators. At the national scale there might also be interest in specific results related to their external commitments such as Convention on Biological Diversity requirements. At the site level, management authorities will be interested in how the MPA is doing relative to its objectives, and stakeholders may be interested in whether their behavior changes (fishing limitations, for instance) have generated the expected results. In parallel with the CI level monitoring, we must continue to support the institutionalization of effectiveness evaluation and adaptive management at the national and site level.

The tracking system should include both process and outcome indicators. When reporting to donors it is important to have process indicators to report on in the short term, as outcomes take longer to achieve. At the outcomes level, we need to track biodiversity conditions. Process related indicators should focus on governance and socioeconomics. Any monitoring system promoted by CI must be simple, supportive, and non-threatening to local authorities.

Key indicators: Effectiveness evaluation should include indicators for all of the program's management plan objectives. All too often, however, MPAs do not have management plans or if they do have management plans, they do not have specific objectives to which they can be held accountable. We identified a number of indicators important for the measure of management effectiveness, including the following.

- ▶ Outcomes level (impact indicators, relating to improved status of priority conservation species and/or habitats);
- ▶ Process level:
 - ▶ Legal status;
 - ▶ Governance:
 - Policy framework;
 - Institutional framework and capacity (including enforcement);
 - Economic conditions and planning framework;
 - Supportive communities, sectors and governments;
 - Generation and distribution of knowledge for decision making;
 - Funding; and
 - Compliance with rules.
 - ▶ Socioeconomic conditions:
 - Mean income; and
 - Equity of benefit distribution.

CI management effectiveness: It is important that we be clear about what a CI based monitoring system is. It was suggested that it be a CI system for tracking CI support for strengthening MPA management. The system would track our efforts, rather than evaluating the efforts of governments or stakeholders. A small group of people should review the scorecard indicators, and make any necessary modifications to meet our needs. A coordination team should include the Regional Marine Strategies team, representatives from the regional marine programs and the Seascapes, the Outcomes Monitoring team, and CABS. This is something we need to do within a relatively short timeframe to meet the expectations of our donors. It would be useful to maintain some sort of network to support management effectiveness evaluation, but we should not standardize the monitoring of impact indicators. In addition to applying a simple scorecard to sites where we are making significant investments, we should occasionally assess governance at all levels.

The reason we are engaged in MPAs is to deliver biodiversity conservation outcomes. What we are trying to communicate, and to whom, however, will determine our evaluation process and indicator selection. Our role should be to make the MPA successful in meeting its outcomes. Process indicators should focus on results as well as process – reporting not how many meetings were held, but about the result of that series of meetings.

Key decisions:

Regional Marine Strategies will work with other CI staff (including Outcomes Monitoring team and Global Conservation Fund) to generate a draft list of process and outcome indicators, to be sent out to the entire group for review and feedback. Regional Marine Strategies will also meet with WFF and a consultant hired by WFF to develop a framework for establishing MPA metrics.

Indigenous and Traditional Peoples Initiative

Introductory remarks: Theresa Buppert

Background:

Within the Seascope program there are several thematic areas that are of great importance to CI's work with indigenous and traditional peoples. These areas include co-management and traditional management, resource rights and resource conflicts, and constituency-building, among others. CI's Indigenous and Traditional Peoples Initiative (ITPI) hopes to further collaborate with marine programs on these issues, enhancing engagement with indigenous and traditional communities in marine conservation action, while building on the marine program's strong examples of success from the past.

Aims:

- ▶ Identify priorities for ITPI support of CI marine programs.

Synthesis:

CI recognizes that although there are many words that reflect what is meant by indigenous, national definitions vary from country to country, and may not coincide with self-identification of indigenous peoples. CI's work is largely tied to spatial settings. Therefore, we identify indigenous peoples in specific geographic areas by the presence, in varying degrees, of:

- ▶ Close attachment to ancestral and traditional or customary territories and the natural resources in them;
- ▶ Customary social and political institutions;
- ▶ Economic systems oriented to subsistence production;
- ▶ An indigenous language, often different from the predominant language;
- ▶ Identification by others as members of a distinct cultural group; and
- ▶ Self identification.

The terms "indigenous peoples", "indigenous ethnic minorities", "tribal groups", and "traditional peoples" are among those used to describe social groups with an identity that is distinct from the dominant groups in society.

The term "local people" is used broadly to refer to the people that live in and/or utilize lands in or near conservation areas. The term is also sometimes applied to all other groups of communities that do not define themselves as either indigenous or traditional, as well as to those regions of the world where commonly accepted definitions of indigenous or traditional people are not recognized or utilized.

Begun in 2003, CI's Indigenous and Traditional Peoples Initiative works to: strengthen the capabilities of indigenous and traditional peoples (ITP) and conservationists to collaboratively:

- ▶ Achieve land, territorial and resource rights of ITP;
- ▶ Strengthen their cultural identities and livelihoods; and
- ▶ Conserve biodiversity.

ITPI collaborates with CI field offices and other key partners to facilitate work in five different programmatic areas all related to ITP and conservation: global policy and decision-making, open dialogue for a common agenda, CI's best practices for community engagement, an indigenous leadership fellows program (pilot phase), and a small grants program supporting projects undertaken by indigenous and traditional communities or organizations as well as CI. By and large, these efforts are designed to strengthen CI's commitments to ITP and support the vital role of their territories in conservation landscapes. The indigenous leadership fellows program supports training for indigenous leaders, working with representatives to effectively link conservation and community initiatives at the global, national, and local scales. ITPI is currently in the process of defining selection criteria and fundraising to take the fellowship program beyond its pilot phase. Once fully established, ITPI indigenous representatives from priority marine areas will be eligible to apply.

Based on the discussion, some of the challenges and opportunities for regional marine programs working with indigenous and traditional peoples include:

- ▶ Conflict resolution between indigenous groups and a pearl farm in the Balabac Strait of the Philippines;
- ▶ Ensuring the benefits, both environmental and social, of MPAs for indigenous and traditional peoples in Brazil, working through partners;
- ▶ In Colombia, communities are re-asserting their right to resources;
- ▶ In southern Mesoamerica, policy changes at the national level recognize the rights of indigenous peoples; and
- ▶ All activities in Raja Ampat are related to indigenous peoples because everyone in the area is indigenous. Designating the MPA in Raja Ampat is empowering the indigenous people and harmonizing traditional rights and regional and national policies.

Global Marine Partnership Fund

Introductory remarks: Chris Jameson

Background:

This session provided the Regional Marine Programs with an update on the development of the Global Marine Partnership Fund (GMPF), and allowed these programs to provide feedback on their various programmatic and operational experiences (lessons-learned).

Aims:

- ▶ Discuss the development of the GMPF and its relationship with the existing Regional Marine Programs.

Synthesis:

CI's Conservation Funding Division (CFD) was designed to scale up and provide critically needed funding to enable conservation outcomes by CI and partners. Over 1,000 partners have been supported by CFD, including NGOs, academics, small businesses, community groups, and private landowners. CFD efforts have resulted in 47 million hectares of newly protected areas, at least 23 million hectares under improved conservation management, over \$100 million in investments designed for long-term protected area financing, and over 15,000 people directly impacted through conservation-based job creation.

The Global Marine Partnership Fund (GMPF), one component of the CFD strategy, was designed to support strategic Seascape planning, implementation and long term financing, with a goal of \$100 million. The GMPF is scaling up marine conservation by providing a global perspective, aggregating and leveraging new funds, innovatively engaging governments, and stimulating private sector participation. The GMPF aims to expand the Seascape vision, establishing ten Seascapes with five years of funding and ten-year work plans for each Seascape. The GMPF will provide a comprehensive and consistent methodology for Seascape strategy development and provide funding to implement these strategies. The ultimate goal of the fund is to protect marine biodiversity and key marine habitats while improving the economic conditions of local stakeholders and resource users.

Investment strategies are created based on the "ecosystem profiles" of targeted areas, which provide roadmaps, based on science, for regional conservation investment. They focus subsequent grant-making on a broad base of stakeholders who are working together toward a common goal. This proven grant-making methodology will curb redundant efforts and ensure complementary initiatives among ongoing marine conservation and development efforts, and will make implementation more cost-effective.

CI will make grants to national and international NGOs, community groups, civil society partners and, in some instances, governments. The GMPF will focus on developing partnerships, building the expertise and experience of local and national stakeholders, and directly funding on-the-ground activities. The Fund will also facilitate the exchange of information, enabling ocean conservationists receiving grants to share what they learn across a global network of practitioners, resources managers and others.

The GMPF received a 2-year grant from the Harold K.L. Castle Foundation in November 2006 for development of a comprehensive strategy for marine conservation in the main Hawaiian Islands. The project has initiated stakeholder analysis, legal review, scientific review/gaps analysis, and is investigating sustainable financing options. The GMPF development plan has been drafted and an initial draft of global priority areas for Fund

investment developed. Additionally, new donors have been engaged.

The next steps for the GMPF are:

- ▶ Develop donor strategy with the goals of \$20M in FY08;
- ▶ Develop guiding principles for operation of the GMPF and finalize the Governing Body structure and composition;
- ▶ Document lessons-learned from existing Marine and Seascope Programs;
- ▶ Develop audience-specific communications and fundraising materials (Fund FAQs, Seascope regional descriptions, donor proposals);
- ▶ Continue to develop and initiate the fundraising strategy;
- ▶ Continue technical review to refine criteria for global priority funding regions;
- ▶ Develop monitoring metrics for measuring impact of grant implementation.

Discussion and Feedback:

Assessment of the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, on which the GMPF strategies are modeled, recommends that the management structure be placed in the counties and regions, with a small unit in the headquarters. Participants suggested that GMPF should consider this recommendation, because having a large management unit in Washington DC could really slow down the program. Additionally, the grant application process should be simplified and GMPF should consider providing initial grants for the planning process in new Seascope regions. It was suggested that while the proposed scheme may work well in the regions where CI maintains a marine program presence, it may be more difficult in areas where there is no CI or Seascope presence. In such areas, CEPF used partners such as WWF to drive the process. GMPF should consider changing the term 'ecosystem profile' because Seascapes are defined not only by biological importance but also by governance structures.

Marine Communications

Introductory remarks: Lisa Bailey

Background:

CI's Strategic Marketing and Global Communications program can be a useful tool for field staff to communicate successes and opportunities to external audiences. This session provided an update on current communications projects, and generated a discussion regarding communications needs and concerns from the marine field directors and staff.

Aims:

- ▶ Gain group's collective understanding of the structure and role of CI's new

marketing/communications program at CI HQ;

- ▶ Identify needs for marine content on the upcoming, new CI website; and
- ▶ Identify story ideas from the field for future Earth Expeditions content on the upcoming, new CI website.

Synthesis:

The CI website should be a useful tool to communicate our successes to external audiences. Unfortunately, many of the field staff have found the current website difficult to access due to poor connectivity in their regions. Participants suggested that the creation of a link right at the beginning, which allows users to access a version of the site that does not require such high connectivity, might let field staff and clients side-step this issue.

We need a clear process that allows programs to review the content of the web site. Currently, all programmatic content is vetted by program staff, at least at the DC level. Field staff is also concerned with the maintenance of the content, and making sure all of the content is still accurate. Allowing program staff to directly edit and upload content to their pages is under consideration. All of the species information on the website is vetted through CABS, but it was suggested that marine species be vetted through the marine program as well.

Current thoughts on marine content for conservation.org include marine stories and overviews about marine projects throughout the website. There will also be a marine exhibit, making it very easy for visitors to see that CI does marine work and for those visitors to easily access the marine content. Within the marine exhibit we expect to have an ocean overview, biosphere statistics, CI Marine programmatic information, marine stories, earth expeditions and textual articles. The content will relate ocean issues to the daily lives of the readers, who do not necessarily live in coastal areas.

Participants discussed the needs for marine content, including the following:

- ▶ There is a concern that we have no content that is relevant to the people in the areas where we work. Should this be addressed entirely by the subsidiary, country specific websites? If that is the case, the content on conservation.org should be directed at fundraising in the US;
- ▶ The use of flagship species, particularly sharks and sea turtles, is important as a way to bring in attention and attract more money. We need to be creative in providing information related to species if the representation in the website is geographic based;
- ▶ It is ideal that each program should have its own site, with links on conservation.org. This will allow the sites to keep the most up-to-date information available. But right now it is challenging because the sites do not have dedicated internet communications experts to work with;
- ▶ Concerns were expressed regarding how Digital Strategies will engage the field offices to address their needs once the new conservation.org is rolled out. Several participants would like for Digital Strategies to use content directly from the

countries' websites. Will field staff be able to update field office content on the new conservation.org?;

- ▶ Concerns were expressed regarding how we brand or promote ourselves without alienating partners. Lisa assured all that our partner audiences will be given credit that is due. Partnership is key to CI's identity; and
- ▶ With respect to storytelling, the Strategic Marketing and Global Communications program needs to be careful not to promote stories as successes before success is achieved. It is also important to equally represent our partners in Earth Expeditions and other stories. Both of these concerns are addressed with field staff prior to launching Earth Expeditions and other stories.

Photo Gallery



S. Vergara



M. Quibilan



S. Troeng



S. Henderson



M. Quibilan



S. Henderson



**CONSERVATION
INTERNATIONAL**

Conservation International
2011 Crystal Drive, Suite 500
Arlington, VA 22202

tel 703.341.2400
fax 703.892.0826
www.conservation.org

1

Seascapes