

Paying for MPAs: Examples of Large-Scale Fundraising for Planning and Management

Money is a limiting factor for most marine protected areas. Whether located in the developed or developing world, and whether financed by government or private parties, most MPAs report budget shortfalls: they do not have the funds to address all their needs.

That finding, described by UK researcher Pippa Gravestock in 2003 (“The cost of operating an MPA”, MPA News 5:5), is perhaps truer now than ever after years of worldwide economic slowdown and related budget cuts. Add to that the challenge of paying for all the future MPAs that will be needed to meet global coverage targets under various international agreements (“The MPA Math: How to Reach the 10% Target for Global MPA Coverage”, MPA News 13:5). Clearly, to meet both current and future needs, new financial models for MPAs are necessary.

In this issue, MPA News examines three financial mechanisms that were specially created to fund particular MPAs or MPA systems. The mechanisms — a not-for-profit partner foundation, endowments, and a dedicated fund — have each generated significant sums: millions of dollars in each case. Although such sums may be larger than most MPAs would require, the mechanisms could be scaled down as appropriate to fit individual site needs.

A partner foundation: National Marine Sanctuary Foundation

Many marine protected areas rely entirely on government support for their funding. As a result, they face a limited pool of funds that is susceptible to political shifts. What if there was a private organization associated with each site (or system of sites) that was dedicated to raising additional funds?

That is essentially what the National Marine Sanctuary Foundation (NMSF) does for the 14 sites in the US National Marine Sanctuary system. Incorporated in 2000, NMSF is the sanctuary system’s not-for-profit partner. It raises funds from private donors (including corporations, foundations, and individuals) in support of sanctuary-related programs and events. In addition, NMSF operates its own initiatives to raise public awareness of the sanctuary system.

Recent NMSF efforts included a US \$3.4-million fundraising campaign to finance exhibits for a new visitor center for the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, and providing more than \$100,000 in grants this year for ocean awareness programs that relate to sanctuaries. The annual budget for NMSF is more than \$7 million.

As a non-governmental charity, NMSF represents an approachable, tangible way for donors to support the sanctuaries they cherish. In fact the homepage of the government’s Sanctuary Program website (<http://sanctuaries.noaa.gov>) directs visitors interested in supporting the sanctuaries to donate to NMSF (www.nmsfocean.org). “Our national marine sanctuaries are both national treasures and pillars of local communities, including Monterey Bay, the Florida Keys, and the Hawaiian Islands, to name a few,” says Jason Patlis, NMSF president. “Through NMSF, the public can take pride in supporting these special places that belong to the American people.”

Patlis says one of the foundation’s priorities now is to build the capacity of local-level organizations that are dedicated to supporting individual sanctuary sites. These site-specific organizations are generally known as *friends groups*. “Friends groups can play a pivotal role toward the success of a sanctuary,” says Patlis. “Although our sanctuaries are designated at the national level, they reflect the community and region where they are located. Those communities can play a valuable role in building awareness, supporting sustainable management, and raising outside resources to help support their favored site. Friends groups are a perfect vehicle to capture that interest and enthusiasm.”

Patlis cautions that setting up a friends group is not easy, and he has seen friends groups for individual sanctuaries come and go. “As with running any business, there are costs and fees involved, and you will need a business model and steady revenue stream to be viable,” he says. “That stream might be through user fees (if they are allowed), merchandise sales, or other methods — donations alone will not sustain a friends group.”

continued on next page

Table of Contents

Paying for MPAs: Examples of Large-Scale Fundraising for Planning and Management.....	1
Marine Protected Areas in Fisheries Management: A West African Perspective.....	5
Notes & News	6
From the Database: Five median-sized MPAs.....	8



Setting up any kind of partner organization for sanctuaries — whether at the national level like NMSF, or the site level like friends groups — takes a lot of work, says Patlis. But it can provide an invaluable service. “Through creating public-private partnerships, we provide synergies that otherwise would not exist, and connect sanctuaries to people in meaningful ways,” he says.

For more information:

Jason Patlis, National Marine Sanctuary Foundation, Silver Spring, Maryland, US. E-mail: Jason@nmsfocean.org

Building the Pacific Island MPA endowments: Gauging progress in Kiribati and Micronesia

Some of the most ambitious MPA programs in the world — in terms of the size of area to be protected

Tips on setting up a fundraising program for your marine protected area

The following advice was adapted by MPA News from the manual *Training of Trainers on Marine Protected Areas Management in the Caribbean*, 2007 edition. Published by the UNEP Caribbean Environment Programme and used in regular training workshops throughout the region, the 436-page document is among the world’s most comprehensive guides on MPA planning and management (<http://campam.gcfi.org>):

The generation of funds for MPAs is more of an art than a science. Some groups are very good at it while others seem to fall flat on their faces.

The right person: In setting up a fundraising program, make sure you have the right person in place as your MPA’s designated fundraiser. That “right” person is someone who has a certain charisma, and who readily establishes personal relationships with prospective donors and other influential people. The right person is someone who can seek information effectively, recognize opportunities and respond to them quickly, and maintain focus on the objectives of the fundraising strategy.

Define your needs: Before attempting to contact potential donors, you should clearly define your MPA’s fundraising needs and ensure that its objectives are aligned with its mission goals. A specific monetary goal should be established: for example, “This is what it would cost to achieve the desired end product...” Keep in mind that the cost to raise the funds should not exceed a reasonable percentage of the total cost — say, 10-15%. Also be aware of any fundraising restrictions that may be in place through the MPA’s enabling legislation, governmental regulations, or fiscal oversight.

Know your donors: It is important to know your potential donor community. Do research ahead of time on what programs or topics they fund, what information they need, and who the principal personalities involved in the funding process are.

Keep good records: Finally, keep good financial records for your MPA: it demonstrates sound fiscal responsibility. You should be prepared to tell potential donors exactly how you intend to spend their money and what the final product will be. 

and the fundraising needed to support those MPAs — are in the South Pacific:

• **Kiribati**

Site: The Phoenix Islands Protected Area (PIPA) was designated in 2006, and was expanded two years later to its current size of 408,000-km².

Fundraising: With partners Conservation International and the New England Aquarium, Kiribati has created a PIPA Conservation Trust whose board is raising funds to build a US \$25-million endowment. Interest earned on the endowment will support site management and compensate Kiribati for lost revenue from canceling tuna fishing licenses to foreign fleets.

Progress: \$5 million has been secured so far. As the endowment grows, fishing effort will be phased out. Currently just 3% of the PIPA is no-take, but that includes most of the site’s priority coral reef and lagoon habitat. When the \$25-million target is reached, an additional 25% of the PIPA will be closed to fishing (for a combined closure of 28% at that point). The target for that is 2014.

• **Palau, the Marshall Islands, and the Federated States of Micronesia**

Sites: These nations have pledged to set aside 30% of their nearshore waters in MPAs by 2020 — the so-called Micronesia Challenge.

Fundraising: With partners Conservation International and The Nature Conservancy, the governments are raising \$18 million for a Micronesia Challenge endowment to support planning and management of each nation’s MPA network. Interest on the endowment will be distributed to the participating governments once they meet their 2:1 matching requirements (providing \$2 for every \$1 raised from outside sources).

Progress: \$11.5 million has been secured so far.

The attraction of using endowments like these for MPA financing is that they promise a consistent source of revenue over the long term. The hard part is building them. Fundraising such large amounts is time-consuming, as is building the necessary capacity to manage the endowment.

The PIPA Conservation Trust just began fundraising in March 2012, six years after designation of the protected area. “The work required to establish and operate the PIPA Conservation Trust and its board, and to build and secure local capacity in Kiribati for the Trust operation has understandably taken significant time,” says Sue Miller-Taei, Conservation International’s marine program manager for Pacific Islands. The Trust is now fully operational and headed by an

I-Kiribati national, Teuea Toatu, with international diplomatic experience. The first fundraisers will be dinner events in the US city of Los Angeles in May 2012.

For the Micronesia Challenge endowment, the main obstacle has been the struggle of the participating countries to meet their matching requirements. “This has delayed the expected commitments,” says Willy Kostka, executive director of the Micronesia Conservation Trust, which manages the endowment. “We are now assisting the governments with ideas on how to raise local funds — such as through resource user fees — to meet their matching requirements.” Palau, for example, has applied MPA visitor fees toward its endowment requirements. The Marshall Islands and Federated States of Micronesia are exploring the use of tuna licensing fees as matching funds.

Amid the global economic slowdown, says Kostka, the team is searching hard for new donors for the endowment. His organization is developing a business plan to map out a fundraising strategy for the coming years. “We hope that the completion of the business plan will trigger new interest and donations, both from local and international sources,” he says.

For more information:

Sue Miller-Taei, Conservation International, Samoa.
E-mail: s.taei@conservation.org

Willy Kostka, Micronesia Conservation Trust, Federated States of Micronesia.
E-mail: director@ourmicronesia.org;
Web: www.ourmicronesia.org

Funding the planning of an MPA network: Resources Legacy Fund Foundation

In 1999, the US state of California passed a law called the Marine Life Protection Act, or MLPA. The law stated that California’s existing system of MPAs was haphazard and inadequate, and that a new, more coherent network of MPAs needed to be developed. However, by 2003, implementation of the law already looked as if it might be dead in the water. Two attempts by the state government to put it into practice had failed: the first due to a planning process that drew public criticism, the next due to the project’s running out of money (because of a poor fiscal year for the state).

With encouragement from the state government, five private foundations stepped forward with a joint offer to bankroll a new planning process.* Approved by the state, the foundations pooled their funding with the Resources Legacy Fund Foundation (RLFF), which would disburse the funds as needed. The initiative turned out to be no small task. Ultimately it involved

Choosing the right financial strategy for your MPA

There are several resources available to help MPA practitioners choose which financial strategies are most appropriate for their sites — from charging user fees, to attracting voluntary donations, to establishing endowments, and more. Here are a few of these resources:

The Little Biodiversity Finance Book

Global Canopy Programme, 2012
www.globalcanopy.org/materials/little-biodiversity-finance-book

Conservation Finance Alliance website, including the Environmental Funds Tool Kit
<http://conservationfinance.org>

Financial Sustainability Scorecard for National Systems of Protected Areas

UNDP, 2010
<http://conservationfinance.org/upload/library/arquivo20101208163251.pdf>

Sustainable Financing of Protected Areas: A Global Review of Challenges and Options

IUCN, 2006
<http://app.iucn.org/dbtw-wpd/edocs/PAG-013.pdf>

forming several regional stakeholder groups, a science advisory team, and a task force to oversee region-by-region implementation; holding dozens of public meetings to collect stakeholder input over more than eight years; and planning more than 100 new MPAs along the California coast, including near densely populated areas. Still in progress (www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa), the MLPA initiative is arguably the most intensive MPA network planning exercise in history.

It was made possible by foundation support. “California has a long tradition of philanthropy collaborating with government agencies at all levels in achieving conservation outcomes,” says Mike Weber, who has managed the MLPA project for RLFF. “The clearest example is conservation of important terrestrial habitats through outright acquisition or through conservation easements, using private funding alone, or a combination of private and public funding. In the case of the MLPA initiative, RLFF managed philanthropic funds to support scientists and stakeholders in designing the regional MPA network options, which

* The five foundations were the Annenberg Foundation, Keith Campbell Foundation for the Environment, Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation, David and Lucile Packard Foundation, and Marisla Foundation.

were then considered by the California Fish and Game Commission in a formal regulatory process.”

RLFF had no direct role in shaping the MPA alternatives that the Commission considered. Once the MPA-design process was launched, RLFF’s role was

administrative: namely, assembling and managing philanthropic funding and disbursing it at the direction of the project task force, whose members were appointed by the Secretary of Natural Resources. “Between 2004 and 2012, RLFF managed hundreds of contracts that ranged from stipends for individual fishermen serving on a regional stakeholder group to development of the MPA-design tool that came to be known as MarineMap (<http://marinemap.org>),” says Weber. “The philanthropic funding provided a level of flexibility and timeliness that is critical for such dynamic and intense processes as science-based, stakeholder-driven MPA design.”

How much flexibility was needed? Weber says the project’s circumstances and demands changed continually as the stakeholder process moved from one region to the next and as the planning process attracted more and more national attention, including opposition from fishing industry groups. “Looking back, it’s remarkable we remained on budget,” he says. The budget was US \$19 million.

Weber says a lesson from the MLPA initiative is for MPA practitioners to think first about what tasks are essential to MPA design or management, and only then to think about who should carry out those tasks — whether that is a government, a foundation, or another entity. “Having worked in federal and state government myself,” he says, “I’m sure that this step is difficult for government agencies to do because their traditional response will be, ‘It is the government’s job.’ But if we keep the focus on what we are trying to accomplish — thriving ecosystems, fisheries, and coastal communities — that makes it easier to be more analytical about how best to get the job done.” 

For more information:

Mike Weber, Resources Legacy Fund Foundation, Resources Law Group, California, US. E-mail: mweber@resourceslawgroup.com

Private funding for the Chagos MPA: How the Bertarelli Foundation got involved

The Bertarelli Foundation, formed in 1998 and based in Switzerland, funds a diverse set of projects worldwide — from children’s issues, to biomedical research, to sports, and more (www.bertarelli-foundation.org). The foundation entered the field of marine protected areas in 2010. At the time, the UK government was in the process of designating waters of the Chagos Archipelago in the Indian Ocean as a no-take area (the Chagos Marine Protected Area), but lacked adequate funds to patrol the 640,000-km² expanse. In support, the Bertarelli Foundation committed GBP 3.5 million (US \$5.6 million) over five years to fund the enforcement activities. After those five years the UK government will undertake to internalize the costs and enforce the no-take reserve indefinitely.

MPA News asked the Bertarelli Foundation to describe how it got involved in the Chagos work. This was the foundation’s response:

“ The Bertarelli family has always been close to the water. Dona and Ernesto were raised on Lake Geneva and are now both professional sailors, with Ernesto’s Team Alinghi having won the American’s Cup twice. This deep passion for the sea led them to a natural interest in marine conservation. Chagos was brought to their attention by the British charity Blue Marine Foundation (www.blumarinefoundation.com), which was working with the British government to create the world’s largest protected area in the Chagos archipelago in the Indian Ocean. The Bertarelli Foundation always prefers projects that lead to real action, as that is what is most likely to inspire others, and so Chagos fit well with the Foundation’s own vision and objectives.

“Chagos was the first initiative conducted by the Bertarelli Foundation in the ocean conservation domain. Because of its huge impact, we are now in contact with many stakeholders in this sector, with future initiatives under active consideration at the present time.”

www.mpanews.org

New website design! Searchable back issues, Spanish translations, conference calendar, and more

Marine Protected Areas in Fisheries Management: A West African Perspective

In December 2011, fisheries managers and researchers from across West Africa gathered in Senegal to discuss the use of MPAs as fishery management tools. Convened by the Sub Regional Fisheries Commission (SRFC), which coordinates the fishery policies of seven West African member states, the meeting featured a global review of the “state of the art” on MPAs in fishery management.* The event’s goal was to find and promote ways that different forms of MPAs could contribute to sustainable development of fisheries in the region. (The SRFC member states are Cape Verde, The Gambia, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Mauritania, Senegal, and Sierra Leone.)

The SRFC website, www.spcsrp.org, contains presentations from the December meeting, a summary of its recommendations, and a video documentary of the event. Below, MPA News speaks with Philippe Tous, coordinator of the SRFC project that hosted the meeting, and Hamady Diop, head of the SRFC’s Department of Research and Information Systems, about the state of MPAs as fisheries management tools — in West Africa and around the world.

Based on your global review, how would you describe the state of the art on MPAs as fisheries management tools?

Philippe Tous: As far as we know, our study on the role of MPAs in fisheries management, presented at the December meeting, was the first of its kind to be sponsored by a regional fisheries organization in a developing region. The main conclusions of the study included:

- Effective establishment of an MPA leads to increased biomass and fish size within its boundaries, especially for species that are exposed to high fishing pressure outside of the protected area. In contrast, the effects outside of the protected area (spillover) are difficult to measure and are confined to a limited distance from the MPAs.
- There is a general lack of baseline studies on protected areas in developing countries prior to establishment of MPAs. This is particularly acute in

* The study was conducted by Serge Garcia (IUCN/European Bureau for Conservation and Development), Didier Gascuel (Agro-Campus, Rennes, France), Jean Boncoeur (University of Brest, France), and David De Monbrison (BRL Ingénierie, Nîmes, France). It was financed by the French Development Agency.

the area of socio-economics, in which the potential benefits of the MPAs can be offset by the negative effect of the closure to fishing.

- As in many fisheries where management plans are lacking or not enforced, many MPAs remain protected areas in name only — paper parks.

What is the current status of MPAs in West Africa?

Hamady Diop: Fisheries are the main service provided by marine ecosystems to SRFC member states — generating around a million jobs, directly or indirectly. Despite this, the subregion’s 30 or so MPAs are mostly managed by environment ministries, with the support of conservation NGOs. A major conclusion of the December meeting was that a strengthening of linkages between MPAs and fisheries in West Africa should include the increased involvement of fishing stakeholders in MPA management.

The subregion’s ecosystem makes MPA planning and management complex. Because the main fish stocks are migratory small pelagics that follow upwelling intensities (accounting for about 75% of the 1.5-million metric ton annual harvest), spatial management of these areas is difficult to implement. As a result, only a few of the existing MPAs — relatively large sites with good governance mechanisms — can effectively contribute to the improvement of fishery management.

What advice is the SRFC giving its member states on applying MPAs to fisheries management?

Tous: During the December workshop, the participants formulated many recommendations. These generally fell within three complementary categories — strengthening knowledge, MPA monitoring, and governance:

- Strengthening knowledge in all areas (ecology, socio-economics, governance) by combining scientific and empirical understanding is critical. This will improve coherence in studies of MPA networks and connectivity, mapping approaches, and rational zoning. All uses of resources (not only fisheries) should be encouraged and facilitated.
- It is necessary to move toward autonomous monitoring systems with the development of simple indicators, created in partnership with stakeholders. This allows easy ownership by resource users while providing valuable feedback to information users (researchers, managers).

- In terms of governance issues, effective cooperation mechanisms must be established between fisheries and environmental departments. The mechanisms should focus on harmonizing the various measures of access and fishing regulations throughout EEZs, not just inside the MPAs. Furthermore, a co-management approach must be favored and the formal signing of social contracts for sharing power among various stakeholders should be facilitated.

The SRFC review also examined the impact of MPAs on other ocean uses, including ones related to alternative incomes to fishing. Can you describe those findings?

Diop: The study recognized that ecotourism can be valuable to MPAs in terms of revenue generation, although it is currently limited in scale in the sub-region. In general, it recommended that a cautious approach be observed with the development of all forms of alternative income-generating activities in association with MPAs. Such activities could adversely reallocate effort to other overexploited resources. 

For more information:

Philippe Tous and Hamady Diop, Sub Regional Fisheries Commission, Dakar, Senegal. E-mail: philippe.tous@spscrp.org / hamady.diop@spscrp.org

New guidebook on writing management plans for MPAs in West Africa

A guidebook for West African MPA managers on how to write a management plan is now available in English, translated from the original French. Published by the International Foundation for the Banc d'Arguin (FIBA), the guidebook walks readers through the stages of writing a management plan, from creating the writing team to evaluating the plan when done. It also provides an adaptable template for readers to use in developing their plans.

The guidebook was developed following a workshop on MPA management plans in West Africa, held in Senegal in 2008. In addition to supporting managers, the publication is intended to help harmonize management plans in the sub-region, particularly in the context of the regional network of West African MPAs, called RAMPAO (www.rampao.org). The *Methodological Guidebook for the Development of Management Plans for Marine Protected Areas in West Africa* is available at www.lafiba.org/index.php/fr/media/files/guide_des_amp_version_anglaise.

Notes & News

UK recalculates Chagos MPA size; finds it is 100,000 km² larger than announced

You know your MPA is big when the officially announced size is off by 100,000 km² and no one catches the mistake for two years. The Chagos Marine Protected Area has been widely reported — including by the UK Government, which designated it in April 2010 — to be 544,000 km² in size. But a reassessment by the UK Hydrographic Office this year has placed the correct figure at roughly 640,000 km², more than 17% larger than previously estimated.

According to UK officials, the origin of the prior miscalculation remains unclear. MPA News suspects it was an error of exclusion: the MPA covers both the EEZ and territorial sea of the Chagos Archipelago, but the Government's original calculation appears to have included only the EEZ area.

In our May-June 2010 issue, MPA News reported the size of the Chagos Marine Protected Area as

636,600 km², based on our summation of the EEZ and territorial sea. Unfortunately we changed our reporting of the MPA's area to 544,000 km² in later issues (MPA News 12:3 and 13:2) to match government reports.

Chile announces plan to expand Motu Motiro Hiva reserve

The Chilean Government has announced its intent to expand the boundaries of the remote, 150,000-km² Salas y Gómez Marine Park. The expansion plan follows a joint research expedition to the no-take MPA in 2011 by the Chilean Navy, Oceana, and the National Geographic Society. That expedition resulted in a proposal by Oceana to expand the MPA to 411,000 km² to help rebuild fisheries for nearby Easter Island. Such an expansion would make the MPA the second largest no-take

marine reserve in the world after the UK's Chagos Marine Protected Area.

Salas y Gómez Marine Park is 3000 km west of the Chilean mainland, and is also known by its indigenous islander name of Motu Motiro Hiva. Any expansion of its area must be approved by the indigenous Rapa Nui people, who live on Easter Island. A referendum is expected by the end of this year. An Oceana press release on the intended expansion is at <http://oceana.org/en/news-media/press-center/press-releases/chilean-government-announces-plan-to-expand-marine-reserves-around-easter-island>.

Mediterranean meeting of MPA managers and artisanal fishers results in recommendations

In mid-March of this year, 23 artisanal fishermen and 24 MPA staffers from several EU countries — Croatia, France, Spain, Italy, Greece and Slovenia — gathered in France to discuss how MPAs and small-scale fishers can work toward common goals. Participants agreed on several conclusions, including that MPAs are a good tool for managing artisanal fisheries, and that co-management between MPAs and artisanal fishers can contribute to economic sustainability of the fisheries. The meeting was convened by the MedPAN North project and partners.

A main purpose of the meeting was to highlight positive case studies of successful artisanal fisheries in Mediterranean MPAs. Attendees expressed frustration that, in their view, the European Commission — which is currently reforming its fisheries policy — does not sufficiently recognize and support the role of artisanal fishers in healthy Mediterranean fisheries. More information on the meeting is at www.medpan.org/?arbo=article&sel=ID&val=680.

Best practices for benthic protection areas

A new publication by the Sustainable Fisheries Partnership, an organization that advises the US commercial fishing industry on sustainable seafood, describes best practices for the planning and management of benthic protection areas (BPAs). Generally, BPAs protect seafloor habitat by limiting or banning bottom-impacting gear. Other gear types are typically still allowed.

The report examines three cases of BPAs in practice — the Alaska Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands; Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary; and the New Zealand EEZ. In each case, the relevant governance and design are examined, and opinions of the BPA from industry and conservation NGOs are described. “We hope this report provides useful general guid-

ance to fisheries on how to design and implement BPA networks, and to the seafood supply chain on how to monitor and encourage their progress,” said Jim Cannon, CEO of the Sustainable Fisheries Partnership.

The report *Benthic Protection Areas: Best Practices and Recommendations* is at www.sustainablefish.org/attachments/sfp_benthic_protection_areas_report_2012_april.pdf.

Study: wind farms could be productive marine reserves if grouped together

A study of one of the world's largest offshore wind farms — the Horns Rev 1 farm in the Danish North Sea with 80 turbines — shows the facility does not adversely impact fish species that depend on the same sandy bottom environment as the turbines require. The wind farm also provides reef-like habitat for species with affinity to reefs. In light of these findings, and in light of the no-take regulations within the farm, the researchers (from the consultancy Orbicon and the Technical University of Denmark) suggest that such offshore wind facilities could conceivably help rebuild overfished stocks — particularly if several farms were grouped together.

“Our studies suggest that the Horns Rev 1 wind farm is too small [by itself] to function as a true marine protected area, because over their lifecycles the fish utilize a much greater area than just the wind farm,” said biologist Claus Stenberg. “But presumably several farms located close to one another could have a combined positive effect on spawning and the survival of fish fry, as wind farms that are located downstream of each other can act as a kind of dispersion corridor for eggs and larvae.”

The study “Effect of the Horns Rev 1 Offshore Wind Farm on Fish Communities” is at www.aqua.dtu.dk/upload/aqua/publikationer/forskningsrapporter/246-2011-effect-of-the-horns-rev-1-offshore-wind-farm-on-fish-communities.pdf.

Publication: monitoring climate effects in temperate MPAs

A new publication provides a framework for monitoring the impacts of climate change on marine protected areas. Focusing on MPAs in the US state of California, the report aims to inform adaptive management of the state's temperate marine ecosystem. Among other guidelines, it describes how certain species can indicate the impacts of climate change, and how these species can be incorporated in existing monitoring programs.

“Many of the same tools that are used for MPA monitoring today are useful for assessing the effects of

MPA News

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF:

John B. Davis

SPANISH TRANSLATION:

Ricardo Gonzalez

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Chair - David Fluharty
University of Washington
Patrick Christie
University of Washington

Michael Murray
Channel Islands National
Marine Sanctuary

CORRESPONDENCE:

MPA News
School of Marine &
Environmental Affairs
University of Washington
3707 Brooklyn Ave. NE
Seattle, WA 98105, USA.
mpanews@u.washington.edu
Tel: +1 425 788 8185

MPA News is published bimonthly by Marine Affairs Research and Education (MARE), a 501(c)(3) not-for-profit corporation, in association with the School of Marine & Environmental Affairs, University of Washington. Financial support is provided in part by a grant from the David and Lucile Packard Foundation.

All content has been written by the MPA News editorial staff unless otherwise attributed. The views expressed herein are those of the author(s) and should not be interpreted as representing the opinions or policies of the Packard Foundation or other funders of MPA News.

Subscriptions to MPA News are free.

To subscribe, send an e-mail to mpanews@u.washington.edu. Type “subscribe” on the subject line and include your name, mailing address and daytime phone number in the text of the message. Please note whether you would like your subscription to be delivered electronically or in paper form. Thank you.

climate change and working to envision management responses,” states the report. “There are, however, many opportunities for expanding the monitoring toolkit by learning how to use old tools in new ways and adding new tools.”

Monitoring Climate Effects in Temperate Marine Ecosystems: A test-case using California's MPAs was authored by EcoAdapt for the California Ocean Science Trust. It is at http://monitoringenterprise.org/pdf/Monitoring_climate_change_effects_in_temperate_marine_ecosystems.pdf.

Program launched to support MPA manager exchanges in Caribbean

The Caribbean Marine Protected Areas Management Network and Forum (CaMPAM) has launched a project to support learning exchanges among MPA managers throughout the Caribbean. Funded by the Italian government and occurring in May 2012, the exchanges are intended to help disseminate best management practices for MPAs in the region.

The project includes:

- Dominican managers exchanging with Cuban colleagues at several MPA sites to learn about the development of Cuba's national MPA system;
- Grenadian MPA staffers participating in a regional workshop in San Andres, Colombia, and learning from local managers on the participatory planning and management tools used at the Seaflower Biosphere Reserve;
- Park rangers from St. Vincent and the Grenadines visiting the Biscayne and Everglades National Parks in Florida, US, to discuss MPA enforcement; and
- MPA and fisheries managers from Antigua and Barbuda attending a workshop of the Dutch Caribbean MPA managers, and visiting the Saba Marine Park and the Saba Bank to learn about management tools there.

More information on CaMPAM is at <http://campam.gcfi.org>.

EU project seeks to train “next generation of MPA scientists and managers”

A European Commission-funded project to expose young and mid-career researchers in the Mediterranean to an array of MPA-related skills is currently seeking candidates. Intended to train “the next generation of MPA scientists and managers”, the project will provide instruction on everything from species

identification to fisheries management to stakeholder engagement and more. In total, the project will hire ten early-stage researchers (each receiving a 36-month Ph.D. candidate position) and four experienced researchers (each receiving a six-month postdoctoral position).

Each participating fellow will follow a research project that serves the particular needs of a participating MPA, and part of his or her time will be spent at the associated MPA. “Our fellows will be trained in the research needed to support informed decisions by Mediterranean MPA administrators, and to reach out to the different layers of society,” says project director Carlo Cerrano. For more information, go to www.mmmpa.eu.

From the database: Five median-sized MPAs

The global median size for marine protected areas is 1.6 km².^{*} In other words, half of MPAs worldwide are larger than that, and half are smaller. The following list, drawn from the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA), features marine protected areas that are equal in area to the global median:

- **Capel Island and Knockadoon Nature Reserve**
Ireland (WDPA ID: 10936)
- **Cayman Brac East grouper spawning site**
Cayman Islands (WDPA ID: 303914)
- **No Diving Zone (West)**
Cayman Islands (WDPA ID: 303909)
- **Olive Marine Protected Area**
Solomon Islands (WDPA ID: 555544155)
- **Yoronto Marine Park**
Japan (WDPA ID: 71188)

Information on each of the MPAs is available at www.protectedplanet.net. The website serves as a searchable interface for the World Database on Protected Areas, compiled by the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre. Each protected area in the database has its own page on www.protectedplanet.net with details such as its IUCN category, year of designation, and more.

^{*} Source: *Global Ocean Protection: Current Trends and Future Opportunities*. (IUCN/The Nature Conservancy/UNEP, 2010). <http://data.iucn.org/dbtw-wpd/edocs/2010-053.pdf>