

WCPA-MARINE / WWF
Marine Protected Areas Management Effectiveness Initiative
Day 1 - Monday, September 23, 2002

Summary of Discussion Questions and Answers

I. Questions about IUCN/WCPA Framework and Lessons Learned Presentation (Marc Hockings)

1. How does the Hockings' Framework document relate to this Guidebook?

Response:

- The Framework relates to the overall structure of the Guidebook especially the indicators, outputs, and outcomes.
- The Guidebook looks at other elements of framework than just for World Heritage sites and more specifically relates to marine sites.
- Need to look at the Framework and Guidebook as a whole package.
- The Guidebook builds on the Framework, but crafts it into something more operational at the field level (more detailed information).
- The Guidebook has a focus on marine areas versus terrestrial. Besides there being a large number of differences in the natural systems, governance, etc. , there is a need to address MPAs specifically.

2. Has a watershed approach (cross-boundary) been incorporated into the Guidebook?

Response:

- Watershed management is acknowledged in the Guidebook, but should probably be developed more; it is important.
- Remember that not all indicators apply to all sites. Since the majority of evaluation results are not used because they are completed from the outside rather than internally (not adaptive), we need the site managers to become involved in the assessment side. Participants need to adapt the template to fit their individual sites so it is useful.

3. What if a site needs to make changes to an existing management plan, how should an assessment of the evaluation be accomplished?

Response:

- TNC has an applicable document.
- Need to go through the cycle diagram again to re-examine the process in a thoughtful way and see how things are doing, evaluate the outcomes.

4. How does a site determine if they have gone through the process effectively? If a site has a management plan, are there some local standards relevant to assess the process?

Response:

- Need to evaluate outcomes based on all information in order to really understand the site.
- Set appropriate systems in site and then monitor achievements against this
- Site age might play a factor.
- Do not need to wait until a site is two-years-old to see outcomes because there will be some outcomes before then.
- Need to integrate evaluation into entire process.

II. Questions about Pilot Project Initiative and Guidebook

1. With this timeline, how much opportunity is there for a site to get useful results in 2-3 months? What are the expectations from sites by February 2003?

Response:

- This initiative will continue beyond February 2003. It is not about establishing a comprehensive monitoring program for each site by February. Sites are all at different stages so some will not be able to prepare an entire report and may only be able to identify a process.
- By February 28, 2003, sites should:
 1. Evaluate the Draft Guidebook (provide comments and recommendations to increase usefulness).
 2. Provide results to the best extent available (e.g. specific survey dataset results or if indicator number XX could be applied in the field and used).
 3. Explain how the Guidebook could be applied to the site in the future? What are the site's plans to continue on with this adaptive management effectiveness process?
 4. Establish and participate in a learning network for information exchange.

2. How does a site decide which indicators to select, which ones are relevant?

Response:

- Apply a hierarchical approach to select indicators:
 1. Assess what indicators can be measured already?
 2. What other indicators are essential to meet site objectives in this timeframe (practical)?
 3. What can accomplish in six months then goes into site workplan
- First sites should look at the indicators from the perspective of what would be ideal to measure. Then will need to determine which indicators are appropriate and practical considering limitations relating to funding, staff, monitoring costs, time, etc.
- The objective is not to test all indicators, but the useful ones for each site.
- It is suggested that a small number of indicators are selected for each protected area. However there should be at least one indicator selected for each category (biophysical, socioeconomic, and governance).

WCPA-MARINE / WWF
Marine Protected Areas Management Effectiveness Initiative
Day 2 - Tuesday, September 24, 2002

Summary of Discussion and Comments on Guidebook

General:

- Develop and include more about using a watershed management approach
- Clearly state assumptions about status of sites to use this Guidebook -- exists as a formal mpa; has a written management plan; and, has been operating at least 2 years. Also should include a diagram/timeline representing where in the process the site is assumed to be. Then if a reader is not yet at this stage, provide references for more background information relating to earlier stages in the process (e.g. IUCN references).
- Emphasize that sites may be developed for a wide variety of reasons and implementation of sites may vary greatly (e.g. sometimes it is government imposed, etc.)
- Address that some sites have implicit goals and stakeholder involvement, but no document or formal management plan. Sometimes no plan exists, but there is legal language in place.
- Make it more explicit that indicators cannot be used as a scorecard to compare sites
- Make the connection with Hockings' framework more clear

Overall Guidebook Process:

- Include a map/diagram to walk through process
- Refine process so it is not too rigid. Current approach may encourage managers to set aside some relevant indicators. Might want to develop a slightly more flexible approach or reminder (e.g. here is this system, but you are encouraged to look back and feel free to pick and choose other indicators)

Goals and Objectives:

- Add examples and clarify good goals and objectives (to appendix)
- Add a loop in the flowchart to reformulate stated goals and objectives (earlier, don't have to wait until the end of the process)
- Add more detailed instructions upfront for formulating goals and objectives
- Include text clarifying goals, objectives, strategy (SMART Objectives)
- Explain what a site should do if management goals and objectives for the site differ from those that are important to the stakeholders. Values of society speak to objectives and goals

Glossary and Terms:

- Review glossary terms, need to clarify and standardize by group:
 - Estimate instead of measure?
 - Results vs. conclusions (explain and make distinct)

Evaluation:

- Add note explaining that indirect/external impacts may lead to different results. Need to interpret information within context and then adapt (e.g. a coral bleaching event may skew results)
- Need to distinguish between internal versus external evaluations; both are useful, but internal evaluations can be biased. Consider having an external review process and explain who is collecting and analyzing data

Adaptive Management:

- Clarify that the Guidebook is not only evaluating management effectiveness in Part 3, but evaluating throughout the entire process and all stages