

Report of FAO workshops at the Third International Marine Protected Areas Congress (IMPAC3)



The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned. The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

REPORT OF FAO WORKSHOPS AT THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL MARINE PROTECTED AREAS CONGRESS (IMPAC3)

Lena Westlund

Consultant

Fisheries and Aquaculture Policy and Economics Division

Fisheries and Aquaculture Department

FAO, Rome, Italy

February 2014

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

SUMMARIES OF FAO IMPAC3 WORKSHOPS

Marine protected areas – MPAs – were initially introduced mainly as a tool for biodiversity conservation. However, in fisheries, spatial–temporal–gear closures are historically a common management measure. Though closures are not necessarily always the preferred measure and spatial closures, when used, generally need to be combined with other management measures to achieve effectiveness and avoid negative effects, including increased fishing pressure outside the MPA and higher costs of fishing. In fact, many MPAs do not provide direct benefits to fishers, especially not when designed mainly for conservation purposes. Many small-scale fishing communities are sceptical about MPAs and do indeed suffer hardship when they are introduced in a top-down manner and with limited understanding of the fisheries and fishery-based livelihoods.

The FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department has been engaged in work on MPAs and fisheries for some time, realizing that the effects of MPAs on fisheries and fishing communities are not well understood nor always considered when designating protected areas. This work includes the publication of technical guidelines on MPAs and fisheries,¹ the organization of regional workshops (covering so far Southeast Asian and Bay of Bengal countries, the Western Indian Ocean region and the Canary Current Large Marine Ecosystem area), the carrying out of governance reviews of the use of spatial management measures and the provision of inputs into biodiversity fora.

In October 2013, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the French Government organized the 3rd International Marine Protected Areas Congress (IMPAC3). It was divided in two parts. First, over five days in Marseille, France, 91 workshops and 37 knowledge cafés were held in addition to regular plenary sessions to discuss various aspects of MPA management. This was followed by a high-level meeting in Ajaccio, France, involving government representatives and international organizations. A total of some 1 700 people participated in the congress.

FAO was represented at the high-level meeting and also organized two workshops during the five days in Marseille. These workshops focused on fisheries issues and were entitled:

- MPAs through the eyes of fishers;
- MPAs as a fisheries management tool.

This report summarizes the presentations and the discussions during these two events.

¹ FAO. 2011. *Fisheries management. 4. Marine protected areas and fisheries*. FAO Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries No. 4, Suppl. 4. Rome. 198 pp. (also available at www.fao.org/docrep/015/i2090e/i2090e.pdf).

SUMMARY OF THE WORKSHOP “MPAS THROUGH THE EYES OF FISHERS”

Workshop WS2J3

Day 2: 22 October 2013

INTRODUCTION

The workshop took place on 22 October 2013 at the Palais du Pharo with some 85 participants and 4 invited panellists attending (see Appendix for workshop programme). It was co-chaired by Naseegh Jaffer, Coordinator, World Forum of Fisher Peoples (WFFP), and Jessica Sanders, Fisheries Officer, FAO. Johanna Herfaut, French Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) Agency, supported its organization, and Lena Westlund, FAO consultant, was a primary organizer and the rapporteur. The objective was to take a forward-looking perspective and discuss inclusive approaches to the designation and management of MPAs: how can fishing communities, researchers, managers and practitioners work together to deliver sustainable livelihoods, food security and conservation outcomes? Three questions were put to the workshop participants to frame the discussions:

- In what situations have fishing communities perceived MPAs as useful?
- What best practices are there for inclusive MPA designation and management?
- What needs to be done differently in the future to ensure more effective MPAs with both livelihoods and conservation outcomes?

OPENING OF WORKSHOP AND PRESENTATIONS

Ms Sanders welcomed participants and invited Mr Jaffer to facilitate the session. He explained that the workshop was planned to be different from other sessions, with a focus on hearing from the audience about their experiences.

Mr Jaffer recounted his own first experience with MPAs. When he was a boy out fishing with his father and grandfather, a government inspector approached them and cut their lines with the argument that they were fishing in a protected area. Their gear was lost with no compensation or further explanation. The experience was humiliating and it was clear that the lives and livelihoods of the fishing community were not understood or respected. This type of incident influences how small-scale fishing communities perceive MPAs and creates a climate of mistrust. It is often felt that MPAs are designated and managed ignoring the traditional management systems already in place to ensure sustainable exploitation of resources.

After this introduction about how fishers can perceive MPAs, the four panellists talked about their experiences:

- **Catherine Sabinot**, Institut de recherche pour le développement, France, referred to her work – done with other researchers (Gilbert David, Rebecca Guézel and Antoine Wickel) – in some of France’s overseas departments and regions (Mayotte and New

Caledonia) and difficulties in reconciling fisheries and MPA management. Particular challenges include:

- how MPAs and government can share management responsibilities and the establishment of rules and surveillance;
- how to deal with different categories of fishing and to permit fishers to continue fishing for food (subsistence fishing) but at the same time also allow them to sell if necessary;
- how to take all different perceptions and objectives of fishing activities, including their social context, that fishing communities have into account;
- how to combine customary territorial user rights in fisheries (TURFs) with the spatial requirements of MPAs.

Ms Sabinot's work indicated that the fishers would object to MPAs unless they were involved in their management. This resistance is particularly strong among subsistence fishers for whom fishing is a vital direct source of food and also of income.

- **Leonardi Vazquez**, Comunidad y Biodiversidad Asociación Civil, Mexico, has worked with six coastal communities in the Baja California Sur Peninsula on TURFs. According to his experience, the key factors for successful MPA projects are: all communities have a sense of security in their rights to fish; they are empowered through participatory science; and they can join a network of fishers through which they can express their needs together to politicians and decision-makers. Coastal communities will be reluctant to invest in conservation projects, such as MPAs, unless they have security through TURFs or catch shares. Using a combined strategy of strengthening formal institutions and fishing rights will allow for establishing and managing MPAs smoothly with acceptance by people rather than reluctance. In developing countries, working in strengthening democracy and governmental efficiency is fundamental. This theory of change would also facilitate adaptation of coastal communities to climate change, both rooting their economies in fisheries and restoring ecosystems.
- **Cristina Pita**, Department of Biology and Centre for Environmental and Marine Studies (CESAM), University of Aveiro, Portugal, talked about the importance of understanding the social, cultural, economic and institutional factors surrounding MPAs. A survey carried out with representatives of the Portuguese fishing industry showed that they perceive MPAs to increase restrictions and negatively affect their fishing activity by increasing production costs and diminishing revenue. Fishers also complain about the increase in competition with other stakeholders for the use of the sea (e.g. recreational fisheries, diving). Fishers feel alienated from the MPA decision-making process, and complain about the lack of transparency on the implementation of MPAs and the lack of trust between stakeholders. There is a need for increased dialogue and transparency between conservation and governmental bodies and the fishing industry, and to have the fishing industry more involved in the MPA decision-making process for the success of these management tools. Ms Pita also mentioned the Too Big To Ignore initiative – a new research network and knowledge mobilization partnership to promote and revitalize small-scale fisheries globally (see <http://toobigtoignore.net>).

- **Duarte Vidal**, Grupo de Recursos Mariños e Pesquerías Universidade da Coruña, Spain, shared his experience from governance and co-management of MPAs in northwest Spain. Most MPAs in Spain have been designated based on proposals by public authorities or conservation non-governmental organizations (NGOs). However, two marine reserves with fishing interests at Cedeira and Lira have been established at the initiative of fishers and their organizations that were involved in the design and the development of the proposal as well as in internal awareness-raising actions. Nevertheless, five years on, both reserves have failed to become successful fisheries management models. Experiences from fieldwork seem to indicate that there are key components in co-management that need to receive adequate attention to make the MPA successful: use of fishers ecological knowledge, establishment of appropriate rights – such as TURF systems – and adequate management organs, effective surveillance and control, and biological and social monitoring. It is also important to understand and pay attention to power relations and political changes.

DISCUSSIONS

In the discussion following these presentations, workshop participants shared examples and lessons learned with regard to fishers' perception of MPAs and good practices for how to make MPAs more successful – with benefits for both fishing communities and conservation.

As a general theme, it was noted that fishers see MPAs as useful only if there are benefits for them or their communities. These benefits may be in different forms, e.g. reduced conflict, secure rights, improvement of fish stocks and support to supplementary livelihoods. Different fisheries subsectors may perceive benefits in different ways, and the approach to MPA designation and management has to be adapted to whether it is in a coastal area and concerns fishing grounds of small-scale fishing communities or in the high seas where commercial large-scale fishing takes place. Commercial fishers could see MPAs as an opportunity to restructure the fleet and eliminate overcapacity, assuming the MPA designation is combined with other fisheries management measures. Both small-scale and large-scale fishers may perceive MPAs as a way of securing their rights by excluding other users and developments (such as energy or tourism, or other fishers) from the area. By using spatial management measures such as MPAs, competing uses and conflicts can be managed and negotiated and, although compromises are required, increase security for all.

It is important to understand and respect the different perceptions that exist and take these into account when designating MPAs. It is imperative that fishers and fishing communities be involved from the outset of an MPA designation and design process. In fact, the most successful MPAs are those established at the initiative of fishing communities and not by outside policies or pressure. Fishers need to be given responsibilities for the fishery resources they exploit. Both bioecological and socio-economic aspects have to be considered, recognizing that it may take time for a natural habitat to recover if overexploited but that it also takes a long time to repair damaged social constructs and lost cultural identities.

In many cases, there is a need to address overfishing and overcapacity – also sometimes in small-scale fisheries, e.g. in Asia where population growth has led to an increase in small craft fishing in inshore areas. However, MPAs are not always the solution and not all MPAs provide direct benefits to fishers, especially not where designed mainly for conservation purposes. There should be greater transparency and honesty about the objectives and benefits of MPAs. Trade-offs will always be required, and in practice there are no clear win-win situations.

There is a need for better bottom-up approaches and ensuring that fishers and fishing communities have the capacity to engage in MPA planning and management processes. This is likely to require education and strengthening of organizational structures to allow fishing communities to be represented in decision-making processes. The involvement of fishers and stakeholders should be mandatory, possibly supported in legal terms. Researchers and MPA practitioners can also play an important role in linking communities and policy-makers. Generally, there needs to be a change in how things are done, including – in addition to the above – more participatory research methods as well as better collaboration and coordination between different government agencies (fisheries and environment). However, funding is a great challenge. Adequate financing is required to ensure the necessary participatory processes and capacity building.

CONCLUSIONS

The workshop did not highlight any outstanding new facts, but it is a concern that the same problems and considerations keep recurring – lack of transparency, insufficient participation of fishers and stakeholders (in particular, in initial MPA design processes), deficient capacity and marginalization of fishing communities.

These issues still need to be resolved and this is a task for all concerned with MPA designation and management. Particular challenges concern the need for sustainable funding, including for capacity building and empowering of fishing communities to help them become equal partners in development processes that directly affect their lives and livelihoods. It is also noted that there is increasing competition for the coastal and marine space and resources. Equitable and sustainable development must be promoted, ensuring that the poor and marginalized do not unfairly bear the costs for others' benefits.

From the discussions, the following key recommendations emerge:

- *To practitioners and the research community:* Ensure better collaboration and participation of communities, and provide a link between communities and governments/decision-makers.
- *To decision-makers and authorities:* Ensure better transparency and honesty with regard to objectives and trade-offs.
- *To citizens and the public at large:* Recognize and respect that fishing and the marine space are the livelihoods of fishing communities.

MPAs have the potential to be a powerful tool to support sustainable environmental, social and economic development. Let us use them wisely and equitably, ensuring that their benefits also flow to those bearing their costs.

SUMMARY OF THE WORKSHOP “MPAS AS A FISHERIES MANAGEMENT TOOL”

Workshop WS4F1A-C

Day 4: 24 October 2013

INTRODUCTION

The workshop took place on 24 October 2013 at the University Auditorium (l'Amphithéâtre de l'Université) with some 60 participants and 18 invited panellists attending (see Appendix for workshop programme). Olivier Abellard, French Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) Agency, supported its organization, and Lena Westlund, FAO consultant, was a primary organizer and the rapporteur. The objective was to promote improved understanding of the MPA conservation and fisheries management interface and of what is required to ensure successful MPAs with multiple objectives. Within this framework, the themes of the sessions were:

1. How can MPAs have positive outcomes both for conservation and fisheries management?
2. How can stakeholder participation be ensured and what are the conditions for successful co-management?
3. What is the way forward – how should different actors address challenges and seize opportunities to promote MPAs with multiple objectives?

OPENING OF WORKSHOP AND PRESENTATIONS

Lena Westlund provided an overview of the workshop programme and structure. Jessica Sanders (FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department) then gave a brief presentation on the FAO Technical Guidelines on MPAs and Fisheries.

The *FAO Technical Guidelines on MPAs and Fisheries* discuss the implementation of MPAs with multiple objectives, where one of the primary objectives concerns fisheries management. Hence, they address the interface between fisheries management and biodiversity conservation. The guidelines outline the biological and ecological effects and the social and economic impact of MPAs in the context of fisheries. They also discuss the institutional, legal and policy context, and how to plan and implement MPAs. Some key messages of the guidelines are:

- MPAs and MPA networks are a potentially powerful tool with both biodiversity conservation and fisheries management outcomes; to maximize benefits, the two concepts need to be bridged.
- However, MPAs are one management tool among many and may not always be the preferred one.
- Process is key. Only meaningful public and stakeholder participation can ensure compliance, long-term sustainable support and equitable results.

FAO. 2011. *Fisheries management. 4. Marine protected areas and fisheries*. FAO Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries No. 4, Suppl. 4. Rome. 198 pp. (also available at www.fao.org/docrep/015/i2090e/i2090e.pdf).

PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION

Each session started with an introduction by its chair and presentations by panellists. These were followed by discussions including also other workshop attendees.

On **how MPAs can have positive outcomes both for conservation and fisheries management**, it was noted that win–win situations are rare. With multiple objectives, trade-offs are unavoidable, and the challenge is to find an acceptable compromise. From a governance perspective, it is important to recognize that government officials (e.g. fisheries managers) responsible for fisheries management also adhere to and implement national policies, which are likely to include, among others, environmental sustainability and food security. This also holds for environment managers, and hence there is usually a more-or-less explicit overarching policy framework within which multiple-objective management measures can be implemented. There should be equal consideration of the three pillars of sustainable development: environmental, social and economic. An example was given from French Polynesia, where a balance between environmental protection, sustainable development and cultural values guides the management of its MPA network.



Courtesy of Pascal Erhel Hatuuku. Lagoon fisherman in French Polynesia

It is vital to be clear about the objectives of an MPA (particularly regarding protection and sustainable use of biodiversity), and greater transparency is needed in this respect. Those MPAs with conservation as their main objective may not have explicit fisheries management benefits but may instead generate costs. Some would argue that, in accordance with IUCN definitions, only closures with a primary conservation objective should be called MPAs, but there are many types of spatial management measures used by fisheries managers, often with other names.

In the context of fisheries management, MPAs are one management tool among many. MPAs do not guarantee positive fisheries management outcomes – it will depend on the particular situation and their management as well as on the quality of the fisheries management outside the MPAs. In many cases, more conventional fisheries management tools may be more appropriate. MPAs are a complementary tool rather than a substitute for other measures.

Achieving better outcomes and bridging conservation and fisheries management intentions should be possible through improved collaboration and involvement by both environment and fisheries stakeholders. Conservation issues should be better integrated in fisheries management, as through the application of the ecosystem approach to fisheries. Similarly, the interests of fisheries and fishers need to be considered when designating MPAs from a conservation perspective. It is essential to use both natural and social science and to involve those concerned from the outset of an MPA planning process to improve legitimacy and compliance.

To better understand **how stakeholder participation can be ensured and what the conditions for successful co-management are**, there is a need to recognize that if fishers do not see MPAs as equitable, they will not perceive them as beneficial and may not comply with them. The concerns of fishing communities and equitable development – and the distribution of costs and benefits – must be considered in MPA planning and management. The opportunity costs for fishers should not be underestimated. As a general principle, a large part of the benefits needs to return to the communities bearing the costs. It is important to consider compensation to these where costs are unavoidable. Likewise, the formalization of customary rights should be given priority.

There is often also an unequal distribution of benefits and costs not only between stakeholders and in space but also in time. Costs tend to arise in the short term but benefits only accrue in a longer time perspective. MPAs do not necessarily improve livelihoods and nutrition benefits for communities, at least not in the short term. It may take many years (sometimes 5–10 years, but also up to decades) for full fishery benefits to be generated, and this may be longer than acceptable to communities bearing the costs in the meantime. The timing to achieve MPA-based fishery benefits depends heavily on the characteristics of the fished species, the design of the MPA itself, and the nature of fishery management outside the MPA. Hence, flexible MPA design and management are required that consider both the final outcome and the trajectory to achieve this outcome. This could include: (i) using no-take areas of different sizes over time; (ii) securing access rights based on traditional fishing rights; and (iii) generating supplementary livelihood options to cope with additional costs. Generating sustainable **alternative** livelihoods is often difficult, especially in small-scale fisheries where fishing is not only a source of income but also a way of life. However, providing **supplementary** income sources may be more acceptable, including through the introduction of new skills, new products or innovative marketing. Tourism is often cited as such an alternative or supplementary income generating activity. However, in some cases, tourism overexploits resources and damages habitats. It can be more part of the problem

than the solution, particularly where revenues flow to entities outside the fishing community and even outside the country concerned.

An MPA created at the initiative of fishers is more likely to be successful than one planned in a top-down process. As a minimum, proper and true participation of fishers is required. There is a need to ensure that fishers and communities are involved not only in the data collection and assessment but also in the elaboration and evaluation of options so that they are the “owners” of their own development and future. Effective participation is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition to ensure sustainability. Participation faces a number of challenges, and decisions need to be made about who should participate and what amount of participation is required and at what scale.

For the future and the way forward, there are various **challenges and opportunities for actors to address and seize with a view to promoting MPAs with multiple objectives**. Ensuring the necessary participation and engagement by fishers and fishing communities may require, among others, empowerment, capacity building, knowledge generation and leadership development. The role of government authorities also needs to be recognized – links between local, regional and national levels, appropriate legal frameworks and enforcement systems are required. The institutional arrangements need to be designed to allow representation of stakeholders and take traditional governance systems into account. Management plans, especially with multiple objectives, have to be adaptive so that they can change as unexpected contextual developments require. Researchers and scientists are more often in direct contact with both communities and government authorities and can help improve communication between the different stakeholder groups.

MPAs in coastal areas and in the high seas require different approaches and solutions. In the high seas, commercial fishing companies are more common stakeholders than small-scale fishing communities dependent on coastal resources. While it may be a complex process to review and amend legal and institutional arrangements in the national context (to allow for effective co-management), the high seas areas – being beyond national jurisdictions – pose another set of difficulties. Still, for fisheries management in the high seas, there are regional fisheries management organizations/arrangements (RFMO/As) that have a key role to play in area-based management and have the mandate and experience to do so. Some RFMOs (e.g. North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission – NEAFC) have identified vulnerable marine ecosystems and provide protection of these. RFMOs can establish legally binding management measures and apply the necessary monitoring, control and surveillance. They already have acceptance by the fisheries sector, which would make good compliance more likely also for a wider set of protected areas. RFMOs are not doing a perfect job but, considering the conditions under which they operate, other environmental institutions are unlikely to perform much better (as the overall low performance of many MPAs, and paper parks, testifies).

At a regional level, the large marine ecosystem projects cover work on fish and fisheries, ecosystem health, productivity, socio-economics and governance. For example, under an ecosystem approach to fisheries management, the Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem

(BOBLME) project promotes MPAs for both fisheries management and biodiversity conservation objectives.

Within the European Union (Member Organization) new policies on MPAs as a management tool and more holistic approaches are providing new opportunities for cooperation – both among countries and between fisheries and environment authorities. The revised Common Fisheries Policy will include MPAs as integrated tools for use in fisheries management. Long-term management plans will cover a wider range of species, environments and actors and hence promote more holistic management of marine ecosystems and regional cooperation.

CONCLUSIONS

MPAs can be useful tools for both conservation and fisheries management but there needs to be a clear understanding of the importance of objectives. An MPA cannot be expected to have a positive impact for purposes not included in its objectives, e.g. if designed for conservation purposes, it may not have benefits for fisheries. In fisheries management, MPAs are one tool among many and do not substitute for other measures (access regulations within and outside an MPA are crucial).

Fishers will only perceive MPAs as useful if they are equitable and provide benefits. The involvement of fishers in MPA design and management is fundamental for successful outcomes. To achieve effective participation, process is as important as outcomes. It should be recognized that participatory processes and co-management do not automatically mean sustainability but that they are necessary elements in a successful management process.

The challenges and opportunities for promoting MPAs with multiple objectives look different in coastal areas and the high seas. In coastal areas, the livelihoods of fishing communities dependent on marine and coastal resources have to be respected, and legal and institutional structures established to guarantee their customary rights and involvement in MPA planning and management. In the high seas, there are RFMOs responsible for fisheries management that also use area-based management measures.

MPAs with multiple objectives are an opportunity for better environment and fisheries management. This opportunity can be capitalized on through improved collaboration and understanding of the needs and limitations of different stakeholder groups. Transparency, communication, cooperation and empowerment are key words for the future of MPAs.



Courtesy of Comunidad y Biodiversidad A.C. (COBI). The fishers' cooperative of Isla Natividad, Baja California Sur (in the picture), was the first Mexican cooperative to voluntarily implement community-based marine reserves in 2006. This initiative has since been followed by other fishers' cooperatives throughout the country.

APPENDIX I: WORKSHOP PROGRAMME

IMPAC3: Day 2

Stream: Socioeconomics and MPAs; Area: Participatory approaches

WS2J3: MPAs through the eyes of fishers

Time: 15:15; Venue: Salle Saint-Jean (1st floor, Palais du Pharo)

Workshop description and objective: A forward-looking discussion on inclusive approaches to MPA designation and management: how can fishing communities, researchers, managers and practitioners work together to deliver sustainable livelihoods, food security and conservation outcomes?

Co-chaired by: Naseegh Jaffer, Coordinator WFFP, and Jessica Sanders, FAO

List of abstracts

579	La pêche vivrière de l'Outre-mer français et les AMP : comment les concilier ? (How to reconcile fishing for food in French overseas departments and regions and MPAs?)	Catherine Sabinot catherine.sabinot@ird.fr
709	Allocation of territorial fishing rights in Baja California Sur, México: key factor to succeed in scaling-up community-based marine protected areas.	Leonardo Vazquez lvazquez@cobi.org.mx
760	Fishers' opinions about Marine Protected Areas in Portugal	Cristina Pita c.pita@abdn.ac.uk
143	Fact or fiction? Evaluating the concept of open governance and co-management of Marine Reserves of Fishing Interest in Cedeira and Lira (NW Spain).	Duarte F. Vidal duartefvidal@gmail.com

Workshop language: English

Session outline

15:15 Opening of workshop

- Introduction by chair: workshop objective and expected outputs

15:25 Presentations by panel members

Each presenter is given 4–5 minutes to present their work and to reflect on how they can contribute to inclusive MPA designation and management for the benefit of livelihoods and conservation.

15:50 Discussion (including presenters and all other workshop attendees)

- Introduction by chair: a fishing community perspective
- Open discussion around the following questions:
 - o In what situations have fishing communities perceived MPAs as useful?
 - o What best practices are there for inclusive MPA designation and management?
 - o What needs to be done differently in the future to ensure more effective MPAs with both livelihoods and conservation outcomes?
- Wrap-up by chair

16:45 Workshop closure

APPENDIX II: WORKSHOP PROGRAMME

MPAs as a fisheries management tool (WS4F1A-C)

IMPAC3: Day 4 – Governance, Partnerships & Industry Involvement

Stream: MPAs in the wider society; Area: MPAs for livelihood support

Thursday 24 October 2013

Venue: L'amphithéâtre de l'Université (the University Auditorium)

10:00 Opening of workshop:

- Workshop expected outputs and structure
 - o Through an exchange of information and experiences, improved understanding of the MPA conservation and fisheries management interface and what is required to ensure successful MPAs with multiple objectives
 - o 3 panel discussions and posters
- Introduction to the FAO Technical Guidelines on MPAs and fisheries (setting the scene for the workshop and its panel discussions)

10:15 Panel discussion 1: How can MPAs have positive outcomes both for conservation and fisheries management?

CHAIR: Serge Garcia, IUCN – FEG

- Introductory statement by chair
- Brief statements by panel members
 - o Frédérique Alban, UMR AMURE, Université de Bretagne Occidentale (France)
 - o Tearii Alpha, Minister of Marine Resources, Mines and Research, French Polynesia
 - o Amie Bräutigam, Wildlife Conservation Society (United States of America)
 - o Jean Michel Culioli, Office d'Environnement de la Corse (France)
 - o Hany El Shaer, IUCN (Lebanon)
 - o Dan Ovando, University of California (United States of America)
- Discussion
 - o What are good conservation and fisheries management outcomes, respectively? What are the trade-offs?
 - o In what situations can MPAs be a useful fisheries management tool?
 - o Under what conditions can multiple objectives be achieved (what type of governance and institutional arrangements are likely to be needed)? What are the roles of marine spatial planning, ICAM, etc.?
- Wrap-up by chair

11:30 Coffee break

11:45 Panel discussion 2: How can stakeholder participation be ensured and what are the conditions for successful co-management?

CHAIR: Jessica Sanders, FAO

- Introductory statement by chair
- Brief statements by panel members
 - o Nathan Bennett, UBC (Canada) / BOBLME
 - o Sidina Ebye, Parc National de Banc d'Arguin (Mauritania)
 - o Luc Fargier / Hans J Hartmann, Université de la Rochelle (France)
 - o Johanna Herfaut, Parc naturel marin de Mayotte
 - o Alain Jeudy de Grissac, IUCN
 - o Fidison Miniminy, Plateforme de Concertation pour le Développement Durable de la Baie d'Antongil (Madagascar)
- Discussion
 - o Why do (small-scale) fishing communities sometimes/often find MPAs problematic and how can this situation be addressed?
 - o What best practices and approaches are there for planning, designating and managing an MPA in a participatory manner?
 - o What are the key challenges in co-management and how can they be overcome?
- Wrap-up by chair

13:00 Poster exhibition

13:15 Break for lunch and congress plenary session and *poster exhibition continued*.

15:15 Panel discussion 3: What is the way forward – how should different actors address challenges and seize opportunities to promote MPAs with multiple objectives?

CHAIR: Sukarno bin Wagiman, Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem project (BOBLME) / Department of Marine Parks, Malaysia

- Introductory statement by chair
- Brief statements by panel members
 - o Stefan Asmundsson, NEAFC
 - o Philip Dearden, University of Victoria (Canada) / BOBLME
 - o Didier Gascuel, University of Brittany (France)
 - o Aylem Hernández Avila, REDPARQUES (Cuba)
 - o Amanda Lejbowicz, Comunidad y Bioversidad – COBI (Mexico)
 - o Naseegh Jaffer, WFFP (South Africa)
- Discussion
 - o Recommendations for actions to governments, international organizations, academia, NGOs and civil society organizations (CSOs) / fishing communities.
- Wrap-up by chair

16:45 End of workshop

