



**Exploring the Role of MPAs in
Reconciling Fisheries Management with Conservation
Bergen, Norway, 29 – 31 March 2011**

A note by the NEAFC Secretariat

1. Introduction

The Challenge: There is now wide consensus that management of human activities using natural resources must take into account the direct and indirect impacts they may have.

The Ecosystem Approach (EA) provides a set of principles for the sustainable use of marine ecosystems and resources. As regards fisheries, the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF) requires that fisheries management be concerned not only with target species, but also with other living resources and the environment at large. The Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF), an approach for the implementation of the CCRF, includes as one of its main principles the need to maintain human and ecosystem health, including both biodiversity and ecosystem functions.

EAF also calls for the use of a suite of management tools that recognise the need for sustainable use of marine resources and protection of the marine and coastal environment as a prerequisite for sustainable fisheries. One of the tools that has potential for assisting in the maintenance of ecosystem integrity in fisheries, and is also widely used as a management tool for nature conservation, is Marine Protected Areas (MPAs). MPAs also directly address another operational principle of EAF, coordination and harmonization across sectors.

Spatial management tools, such as MPAs, that are linked to specific areas and thus highlight the interaction of fisheries with other potential uses of the same areas, are particularly useful in addressing impacts from multiple sectors. Such management tools should also be embedded in broader spatial management frameworks for coasts and the ocean that are being increasingly used to create effective cross-sectoral management and collaboration in marine and coastal spaces.

However, in practice MPAs are often created independent of overall sectoral and cross-sectoral management frameworks and policies. MPAs are rarely designed or implemented in dialogue between, for example, fisheries and conservation efforts. There is an opportunity to realise the potential of MPAs to reconcile fisheries management and conservation by examining key issues and solutions in the implementation of MPAs and related policies. In addition, there is also an important level of misunderstanding about the effects and goals of MPAs between those that work on fisheries and conservation, leading to a lack of coordination and collaboration regarding the implementation and general use of MPAs. These issues necessitate a greater level of bridging and linkages between the fisheries and conservation community to ensure more effectively managed MPAs with sound management objectives.



A number of international processes and organisations have recognised this challenge and are addressing issues related to sustainable marine and coastal resource use. The FAO is in the process of publishing guidelines on MPAs in a fisheries context that focus on bridging the fisheries and conservation community to complement earlier guidance on fisheries management based on the Code of Conduct. Other resources are being developed to inform the discussions on broader management frameworks such as the UNEP guidance on the Ecosystem Approach and MPA Governance, as well as completed guidance on marine spatial planning by UNESCO/IOC and the Nordic Council of Ministers, and regional and global work on MPAs for fisheries management and ecosystem conservation.

Despite the abundance of guidance and information on MPAs, there is still a need for consolidated information on practical experiences and lessons learned on the implementation of MPAs and linkages to related policies. In addition, national and regional experiences can provide important information on how institutional frameworks and policies have worked to improve the linkages to overall fisheries management within an ecosystem approach to fisheries, and in turn how to make sure that EAF is appropriately linked to broader coastal and ocean management frameworks.

2. The Workshop

a. Presentations

Secretary of State, Hans Kristian Amundsen: Opening Lecture

Serge. M. Garcia: Marine protected areas in fisheries management: aliens or allies? Pedro de Barros: The FAO Technical Guidelines on MPAs and Fisheries in the context of the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries

Peter Jones: Governing MPAs - getting the balance right (FAO Guidelines).

Takaomi KANEKO and Mitsutaku MAKINO: Marine Protected Areas in Japan

Susanne F. McDermott: MPAs as management tools in northern boreal ecosystems: What are our goals and how do we get there?

Thomas Kirk Sørensen: MPAs for fisheries management and nature conservation in the Nordic region.

Richard Kenchington: Ecosystem Based Management, MPAs and Fisheries and the bigger picture

Colin G. Attwood: Marine Protected Areas in South Africa: from coastal successes to offshore challenges

Chandrika Sharma: Spatial management approaches in fisheries and environmental conservation: Experiences from selected Asian countries



The presentations can be found at
http://www.imr.no/om_havforskningsinstituttet/arrangementer/konferanser/mpafish2011/presentations/en

1988 IUCN introduced the representative network of protecting areas.

b. Workshops

The lectures were discussed in 5 parallel workshops.

Workshop 1A: MPAs to reconcile fisheries management and conservation objectives

- What is effective 'reconciliation'?
- How have/could potential synergies and conflict of interests been accounted for in reconciling fisheries management and conservation objectives?
- Identify ecological and policy areas where fisheries management and conservation objectives diverge and/or converge the greatest.
- How have/could these objectives been defined/scoped
- How have/could these objectives most effectively be reconciled?
- How have/could stakeholders be effectively identified and engaged, resulting in intentional and meaningful solutions for reconciliation?
- How have/could MPA cost and benefits be distributed equally?
- To what degree can/should scientific advice be compromised to achieve reconciliation?
- How have/could the MPAs be evaluated and how has/can this information feed back into management planning and implementation processes (adaptive management)?

Workshop 1B: Institutional, policy and management frameworks for reconciling fisheries management and conservation

- What type of institutional structures facilitate reconciliation of fisheries management and conservation and how do these institutions interact/communicate/collaborate?
- What is the effectiveness of these arrangements or institutions?
- In cases where reconciliation has been attempted, what has the process been in redesigning or establishing new institutions to enable better collaboration? What have been the main obstacles?
- What are key considerations and incentives in moving toward better collaboration between institutions?

Workshop 2A: Management approaches

- Have MPAs with primary fisheries management objectives had coincidental positive or negative impacts on biodiversity status and have MPAs with primary conservation objectives had positive or negative effects on fisheries?
- How can these effects/impacts be optimized or minimized through coordinated/collaborative management approaches?



- Which management initiatives have been effective in achieving reconciliation of fisheries management and conservation in the use of MPAs
- How are management trade-offs being identified and addressed?

Workshop 2B: MPAs within a multi-sectoral context

- In what way have multi-sectoral considerations been taken into account in the design and implementation of MPAs to date? Should they be? Which sectors?
- How can sectoral management approaches (EAF, etc) been integrated into broader management frameworks (ICZM, MSP, etc)? And how can holistic management frameworks be implemented most effectively in sectoral approaches?
- In what way have these broader management frameworks contributed to reconciling objectives/goals for MPAs? Under which conditions have these frameworks contributed to reconciliation?
- How can management frameworks address the above issues in an operational context?
- How has the value of the ecosystem and its goods and services been taken into account in comparison with economic value of competing sectors?

Workshop 3: MPAs in the open oceans

- What are the expected effects of MPAs on fisheries management and conservation in the open oceans?
- What are the challenges of establishing and enforcing MPAs in the open ocean?
- How can stakeholders be engaged in areas that are far from shore?
- To whom do the goods and services of open sea ecosystems belong?

Reports from the Workshops can be found at

http://www.imr.no/om_havforskningsinstituttet/arrangementer/konferanser/mpafish2011/wg-reports/en.

3. Outcome

The expected outcome of the workshop was:

- Review of sectoral and cross-sectoral policy and institutional framework that enable MPAs to be used as one of the tools to reconcile fisheries management and ecosystem conservation in different regions
- Review and synthesis of experiences that will serve to inform implementation of MPAs as one of the tools to reconcile fisheries management and ecosystem conservation
- Practical advice on sectoral (e.g. fisheries and EAF) and cross-sectoral management frameworks (e.g. EA, ICZM, MSP) that can inform the appropriate implementation of MPAs, including input and guidance for dealing with management trade-offs when developing MPAs



The meeting ended with a plenary chaired by Mr Maarten Mens. He used the “House of Commons concept” allowing free discussion and forcing participants to take a position on specific questions,