

Scoping workshop on review of the state of critical habitats and Marine Protected Areas in the Western Indian Ocean region

19-22 June, 2017

Berjaya Beau Vallon Resort & Casino, Mahe, Seychelles

MEETING REPORT

INTRODUCTION

[Opening remarks and Organizational matters](#)

The meeting was called to order at 09:00hrs on 19 June 2017 by Mr. Dixon Waruinge, head of the Nairobi Convention Secretariat. After introduction of participants (**Annex 1**), Mr. Waruinge brought to attention the relevance to the meeting of the Nairobi Convention Protocol on Flora and Fauna to the meeting. Of particular interest to the meeting was the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) Targets 14.2 and 14.5. The targets aim to achieve by 2020, sustainably managed and protected marine and coastal ecosystems to avoid significant adverse impacts, including by strengthening their resilience, and to take action for their restoration in order to achieve healthy and productive oceans (target 14.2), and to conserve at least 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, consistent with national and international law and based on the best available scientific information by 2020 (target 14.5).

To initiate the programme the Nairobi Convention partnered with the Western Indian Ocean Marine Science Association (WIOMSA) to organize the 4-day expert scoping workshop to develop a process for the review of the state of critical habitats and Marine Protected Areas (MPA) across all Nairobi Convention countries. The scoping process would align activities to the targets under SDG goal 14, in particular Targets 14.2 and 14.5. The process would be informed by the obligation under the Convention of Biological Diversity (CBD) Aichi Strategic Goal C, Target 11, to increase MPA coverage for coastal and marine protection in the Western Indian Ocean (WIO) region to 10% by 2020. This would include further enhancing the use of ecosystem-based and other large-scale approaches to managing the coastal and marine ecosystems.

Mr. Frank Turyatunga, Deputy Director, Regional Office for Africa, UN Environment, moderated the four-day workshop. At the onset, the moderator brought into the fore the reporting framework on SDGs and called on the participants to define the baseline for Target 14.5 and project how countries can achieve 10% marine and coastal protected areas by 2020.

[Aims, scope and expected outputs of the meeting](#)

The GEF-funded project on the *'Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the protection of the Western Indian Ocean from land-based sources and activities'* (WIOSAP) aims at developing tools and guidelines for vulnerability assessment and spatial planning. These tools and guidelines are intended to be used by the institutions in participating countries to both conduct ecosystem vulnerability assessment studies and support coastal monitoring and spatial planning processes at a national level. The outputs will contribute to building the capacity for relevant institutions to undertake vulnerability assessments and to support management and monitoring of the state of coastal ecosystems in the participating countries. The activity will make a major contribution to the achievement of United Nations Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) Targets 14.2 and 14.5 by reviewing critical habitats, river flows and water quality in the WIO region. The sister GEF-funded project on the *Western Indian Ocean Large Marine Ecosystems Strategic Action Programme Policy*

Harmonization and Institutional Reforms (SAPPHIRE) which has a governance component on MPA in the Economic Exclusive Zones (EEZ) and in the Areas beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ) areas

The moderator outlined the objectives of the workshop as (i) to develop and agree on a process to conduct of an overview of existing regional MPA as part of the implementation of the SDG Target 14.5, and (ii) to develop and agree on a process to undertake a regional critical habitats inventory in the context of biodiversity and existing and emerging economic activities. Participants were made aware that the objectives would lead to (a) establishment of authoritative databases on the most critical habitats and the biodiversity most at risk; (b) MPA coverage (size, maps, and the conservation value of the MPA's from a biodiversity and socio-ecological values) (c) determination of the management effectiveness of MPA including adaptive management processes and requirements (d) determination of participating countries' future options for achieving 10% MPA coverage (e) communication to countries on what they need to do to achieve the 10% target based on identification of critical habitats that require protection, and on the consequences of failing to meet the target, and (f) a consistent monitoring and reporting framework at national and regional levels.

As the basis of the scoping workshop, Mr. Waruinge called on participants to engage on the process of attaining 10% marine protected areas in the Western Indian, identify the matrices, criteria and process to be followed, and develop a roadmap on how to communicate to governments on the reporting and attainment of the Targets both quantitatively and qualitatively. He mentioned that the scoping workshop was one of the priorities on the implementation of the Western Indian Ocean Strategic Action Programme on critical habitats.

Participants made some additional inputs to the meeting agenda as a guide to deliberations during the workshop. For example, what definition is acceptable for MPAs at the regional level noting the situational challenges and differences at national level and the need for coherence at the regional level? What other SDGs can be used as quality indicators for MPAs? What approaches are available for representativity of MPA? Should we develop a dashboard for reporting? At the SDG level, how do we use MPAs as a quality indicator for reporting? Why can't countries achieve 10% MPA despite the many attempts since the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002? What capacity is required to achieve 10% MPA coverage by 2020?

[UN Environment work on SDG14 targets and indicators: what the countries are expected to report on SDG14 especially on 14.5.1 and 14.2 and other relevant indicators](#)

Ms Joana Akrofi's presentation on the UN Environment work on SDG14 focused on SDG14 indicators assigned to the UN Environment covering the index of coastal eutrophication and floating plastic debris density (indicator 14.1.1), proportion of national exclusive economic zones managed using ecosystem-based approaches (14.2.1), and coverage of protected areas in relation to marine areas respectively (14.5.1). She mentioned that The UN Environment (Science Division) has composed a working group to develop a manual for national practitioners to support reporting on the three SDG Targets (14.1, 14.2 and 14.5) and future indicators used to track progress against these Targets. UN Environment in collaboration with WCMC is collating examples of datasets and indicators relating to these targets, from which best practices can be compiled; specifically datasets (including data collection protocols) and indicators (including indices and methodologies) relating to key elements under each of the three targets. In this respect, the UN Environment is reaching out to global networks of experts to suggest examples, at any spatial (local, sub-national, national, regional or global) or temporal scale, of datasets or indicators that could prove relevant. These examples can come from peer reviewed or 'grey' literature, web sites, factsheets (e.g. available through national clearing house mechanisms or biodiversity platforms), official indicator lists for national/regional/international/intergovernmental processes, or in any other format/source.

A brief was made on the Transboundary Waters Assessment Programme (TWAP) indicator based assessment and the SDGs-Multilateral Environment Agreements synergies portal available on the UN Environment Live platform at <http://uneplive.unep.org/synergies>

In the discussion following the presentation, several lead questions facilitated discussions relevant to the workshop. What key lessons have we learnt through collecting indicators? What data is available to support SDG14 indicators? What data is available to support MPAs in the WIO region? Using TWAP as an example, how does science inform policy on SDG14 at national and regional levels? How can TWAP assessment colour code assist-in the reporting on MPAs? Since the SDG14 indicators are still in Tier III, can the UN Environment influence and have a direct input into the indicators? What is the value proposition of increasing MPAs?

Participants agreed to a scoping on data available at national level, to seek broker data sharing at the national level through the Nairobi Convention and to identify benefits associated with increased their coverage of MPAs.

IUCN work on SDG targets 14.2 & 14.5 with special emphasize on WIO region

Ms Carole Martinez's (IUCN), presentation focused on relevant IUCN activities in the Western Indian Ocean region. The European Voluntary Scheme for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services in Territories of European Overseas (BEST) initiative aims at promoting biodiversity and ecosystem based solutions to climate change in the EU Overseas located in 7 regions of the world including the Western Indian Ocean. The project has identified 16 key biodiversity areas (KBA) in the marine environment of the EU territories in the Western Indian that make significant contributions to the global persistence of biodiversity. The Indian Ocean is one of the regions where 3 large MPAs have been established of which with 39% no-take zones, make up 85% of the no-take MPAs of the European Overseas in the Indian Ocean. The meeting was informed that Mayotte has been losing 22% of mangroves since 1950. BEST project will develop an atlas of MPA and Ecologically or Biologically Significant Areas (EBSA) and will share the product with the Nairobi Convention.

BEST, http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/biodiversity/best/index_en.htm

IUCN also leads a project in the Marine Spatial Atlas for the Western Indian Ocean (MASPAWIO) that sets out to support the development of marine spatial planning (MSP) in the region combining modelling for better taking into account the necessary adaptive and iterative approach of MSP in the face of climate change. The project provides for Marine connectivity patterns and habitat degradation scenarios to better inform planning, management of coastal and marine resources and conservation measures. According to the existing assessment by IUCN, only 15% of highly impacted coral reefs benefit from conservation efforts

The GEF/FFEM Seamount projects seek to apply an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF) Management in the High Seas by improving scientific understanding and capacity for monitoring, assessment and analysis of high seas biodiversity and fisheries around seamounts, and by enhancing governance frameworks for high seas resources conservation and management. The project has so far provided four reports on Ecosystem Approach to Management of Seamounts in the Southern Indian Ocean (overview of seamounts and biodiversity, anthropogenic threats to seamounts ecosystems and biodiversity, legal and institutional gap analysis, and a roadmap towards sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity in the Southern Indian Ocean).

The presentation provided criteria for assessment and identification of Key Biodiversity Areas. The criteria involve survey of threatened biodiversity, identification of geographically restricted biodiversity, ecological integrity of sites, biological processes, and irreplaceability through quantitative analysis.

The state of critical habitats and MPA across all participating WIO countries

WIOMSA's presentation on the state of critical habitats and MPA highlighted efforts that have been made to identify priority areas of the Western Indian Ocean such as the Eastern African Marine Ecoregion, Western Indian Ocean Islands Marine Ecoregion, Ecologically or Biologically Significant Marine Areas, the Strategic Action Programme for the Protection of the Coastal and Marine Environment of the Western Indian Ocean from Land-based Sources and Activities, and others such as Critical Ecosystems Partnership. In all of these priority areas criteria employed take into account the areas of high fisheries productivity, areas of exceptionally high species richness, areas with outstanding ecological or evolutionary phenomena, and the EBSA criteria.

Participants found it wise to define the process, to identify criteria to use in carrying out the overview on the status of critical habitats and MPAs in the WIO region and to design a regional MPA network focusing on resilience, connectivity and representativity

Selected case studies (National MPA identification processes) - South Africa

Dr Ané Oosthuizen's presentation on - South African National Parks focused on spatial assessments, spatial planning and implementation (commonly known as Operation Phakisa). The first comprehensive national spatial assessment, including marine assessment in South Africa, was carried out in 2004. A National Biodiversity Assessment in 2011 updated marine data, identified threatened ecosystems for listing in terms of the Biodiversity Act, and proposed the National Protected Area Expansion Strategy. The next National Biodiversity Assessment is expected to progress in earnest in 2018. The assessment process characterised and classified coastal and marine habitats, pressures on marine and coastal biodiversity, and identified biodiversity targets. The exercise assessed ecosystem threat status, protection level, and spatial biodiversity priorities.

The key findings were that 47% of marine and coastal habitat types are threatened, 40% of marine and coastal habitat types have no protection, 6% of marine and coastal habitats are well protected, fishing remains the greatest pressure on marine biodiversity, the majority of marine resources are overexploited and several species are threatened. As a result, only 9% of inshore area protection has a no take status (offshore = 0%). The total of EEZ under protection (no take) is only 0.4%. Under spatial planning, several regional coastal systematic conservation plans have been developed, including an offshore Marine Protected Area project. The spatial planning process took into account mapping of biodiversity patterns, ecological processes, fishing/Oil & Gas/Mining industry activities, and setting targets using Marxan /C Plan.

Implementation of the regional and offshore planning initiatives has benefited from Operation Phakisa which includes MPAs from Regional and Offshore planning initiatives covering areas ranging in size from 72 km² to 16 536 km² and approximately 72 000 km² is in new area for protection. This has doubled the number of MPAs and increased coverage within the South Africa EEZ from less than 0.5% to more than 5%. Habitat representation has increased from 60% to 94% and zoned for use on 70/30 ratio of take/no take

The proposed new MPAs include 46 of 54 habitat types that have no protection, and have significantly advanced representation of pelagic and benthic habitats. The MPAs include 10 of 13 critically endangered habitat types that have no protection with a focus on protecting the last remaining good condition areas of threatened ecosystem. South Africa may have 5% protection by 2018, covering 94% of marine habitats.

Selected case studies (National MPA identification processes) - Seychelles

Flavien Joubert's Seychelles National Parks Authority (SNPA) presentation informed participants that Seychelles has 25 protected areas, marine and terrestrial combined, with a total coverage of 55,000 hectares.

Currently, more than 47% of the land and 0.04% of the ocean is protected. While a new policy (2016) is being drafted to replace the current law, the roles and mandates for protected areas in Seychelles rests with the Ministry of Environment. SNPA is only responsible for 6 marine and 3 terrestrial parks, while other Protected Areas are under the responsibility of other entities, (Agencies, NGO, foundations). Seychelles Fishing Authority (SFA) shares some responsibility for species such as turtles.

Major national challenges on protected areas include having protected area network that is representative and is effective for conservation of species and habitats, administering and financing the expanded Protected Area estate, competing economic interests from the private property sector, and aligning protected areas under singular administration in order to facilitate resource synergies, reporting, etc.

On SDG14 position in Seychelles National Parks Authority, indicator clusters for management effectiveness were presented. Strategies and plans, percentage achievement and legal measures have been realized. These are in the green colour code. At amber stage is effective management while at red light stage is the need for resource adequacy, and regular monitoring & reporting. Participants agreed to assign Peter Chadwick the responsibility to unpack the six SDG14 positions with reference to MPAs at national and regional level and provide a guide to the three colour codes with respect to effective management.

Summary of Discussions

1. Defining an ideal Marine Protected Area
 - What do we understand by a Marine Protected area? [Managed Marine Areas, Parks, reserves – what is included or not?]; what are the (universal) descriptors of such an MPA? Can we build a “coherent” understanding across the board? By conducting national audits? If “representativeness” and “effectiveness” are part of the description, what do they actually entail? From the above, can we define the qualitative values of the 10% area coverage of MPAs; 10% of what (e.g. coastal, marine, catchments, EEZ, etc.)?
2. Capacity to Manage MPAs
 - What are the capacity requirements for the effective and efficient management of an MPA?; Drawing from the above, what is the desired capacity infrastructure for management of MPAs?; Partnerships are important for meeting the capacity needs; what do we need to identify, attract and work with relevant partners?; How do we assist governments to understand the value of these partnerships and to embrace them?
3. Nature of Assessments
 - Suggestions were that the starting point should be current approaches to include responsibility to assess; regularity of assessment; intended audience; managing the science–policy interface; feedback management and lesson learning; and implementing an improvement plan to include value proposition for governments to justify investment in assessments and reporting?
4. Indicators to Support Assessment
 - What indicators are we currently using? Are they well aligned to reporting on SDGs? What social and economic indicators can we add? Can we include indicators that track multiple SDGs? How do we conduct the gap analysis? What process should be recommended for aligning current data and indicator frameworks to the requirements of SDG reporting?
5. Reporting
 - What should countries/the region be reporting (on)? What are the national, regional and international reporting obligations? How should this be managed and organized to meet the needs

of multiple audiences? What is the value proposition to invest in reporting? Are there contributions to reporting from multiple SDGs? On the proposed reporting dashboard – what is it, what does it do, how can it be developed, introduced, customized, etc. What is the added value?

6. Other Issues

- Participants proposed that a research is conducted by WIOMSA to consider the following: What is it that has made governments agree to establish MPAs? e.g. financial gain, intrinsic value, cultural values, social value etc.; Are these justification arguments still sustaining in view of the recent changes and pressures on MPAs? This should help to inform the path towards the 10 per cent MPA coverage?
- There is need to balance the social, economic and environmental dimensions in reporting. What social and economic dimensions should be included to assist with increasing relevance to SDGs?

Participants agreed to further delve on outcomes 1-6 of the discussions through small group efforts.

Presentations from Group Discussions

Defining an ideal Marine Protected Area (MPA)

According to IUCN, a Marine Protected Area is a clearly defined geographical space, recognised, dedicated and managed, through legal or other effective means, to achieve the long-term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values. Similarly, a network of MPA is a collection of individual MPAs or reserves operating co-operatively and synergistically, at various spatial scales and with a range of protection levels that are designed to meet objectives that a single reserve cannot achieve and to support ecosystems connectivity as well as species' life cycles and migrations.

In practice and in order to contribute to meeting Sustainable Development Goal 14 and AICHI Target 11, a coastal and/or marine area under protection must reflect habitat criticality, representativity and connectivity criteria. It has formal recognition by national government through gazette or other means; and has a managing authority, with a formal, recognized mandate, accountable to government and other stakeholders. An ideal MPA has an existing, current management plan and an appropriate/adequate level of resources and personnel. It is integrated in its wider environment and supported by other planning processes (catchment plan, ICZ plan, MSP) and partnerships; it is part of a national/regional protected area system and ecological network; is subject to regular, rigorous (including external) assessment of management effectiveness; ensures equity in its designation and management (participation, benefits sharing, acknowledgement of local and other actors).

The group agreed to adopt the definition of **critical habitats** as used in the IUCN Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA). Critical habitats provide important functions (e.g. species refugia, commercially important species, and uniqueness); they have a representativity of species, processes, functions; and they have connectivity both within the ecosystem and externally. In terms of the level of threat (both current and potential) the Group agreed to use IUCN RED List of ecosystems categories (critically endangered, endangered, vulnerable) which is already accepted internationally. A critical habitat is irreplaceable and displays biological integrity.

In term of establishing baselines for MPA, these should constitute the following three elements: (i) **biophysical data** (*based on best available knowledge and information, applying qualitative descriptions where hard data is lacking*) on species, habitats, processes and functions; (ii) **management effectiveness in which there exist** mandate, governance, staff levels, funding, review processes in existence, management plans for operational implementation, adaptive management incorporated, and support from other management tools; (iii) **equity/social** baselines where there is participation, benefits, and acknowledgement of local and other actors

Capacity to Manage MPAs

Participants in the group agreed that capacity to manage an MPA requires political, individual/institutional competence to carry out activities which are related to management, and external organization (partnership). In addition to the usual capacity requirements, the following need to be considered: (i) existence of legislative support, including mandate – policies, legislation, implications of weak management, function, (ii) existence of external partners (iii) managing information – for awareness, for generating support, to justify continuous existence of MPA, to showcase and demonstrate value, etc. and (iv) support by networks, (v) capacity to address emerging issues (through continuous skills development)

Institution or organization capacity revolves around policy, legislations and general management plan, business plan; infrastructure (office buildings, staff houses, wet laboratories, slip ways); equipment (boats, vehicles, diving equipment, etc.); human and financial resources; well-developed management systems (enforcement, monitoring, education and awareness raising, resource mobilization etc.); motivation mechanisms at individual, institutional and stakeholder level. For detailed capacity requirements, reference should be made to WIO-COMPAS (Western Indian Ocean Certification of Marine Protected Area Professionals)

Nature of Assessments

The group agreed that the starting point should be current approaches to include the following: (i) responsibility to assess is a mandate provided by the national government within national, regional and international obligations. The focus of assessment runs from strategic to an individual MPA and is linked to objectives, management effectiveness, state of biodiversity and capacity. National spatial assessments in the EEZ area are necessary towards 10% MPA coverage and to identify what is available for protection, and status (good condition, critical or recoverable); (ii) regularity of assessment is often 3 years for management effectiveness and 5 years for the state of biodiversity; (iii) intended audience ranging from park/organisation, national, regional, international, larger citizenry, e.g. NGOs, academia, stakeholders, there it is important to understand the audience and structure the assessments and resulting reports to suit the intended audience(s); (iv) managing the science–policy interface to include scenarios (e.g. doing fine – no need for change or doing a bit fine but not quite there yet) and SDG indicators where possible to influence policy and decision making; (v) feedback management and lesson learning should be at different levels covering individuals, government, and organisations and (vi) implementing an improvement plan at organisational level will require incentive (for better conservation at MPA level), more capacity, either in training or resources, and guidance. The value proposition for governments to justify investment in assessments and reporting require the use of ecosystem services and functions to show value of MPA to governments and stakeholders.

Indicators to Support Assessment

There was a general agreement that both qualitative and quantitative indicators have to be used and that the best position to start is to examine the relevance (both regular monitoring and assessment + SDG reporting) of the ones that are already being used in the region. . Appropriate data are a pre-requisite to the development of indicators for reporting and the indicator types that are required fall in the following categories: Biophysical, Equity/Social, Management Effectiveness.

Use can be made of the following SDG indicators: 14.2.1: *Proportion of national exclusive economic zones managed using ecosystem-based approaches* and 14.5.1: *Coverage of protected areas in relation to marine areas*. The indicators are aligned to country level reporting, are complementary and specific on the management approaches. Social and economic indicators that can be added are the elements of the Ecosystem-based Management (EBM) including governance, stakeholder capacity and participation, while GDP may be more relevant at country scale than at site scale. EBM may also support other SDG indicators such as

for SDG target 1.5: *by 2030, build the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations and reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters* and for SDG target 14.1: *Index of coastal eutrophication and floating plastic debris density*. In order to conduct a gap analysis, the group noted that data on MPA coverage and effectiveness and for on areas under EB management may need to be evaluated.

Likely strategies for countries to adopt to attain 10% MPA coverage

Participants observed that while Other Effective Areas- Based Conservation Measures (**OECM**) are not MPAs, they are important in conservation and their value should be recognized. They also stressed the importance of not blending OECM measures with MPA reporting as these are two separate conservation approaches as per the definition of MPAs that the meeting adopted. Other than Seychelles, not many countries in the region will attain the 10% coverage by 2020. However countries can report on trajectories/process towards 10% coverage. The reporting process would require (i) establishing a baseline for each country, (ii) consideration of the circumstances in each country (e.g. South Africa's Phakisa process and 5% coverage for MPAs by 2018), (iii) identifying opportunities that exist for each country (e.g. the Marine Spatial Planning process in Seychelles and South Africa) (iv) supporting countries in their trajectories towards 10 % coverage (e.g. group of experts to assist in identifying key priorities areas/habitats for meeting targets), and (v) encouraging countries to establish OECMs leading to MPAs and reporting on these processes.

What products should be generated on MPAs and critical habitats?

Participants spent considerable time on the review of critical habitats and MPA assessments and what needs to be communicated to diverse audiences on the attainment of 10% coverage, the provision of frameworks for management, and opportunities to strengthen national level management (through outlooks). Specifically, such are communication products for improved planning, capacity building, informing a variety of audiences, influencing policy and decision making, meeting reporting obligations, resource mobilization, learning and sharing scientific knowledge , entertainment, and encouraging participation (partners, citizens, etc.).

Review of critical habitats at regional scale needs to recognise that not all critical habitats are found within MPAs; therefore a review should include those that fall outside MPAs. The meeting agreed to consider using already existing data and information and facilitate a process for collecting data to fill gaps. Two products are necessary: **main technical report** (scientific with map-supported databases), and summary for Policy Makers or **Policy Briefs**.

The review of existing MPAs and general information on Marine Protected Areas should include among other issues the number of MPAs or percent of area covered by MPAs, provision of biophysical data to show what is protected (e.g. % of EEZ, etc.), management/governance information (governance structures, staff, finance, planning, social equity, etc.) and the need to define principle and subsidiary information to be collected for each MPA.

Primary MPA information should include general location, administrative area (e.g. province, region, district, etc.); legal status (as designated) including date of establishment; formal categorization (by IUCN) and current official category (World Commission on Protected Areas –WCPA: assessed or not); managing authority (including conservation agency responsible for day-to-day management); type of governance (e.g. co-management); Zonation (take, no-take, specified use zone, etc.); type of Protected Area (completely marine, a combination of marine and terrestrial); habitat types and key species; geographical location (employ the use of GPS coordinates to generate shapefiles and maps with attributes); and the existence of a management Plan (Yes or No response required).

Structure of the database on critical habitats and linkage with the clearinghouse mechanism

The Nairobi Convention Secretariat made a presentation on the MPAs and critical habitats database structure including a possible data dashboard and of data layers available in the Convention's clearinghouse. The data ranges from basemaps, marine ecoregions, priority ecoregions, EBSA, heritage sites, MPAs, OECMs, biogenic habitats (Mangroves, salt marshes, warm and cold coral reefs) species habitats (sea turtles) and biogeographic sites (seamounts, knolls). Validation of the data at national level will be required including ability to determine from the maps the sizes of MPAs and software that can display the data at national level

Proposed structure of Outlooks for Critical habitats and MPAs

SECTION	CONTENT	PROCESS
CRITICAL HABITATS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of the region • International Legal Context (agreements, treaties, protocols, conventions; global and regional) • Describe the ecosystems and habitats that are critical and why • Combination of criteria used to characterise the critical habitats: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Connectivity - both within the ecosystem and the ecoregion ○ Providing important functions (e.g. species refugia, commercially important species, uniqueness) ○ Biological integrity ○ Irreplaceability ○ Level of threat – both current and potential; agreed to use IUCN categories (critically endangered, endangered, vulnerable, Already accepted internationally) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical habitat inventories and descriptions at the national level. • Identified KBAs • EBSAs • WIO State of the Coast Report
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representativeness (species, processes, functions) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Map and quantify all the ecosystems and habitats in the region and what each of the ecosystems represents in terms of coverage ○ Description of ecosystems and habitats ○ What it represents per country (%) ○ Representation at a regional level (% in the WIO Region). Maps to depict this. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habitat inventories and descriptions at the national level. • WWF work on Ecoregions • EBSAs • WIO State of the Coast Report
MARINE PROTECTED AREAS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of MPAs in the region • Total coverage area of MPAs vs total coverage of waters under national jurisdiction (under the sovereignty of states), • Type of MPA (Coastal, pelagic, offshore) • Habitats in each MPA • Broad objectives of the MPAs represented • Management Effectiveness • Legislative governance • Planning frameworks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government and other national sources (Acts, Statutes and Policy Documents, CBD reports) • Management plans (management effectiveness reports) • WCMC and MPA Atlas • Biodiversity assessment • International legislative documents (to pick legislative frameworks)

SECTION	CONTENT	PROCESS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources Operational Implementation Monitoring and review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indian Ocean Commission IUCN report on EU overseas MPAs

What next?

Participants were able to define and achieve the following in relation to critical habitats and MPAs

- What is an ideal Marine Protected Area
- Capacity to Manage
- Nature of Assessments
- Indicators to Support Assessment
- Reporting
- Proposed research: What is it that has made governments agree to establish MPAs?
- Definition of critical habitats
- What should baselines constitute?
- Process to Engage Countries
- Potential products
- Draft outlines of selected sections

Key products/outcomes relevant to the review of critical habitats and MPAs

Primary communication products

- Regional Report on critical habitats
- Regional Report on MPAs status & baselines
- Brief syntheses on critical habitats & MPAs
- Regional Database for MPAs
- A Dashboard
- Contribution to the revision of the Protocol on Protected Fauna and Flora of the Nairobi Convention
- Adoption of the outcomes (products) by the countries
- Contribution to the Regional State of the Coast Report

Secondary communication products

- Templates for national reports on SDG 14
- Identification of information gaps and priority areas for research & conservation
- Policy briefs and other products e.g. summary for policy makers
- Setting up of a regional MPA Network including a Network of managers
- Reset/revive the Group of Experts for Marine Protected Areas (GEMPA) in the Western Indian Ocean
- Report on what is it that has made governments agree to establish MPAs and the establishment of OECMs? And to identify enabling conditions for creation of MPAs & OECMs
- Making the case for the establishment MPAs with success stories drawn from global experiences e.g. from South America

Setting up of a Regional MPA Network

- The network should be activity based with a value proposition. The regional network may require joint programming with national managers as happens in the Mediterranean region
- Criteria for membership (may be open or linked to the Regional MPA network?)
- Types of networks:
 - National network of MPAs- nationally governed, made up of all MPAs. Supported by the NBO Convention/WIOMSA
 - Regional network of MPA Managers based on MPA contribution to regional functions.

- Process:
 - Analysis of existing regional networks
 - Develop a draft concept
 - Convene a forum to discuss and refine the draft concept
 - Implement all agreed actions

Expected Outputs

- Structure of the database
- Determination of criteria for identification of most critical habitat
- Structure for a regional assessment report/overview (outlooks) of the status of the existing MPAs in the region
- How to monitor the establishment and development of the network of protected areas (for targets SDG14.2 and 14.5) and to adopt guidelines to facilitate the establishment and development of that system and to increase co-operation among the Contracting Parties to the Nairobi Convention
- Messaging for SDG 14.2 and 14.5.

Workplan to develop the products identified

	Tasks	Timeframe	Responsible
1	Finalization of the Meeting Report held 19-22 June 2017)		WIOMSA/Nairobi Convention Secretariat (NCS)
2	First draft of the annotated outline of the Outlook and complete and detailed work plan		
3	Feedback on the draft outline		
4	Partnership building		NCS
5	Editor & Authors selection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Appointment of consultants 		NCS/WIOMSA
6	Review of sources of information and compilation of data and information		Consultants
7	First Authors meeting & NC Focal Points Meeting	Nov 2017	NCS/WIOMSA
8	Designing of a dashboard		Consultant
9	Database Structure		Consultant/NCS
10	Presentation of products during COP9	March 2018	

Closing remarks

Participants suggested the need to adopt a dynamic way of reporting away from static reports and to increase the number of downloadable reports rather than hard copy prints. It was also suggested that a Community of Practice be put in place for the authors to interact in the development of the outlooks.

The moderator informed that the report of the meeting would be circulated to participants. Julius Francis accepted to finalise the workplan with timelines and to circulate the terms of reference for chapter topics.

The four-day intensive scoping workshop closed on 22 June 2017 at 13 hours.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

To the scoping workshop on review of the state of critical habitats and MPAs in the Western Indian Ocean region on 19-22 June 2017 in Seychelles

	Participant	Institution	Emails
1	Lawrence Sisitka	Associate Researcher Environmental Learning Research Center Rhodes University Conservation, Environment & Development Education, Kariega Drift, P.O. Box 87, Grahamstown, 6140, South Africa	heilaw@imagnet.co.za
2	Nirmal Shah Dr.	Chief Executive Officer Nature Seychelles Centre for Environment & Education, Roche Caiman, P.O. Box 1310, Mahe, Seychelles	nirmalshah@natureseychelles.org
3	Flavien Joubert Mr.	Chief Executive Officer Seychelles National Parks Authority P.O. Box 1240, Victoria, Seychelles	f.joubert@env.gov.sc , ceo@snpa.sc
4	Milali Machumu Dr	Manager & Secretary to the Board Marine Parks and Reserves Unit, Tanzania P. O. Box 7565, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania	milalimachumu@gmail.com
5	Peter Chadwick	Conservationist, Conservation Photographer Fellow of the International League of Conservation Photographers, Formerly WWF SA	peter.ian.chadwick@gmail.com
6	Ane Oosthuizen Dr.	National Marine Coordinator – Park Planning and Development South African National Parks – SANPARKS	Ane.Oosthuizen@nmmu.ac.za
7	Joseph Maina	Lecturer Department of Environmental Sciences, Macquarie University Sydney, Australia	joseph.mbui@mq.edu.au
9	Akunga Momanyi Dr.	School of Law, Commercial Law Dept University of Nairobi c/o P. O. Box 30197 or 10324 – 00100 Nairobi, Kenya	amomanyi@uonbi.ac.ke ; akungamomanyi@yahoo.com
10	Carole Martinez	Programme Coordinator Regional Seas and EU Overseas Programme Global Marine and Polar Programme IUCN World Headquarters Rue Mauverney 2 1196 Gland Switzerland	carole.martinez@iucn.org
11	Julius Francis	Executive Secretary WIOMSA P.O. Box 3298, Zanzibar	Julius@wiomsa.org
12	Lilian Omolo	Operations & Administration Manager WIOMSA P.O. Box 3298, Zanzibar	Lilian@wiomsa.org

13	Dixon Waruinge	Head, Nairobi Convention Secretariat Ecosystems Division UN Environment Nairobi	Dixon.Waruinge@unep.org
14	Theuri Mwangi	Nairobi Convention Secretariat Ecosystems Division UN Environment Nairobi	Theuri.Mwangi@unep.org
15	Joana Akrofi	UN Environment Programme Officer Science Division UN Environment Nairobi	Joana.Akrofi@unep.org
16	Frank Turyatunga	Deputy Director Regional Office for Africa UN Environment	Frank.Turyatunga@unep.org

PROVISIONAL AGENDA

Scoping workshop to review the State of critical habitats and MPAs in the Western Indian Ocean

Date: 19 – 22 June, 2017

Venue: Berjaya Beau Vallon Resort & Casino, Mahe, Seychelles

TIME	ACTIVITY	RESPONSIBLE
Day 1 19/06/2017		
8:30 - 9:00	Registration	
9:00 – 10:00	1. Opening of the Meeting i. Opening remarks and Organizational Matters ii. Aims, scope and expected outputs of the meeting	Nairobi Convention
		Nairobi Convention / WIOMSA
9:50 – 10:10	Coffee Break	
10:10 – 1:00	2. Aligning WIOSAP project activities on critical habitats: - MPAs and EBM and link with SDGs Targets 14.2 and 14.5. - Summary of critical habitats in WIO region - Review of current status, effectiveness and utility of critical habitats in the Western Indian Ocean	WIOMSA
1:00 - 2:00	Lunch Break	
2:00 – 5:00	3. Process for the review of the state of critical habitats and MPA's across all participating countries - Template for review of critical habitats and MPAs	WIOMSA
5:00	Coffee	
DAY 2: 20/06/2017		
9:00 - 9:15	Recap of Day One	
9:15 – 10:30	1. UN Environment work on SDG14 targets and indicators	Nairobi Convention
10:30 – 10:45	Coffee Break	
10:45 – 1:00	2. Discussion - Likely strategies for countries to adopt in order to attain 10% MPA coverage - Methodology, tools, instruments and reporting framework for critical habitats inventory at national and regional level	
12:45 – 2:00	Lunch Break	
2:00 – 3:30	- determination of strategies for countries that may not achieve 10% coverage such as Other Effective Areas- Based Conservation Measures (OECMs)	
3:30 – 4:00	- management effectiveness of MPAs including adaptive management processes and requirements	
4:00 – 4:15	Coffee Break	
4:15 – 5:00	- Messaging for SDG targets 14.2 and 14.5	

DAY 3: 21/06/2017		
9:00 – 9:15	Recap of Day Two	
9:15 – 10:30	1. Structure of the database on critical habitats and linkage with the clearinghouse mechanism <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Digital maps of EBSA, PSSA, EAF, MPAs, critical habitats, biogenic habitats, species habitats, species distribution, biogeographic classification, ABNJ biodiversity - Environmental descriptors and natural capital, marine highways, admin regions 	Nairobi Convention
10:30 – 10:45	Coffee Break	
10:45 – 12:45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (country, date, size, marine ecoregion, ecoregion criteria, cultural and socioeconomic criteria, site description, management status, stakeholders involvement) 	
12:45 – 2:00	Lunch Break	
2:00 – 5:00	2. Management approaches of critical habitats <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Determination of criteria for the most critical habitat for demonstrating MSP/EBM/ICM - novel approaches for the management of habitats outside MPAs - guidelines for establishment, monitoring management network of MPAs at national and regional level 	
5.00	Coffee Break	
DAY 4: 22/06/2017		
9:00 – 9:15	Recap of Day Three	
9:15 – 10:15	1. Proposed structure for the regional outlook on MPAs for the WIO region: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outlook template - Audience - Message of the product - Potential topics to be covered - Authors (assigned roles and topics) 	
10:15 – 10.30	Coffee Break	
10.30 – 1:00continuation	
1.00 – 2:00	Lunch Break	
2:00 – 4:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tools for authors engagement (Community of Practice) - Timelines for development of outlook 	Nairobi Convention
4.00 – 4.15	Coffee Break	
4:15 – 5:00	2. Any other Business and Closing Remarks	Nairobi Convention / WIOMSA