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Introduction

As countries across the Pacific grow concerned about the dwindling of, and damage to, resources in the world’s oceans, there is an effort to develop plans to sustainably integrate human use and marine conservation.

Marine spatial planning (MSP) is a practical way of organising the human use of marine areas to balance the demands of human activities with the need to protect the health of the ecosystems on which those activities depend. MSP is already occurring to varying degrees in some Pacific nations, while others are yet to embark on the journey towards integrated ocean management. This workshop aimed to bring together managers and ocean planning practitioners from Pacific Island nations to share their knowledge and experience.

Specifically, the objectives of this workshop were to:

1. describe how MSP fits into international, regional and national policies;
2. overview of, and feedback on, a draft MSP Toolkit prepared by the MACBIO project;
3. describe MSP within a broader Integrated Ocean Governance framework;
4. increase mutual understanding of the key aspects of MSP;
5. increase mutual learning about the opportunities and hurdles to implementing MSP;
6. facilitate networking of influential practitioners who can continue to support and guide each other in implementing MSP in the Pacific;
7. explore cross-country synergies in terms of implementing MSP and the seeking of funding support; and
8. facilitate sustainability of MSP efforts beyond MACBIO.

The workshop brought together 85 participants from 11 Pacific Island countries (Appendix 1 – participants list), and included presentations, time for discussion, and a field trip (Appendix 2 - Agenda). Rapporteurs or note-takers were assigned, especially during group exercises, to document discussions occurring among smaller groups. The following is a documentation of workshop proceedings.
Day 1

Opening

The following three speakers officially opened the workshop.

Mr. Mason Smith, Regional Director IUCN ORO
Mr. Mason Smith recalled the many international commitments and targets made by Pacific countries that can benefit from implementation of marine spatial planning (e.g., Aichi Target 11, SDG 14, UNOC voluntary commitments, Oceans Pathway). He also recalled the regional conventions and commitments that should be implemented by regional and nationally-driven MSP processes (e.g., PIROP, Pacific Plan, Pacific Oceanscape). Every country represented in the workshop is at some stage in the process of developing or progressing aspects of national MSP. He mentioned that funding for MACBIO will likely end in November 2018. New donors and partnerships will need to be found to progress these efforts further. Mr. Mason Smith reminded participants that this forum was created for regional experts to ask questions, share lessons and seek solutions, and that the offerings from the forum will be captured in knowledge products that can further assist MSPs after the life of MACBIO.

Ms. Sainimili Bulai, Senior Environment Officer, Fiji Ministry of Waterways and Environment
Ms. Sainimili Bulai noted that despite the greatest proportion of Pacific Island Country (PIC) areas being ocean, most of the national planning efforts to date have been devoted to land. Now countries are starting to include oceans in their
development agendas. In 2005, Hon. Minister Tavola set the stage with Fiji’s commitment of protecting 30% of its marine area, which fed into the Micronesia Challenge and other challenges. This commitment was reinforced at the Samoa Small Island Developing States (SIDS) 2014 conference: 30% of Fiji’s seas is to be protected by 2020. The Fiji National Development Plan 2017 aims towards a sustainably managed inshore fisheries sector through further establishment of marine protected areas (MPAs) and other measures and also 30% MPAs offshore. The 2017 National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) – also includes targets for the sustainable use of marine and terrestrial areas, including 30% MPAs. The National Environment Council, under the Environment Management Act, has the function of appointing technical committees to advise it on matters about the environment. In Fiji, the Ministry of Fisheries has a MPA Technical Committee focused on achieving the MPA target. Both initiatives provide guidance and oversight of MPA initiatives in Fiji.

Dr. Jan Steffen, MACBIO Project Director, GIZ
Dr. Jan Steffen recalled prior regional meetings in Nadi in 2009 and 2011, where countries shared lessons learned about Programme of Work on Protected Areas (POWPA) and NBSAPs to achieve Aichi Targets. The 2011 regional meeting was the beginning of MACBIO, which was essentially developed to help address some of the key challenges raised during that meeting. Ministries of Environment and Fisheries had difficulties raising awareness about the value of the ocean. Annual corporate plans were still very much single sector efforts at that time, but there was concern that if we were to continue along the “silo” approach, it would be very difficult for governments to achieve regional and international commitments. There was discussion about whether few large MPAs or many small MPAs would be more feasible under each country’s circumstances, and a concern that establishing MPAs in isolation would be difficult in the absence of a more holistic planning approach.

The objectives of the MACBIO are to make oceans goods and services visible, provide technical support for MSP, compile spatial data, and to support partners in national learning sites to share existing practices at a national level.

There are 5 countries so far that have received detailed support from the MACBIO, and the differences in the contexts among these 5 countries has enriched the process overall. Dr. Steffen cited the example of Vanuatu’s Ocean Policy, which he found an inspirational process. He also cited the example of the Solomon Islands Oceans 12+ committee as a model of intersectoral engagement. He celebrated the gazettal of the Arnavon Islands Marine Protected Area as an example from the Solomon Islands. He noted the evolution of Tonga’s Special Management Area (SMA) network, noted the milestone achievement of the Phoenix Islands Protected Area (PIPA) and the further development of work around other Kiribati islands (e.g. Kirimati), and highlighted lessons learned from Fiji’s work in Macuatu, Kadavu and Navakavu.

Session 1 – Workshop objectives and expectations
The workshop objectives were introduced as follows:
1. Overview of and feedback on draft MSP toolkit for the Pacific;
2. Increase mutual understanding of the key aspects of MSP;
3. Increase mutual learning about the opportunities and hurdles to implementing MSP;
4. Facilitate networking of influential practitioners who can continue to support and guide each other in implementing MSP in the Pacific;
5. Explore cross-country synergies in terms of implementing MSP and the seeking funding support for same; and
6. Facilitate sustainability of MSP efforts beyond the MACBIO Project.

Participants were encouraged to write down their individual expectations of the workshop. The following list includes all expectations that were contributed. The expectations are broadly “grouped” into themes (some may be repeated, as all expectations were included).

- Learn about the MSP Toolkit
- Learn about MSP and how we can apply it to our country
- Look forward to achieving a regional outcome where all countries are committed to manage ocean sustainability
- We are expecting from this workshop to have a more realistic understanding of Integrated Ocean Governance (IOG) and Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) that can deal directly with the issue of economic injustice in ocean resources – Tuvalu
- Learn more about how to put a Protected Area Network (PAN) map on the world map
- To learn more about what elements should be covered in ocean planning and management legislation, and how they will be implemented
- Expect to come out with ideas that can help finalize the MSP Toolkit
- Expect to learn the diverse opportunities and hurdles that may arise during MSP.
- To hear lessons learned from various countries on the implementation of MSP
- Learn of challenges and solutions from countries that have developed their MSP
- To network with practitioners and pool relevant resources to support national MSP
- Learning from different country-level implementation lessons
- Opportunity to work with different teams during group work sessions
- To connect and network with other GIS professionals from the Pacific
- To learn how MSP makes room to integrate traditional management
- Practical / relevant tools for community based management/agreements
- Learn how MSP is implemented in Pacific Island countries and use lessons learnt to help strengthen implementation in Itaukei (Indigenous) communities in Fiji
- What mechanisms can we use to incorporate traditional MPAs like tabu and ra’ui into the MSP process, especially when these traditional MPAs can be ephemeral?
- Increased understanding of MSP in improved MPA management
- Identifying key stakeholders to participate in planning
- Key areas to consider for climate issues
- Common problems and solutions
- Tuvalu needs to have MACBIO office in the island before the end of this year 2018. MACBIO may strengthen the integrated institutional authorities to achieve MSP practices
- Learn about types of data used for designing ocean zones
- Will the outcome of MSP support marine biodiversity?

This workshop emphasises the opportunity to learn from peers in other countries. MSP involves building a picture that takes into account all ocean uses, to detect cumulative impacts and to encourage transparency and accountability during all stages of the process. Community awareness is crucially important in the Pacific; the workshop will offer opportunities to raise issues such as the difficulty that governments may have in raising awareness about MSP/MPAs. There are some additional cross-cutting issues to consider: cultural values and traditional management systems; climate change impacts; diversity and inclusion of women and other minorities in planning processes.

Session 2 – Group Activity: Local scale MSP exercise

Each table was provided with a ‘scenario’, on a map of a hypothetical island, to complete a local scale marine spatial planning exercise. Each table had a rapporteur who submitted notes on the exercise (full set of notes from each rapporteur is available in Appendix 3). At the end of the exercise, each table briefly summarised the process. Following is a summary of the discussion from each table.

Table 1 (Tuvalu, PNG, Fiji)
  - Community was well-represented in stakeholder discussions.
  - Important tourism areas (e.g. diving, surfing, fishing, snorkeling) were identified.
  - Process of coming to decisions of where things should be located: the chief led the effort of trying to balance development with cultural use.
  - Discussions of seasonal versus permanent fishing ban.
  - Keep pets off turtle nesting beaches.
  - No BBQ on turtle nesting beaches.

Table 2 (Vanuatu)
  - Conflicts identified.
  - Considered environmental, social and economic aspects.
  - Within economic aspects, can conflict with other objectives be resolved?
  - Cultural sites need to be preserved.
• Chose port/anchorage area because it is sheltered.
• The gleaning area is an important site to manage for maintaining food security.
• A hotel is seen as important for economic development.

Table 3 (Cook Is, Niue)
• The planning started with the assumption that people will glean and fish everywhere if given the option. Then practitioners marked out areas that needed special restrictions for other reasons (e.g. turtles nesting).
• Important to ensure comprehensive consultation with all stakeholders.
• Hotel representative waited until the end, to see where other uses were before identifying appropriate sites for hotels.
• Areas of conflict include things like fishing, versus where tourists lay with bikinis, versus cultural sensitivity.
• From enforcement standpoint, it is useful to have clear boundaries for all areas.

Table 4 (Tonga, Fiji):
• Decisions to restrict access to gleaning in aquaculture area.
• One of the hotels located near the port for ease of access.
• Cultural sites included old village sites.
• Located tabu areas closer to community areas for ease of enforcement.
• Each stakeholder was given 2 priorities to select from, to apply a democratic approach.
• Used science-based approach when deciding locations, and incorporated expertise from each stakeholder (LEK) to assign placement and rules.

Table 5 (Samoa, Fiji)
• Objective to ensure livelihoods, culture and traditions of people through sustainable use of marine resources.
• Set up technical working group with various stakeholder representatives.
• First looked at areas important to communities.
• Very strict gear restrictions, quotas and seasonal bans in fishing areas.

Table 6 (Fiji, Palau)
• Addressed respect of communities – obtaining proper permissions before planning or development.
• Noted old village sites as cultural sites.
• Noted decline of seasonal aggregations of fish – established managed areas to promote population recovery.
• Protecting turtle nesting areas – balance tourism (nesting beaches draw tourists) with protection.

Table 7 (Fiji, Solomon Islands, Nauru)
• Important to recognize cultural and sacred sites.
• Fisherperson identified importance of tabu area and sites for tourism.
• First mapped out different uses.
• Asked stakeholders to do face-to-face consultation with “chief” so he is aware of development interests.
- Request stakeholders to provide data/info to resolve conflicts.

**Table 8 (Solomon Is, Fiji)**
- All stakeholders agreed to approach chief, who delivered the history of island and the location of important sites.
- Demarcated areas for spawning grounds, turtle nesting, fisheries sites.
- Identified sites for development sites for renewable energy and port.
- Identified tourism sites.
- Identified rules for each site.
- Range of conflicts: no initial planning, poor consultations with community and leaders, women’s uses not taken into account, consumption of tourism for cultural events creates conflict with tourism.

Main lessons learned in this exercise were that:
- Marine spatial planning is already occurring at a small scale in all Pacific Island countries.
- There will be a variety of users and interests in MSP at the large scale – similar to at the local scale.
- Effective consultations are important in community-scale planning and will also be important at large-scale MSP.
- Application of a clear, transparent process of community-scale planning is helpful, and it will also be helpful at the large-scale.
- There will be conflicts between users when doing spatial planning, at any scale.
- Mechanisms to address and ameliorate, if not completely remove, conflicts are important at community-scale and large-scale spatial planning.
- Lessons and experience from small-scale marine spatial planning are relevant and can be applied in national marine spatial planning.

**Session 3 – Marine Spatial Planning Overview**

**Main points**
MSP balances ocean use to meet multiple objectives. However, it does not preclude responsibilities of individual sectors for management. MSP transcends the limitations of single sector management, where competing uses within spatial areas are often overlooked. The MSP Toolkit, presented at this workshop in draft, is tailor-made for Pacific Island countries, with detailed technical advice and examples from Pacific planning processes. Note that the toolkit focuses only on the main steps of MSP development, but not implementation. The workshop addressed most, but not all, of the following steps that make up the Toolkit.
10 Steps to Developing a Marine Spatial Plan (MSP)

| Step 1. Identify need, political will and financial support |
| Step 2. Prepare and implement a consultation plan |
| Step 3. Frame vision and objectives |
| Step 4. Gather and map baseline data |
| Step 5. Identify special, unique marine areas |
| Step 6. Define desired ocean zones |
| Step 7. Prepare guidelines to assist zoning decisions |
| Step 8. Establish the legal and institutional basis for MSP |
| Step 9. Prepare a draft marine spatial plan |
| Step 10. Prepare the final marine spatial plan |

Discussion: Responses / lessons from countries to overview presentations – what were the first experiences with MSP?

Tonga
- Tonga showed a commitment to MSP by establishing the Oceans 7 – a technical working group of key MSP practitioners in seven Ministries.
- Step 8 (legal framework) was dropped as a separate session in this workshop – mentioned commitment to establishing legal framework for MSP in Tonga.

Federated States of Micronesia
- (Offshore Fisheries rep): The FSM is mainly working to manage tuna.
- Started working on spatial planning, but not in an organized way.
- FSM is closed to commercial fishing out to 24 nm.
- MSP Toolkit will be beneficial.

Nauru
- The first question the technical people asked was: what does the community think about MSP? What is their understanding? How will they take it?
- Need to spread awareness of what MSP is – the public does not like surprises.
- Their second question was about finances to support implementation.
Palau
- (PCS): Thinks of MSP as more of an avenue for planning and/or an approach to create harmony between different uses and needs.
- But from conservation perspective, wondering how deep MSP approaches rooted in protection of biodiversity?
- Wants to challenge the MACBIO team to help us understand how rules within MSP can assist with biodiversity conservation (and other objectives). E.g. placement of buffer zones, implementation of setbacks.

Fiji
- (CI): From terrestrial perspective, it's simpler because there is a clearer understanding of who is using land for what purposes. There is less understanding about who is using marine space for what.
- Have tried to think of MSP in the sub-regional context. How can we scale down the national scale thinking to the provincial, district, community level so that users better understand various uses and objectives.
- Community plans are often siloed within sectors.
- Do not necessarily incorporate all sectoral considerations and external users.

Answers and concluding remarks

GiZ (Jan Steffen)
- From German perspective, helps to take step back and think about urban planning. How to convince communities that urban planning is important? People can see multiple uses of urban space. Planning not a tool to create protected areas – is a tool to manage for multiple uses. MSP often highlighted under CBD – thus people think it is linked for biodiversity conservation – but really a tool for minimizing conflict.

IUCN (Leanne Fernandes)
- The conference will address all these issues. MSP is not just about protection, but does includes protection.
Main points
Valuing the marine ecosystem and its services in economic language addresses aspects of Aichi Target 1 and 2. It helps to integrate biodiversity values into national development strategies and planning processes and incorporate it into national accounting. Infographics with clear, relative monetary values of different activities in the marine environment were assessed so that values identified in country reports might get incorporated into decision-making.

The MACBIO project conducted national marine ecosystem service valuations in Fiji, Kiribati, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu. These, together with report summaries and infographics as well as tailored methodological guidelines for use in the Pacific (as to how to conduct these valuations) are available at: http://macbio-pacific.info/categories/valuing/

Discussion
WCS: Can anyone from individual countries share specific examples of when values/infographics have been useful in decision-making processes?

Tonga: Ministry and Revenue and Customs did not have a figure to put to the whale watching tourism industry – they were surprised by the value produced by the report, and this understanding has helped increase their collaboration with MSP.
TNC: In PNG, there was an activity with communities to collect community values for ecosystem services. The collected information was ranked on importance, amount available, food security benefit, cultural benefit. Helped to identify top 5 things for each community to think about and manage.

Niue: Cost/benefit analysis (CBA) has been critical. Proposed 40% of EEZ as MPA. Undertook CBA of various activities – in every scenario, there was far more benefit from marketing Niue as a conservation destination than from fishing/extraction. CBA drove decision-making for Government to agree to 40% commitment. Able to break outcomes of CBA down into language that people can understand and create video for end-users.

GIZ: The Kiribati Director of Statistics was part of the exercise – he was reminded of data gaps. The work allowed the Department of Statistics to see where census data were not filling the gaps and then tried to fill them. Also – in Vanuatu – in prep for the National Sustainable Development Plan (2016-2030), they used some of values to influence the development of the strategy. Fiji example – Director Environment has used the mangrove valuation information within EIAs to guide decisions on development proposals to minimize impact. She also wanted to use the mangrove values to come up with a formula to inform the development of environmental bonds.

Samoa: Congratulations to the 5 countries. Budget cuts are challenges to all countries. Such figures might help to fight off budget cuts (particularly for conservation activities).
Session 5 - Integrated Ocean Governance (IOG) and Marine Spatial Planning (MSP)

The integrated ocean governance aims to:
- Minimise conflict between user groups;
- Recognise cumulative impacts of activities on the environment;
- Develop a collaborative but not forcible procedure;
- Be transparent and adaptive to the changing environment and human needs; and
- Develop a process that respects existing authorities.

Integrated ocean governance requires:
- consideration of ecological, economic, social and cultural values;
- consideration of the impacts of uses on these values;
- the coordination of sectoral management activities at all levels; and
- the involvement of community and stakeholder groups in management and implementation.

Marine Spatial Planning is a very effective tool that helps implement integrated ocean governance.

**Main points**
- Oceans Policy is the house – MSP is how you arrange the furniture inside the house
• Institutional memory is crucially important in planning processes – maintaining key individuals that drive the process
• Maritime boundaries are very important for Vanuatu – neighbouring countries have asserted boundaries that encroach into Vanuatu’s EEZ.
• Fortunately, the government has already set up a committee for Maritime Boundaries. Political will is there, thus this is a priority government program.
• Nationwide consultation resulting in endorsement in 2016 Ocean Policy – traveled to all major islands to obtain comprehensive input, as well as raise awareness of ocean issues. Will do same type of consultation for MSP.
• MSP is a tool that is part of Ocean Policy
• Vanuatu is working on creating GIS grids with compiled information for each cell – cell size different (smaller) for within 12 nm versus 12 nm to EEZ boundary

Discussion
Cook Is: Was there any resistance to Ocean Policy? Toney: No.

Tonga: Noted importance of inclusion of TEK/LEK in consultation process

Palau: Confusion about where MSP fits into Policy

Vanuatu: Policy used as a vehicle to obtain endorsement from all sectors and at highest levels of government that this is the agreed way forward with common goals. Marine Spatial Plan is the mechanism to put policy into action.

Palau: Clarify how MSP can assist with cross-boundary issues?

Vanuatu: Tendency for co-management around boundary areas – particularly where they are not nailed down.

Nauru: Noticed that there is no particular legal framework for MSP.

Vanuatu: Legislative gap analysis was done, and we found enough existing legislation that can be used to begin implementation.

IUCN: In Fiji, Marine Spaces Act comes under Foreign Affairs. Need to engage with them for activities outside of 12 nm to EEZ Boundary.

Session 6 – Panel Discussion: Ocean threats, conflicts and challenges – what is the role of MSP?
Three panelists: Margaret Tabunakawai Vakalalabure (FLMMA, Fiji), Joyce K. Beouch (Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment & Tourism - Protected Areas Network Office, Palau), Maria Satoa Peni (Ministry of Natural Resources & the Environment, Samoa)
Theme
Ocean threats, conflicts and challenges – What is the role of MSP?
- Balance / consensus / conflict – importance of consultation
- Threats and concerns are likely to be similar across the Pacific: sedimentation, pollution, run-off, boundary disputes between community and national sites, boundary disputes between nations, misunderstanding about ownership, coral bleaching, acidification, sea level rise, increasing intensity of cyclones, consumption preferences, subsistence and commercial poaching
- Many countries already have MPAs or equivalent, but not as an integrated planning tool
- Community participation in offshore areas will increase with increasing damage to coral reefs
- Pacific countries all have as their legal foundation the CBD Aichi Target 11

Main points and discussion
- Scaling down and acknowledging community needs is a big challenge
- Poor planning for natural disasters is common
- Multiple factors are contributing to coral bleaching – sea surface temperature, runoff – in addition to coral mortality from other threats (e.g. COTS)
- Challenges from IUU fishing
- Mangrove reclamation from development and settlement
- Impact of waste disposal – directly into ocean or into rivers and coastal areas (e.g. mangroves)
- Conflicts around deployment of FADs
- Boundary issues and disputes – ownership of specific reefs, disputes with neighbouring countries
- Enforcement issues – particularly in remote areas. Lack of appropriate judicial systems at local level.
- The challenge of changing preferences in people’s tastes away from reef fish
- There is interest in Samoa for implementing MSP Toolkit
- Palau has already progressed planning processes – started from the bottom up, then embraced by state, followed by RAP by PICRC to identify resilient and vulnerable reefs. Used information for additional planning purposes. Used
conservation action planning as a tool to engage communities to capture ideas and experiences. Used PIMPAP model for management planning. Used PA METT to evaluate effectiveness of PAs. Regularly do SE surveys to gauge impact on communities. Established fishing cooperative to help monitor fishery and bring fishers into planning – they establish their own rules (as there is recognition that MPAs alone are not sufficient).

- Realization that impact of severe cyclone can bring management planning back to stage one – many communities in Fiji are having to rebuild and rethink. Inshore FADs have been placed in some places as interim measure. Communities should have a say in how offshore areas (outside of reef) are managed. Communities are accessing these resources as a consequence of damage to their inshore areas from Cyclone Winston. Some communities have left fishing altogether and are focusing solely on agriculture as consequence of the disaster.

Session 7 – MSP / MPA Objectives

Presentation by: Ms Mere Lakeba, Ministry of Fisheries, Fiji

Marine protected areas (MPAs) are one of the main MSP tools for marine environmental protection. This is Fiji’s journey in setting objectives to guide the development of a nations-wide MPA network. Dedicated committees of technical experts were crucially important to keep the momentum of the process. The use of existing objectives set within environmental legislation ensured that MSP was tied to Fiji’s ongoing environmental obligations.

Main discussion points

- Tuna and tuna-like species are crucial in Pacific MSP
- 2005 – Fiji made a commitment at the Mauritius SIDS meeting for 30% protection of its EEZ.
- 2017 UNOC – developed a legally recognized multiple use marine spatial plan for the whole EEZ, including ecologically representative network of MPAs
- Vision derived from the MWG of the PAC – biological and social objectives, as well as focus on productivity and resilience
- Vanuatu: Idea to pilot MSP at Malo Pass – use process to inform national MSP process
- Importance of establishing a practical working group and linking it to NGOs (e.g. Tonga – Ocean 7)
- Legal drafting: cementing the Ocean 7 as the implementation team
- Developing GIS layers to inform the development of MSP (e.g. displaying maps of SUMAs, bioregions).
Session 8 – Data Needs

Presentation by: Mr Hans Wendt, MACBIO

Data and information are the forms of knowledge we use to spatially organize the marine environment. Spatial data are represented as maps, and those maps are then used to identify types of habitats and human uses. Finding the right kinds of data is time-consuming and not always fruitful, and storing the data can be an issue.

**Main points**
- What data are needed?
- What data are available?
- Data – variables in the form of characters, text, numbers, pictures etc (unprocessed)
- Information – processed data, usually formatted (graphs)
- Spatial data (geospatial) represents location, shape and size of an object on earth
- Maps – representation of data to highlight relationships between objects mapped.
- Main questions driving data needs (e.g., are there sectors/ministries that depend on certain type of marine areas, types of jurisdictional boundaries)
- Ensure access protocols are followed
- Importance of meta-data described – MACBIO uses Australia/NZ standards for all data compiled/generated
- Data access can take time – different countries have different ways of compiling and storing their data, with different levels of sensitivity
- Not all data will be useful
- General rules with data. It should be:
  - Up-to-date
  - Objective
  - Reliable
  - Comparable
• Current status and future trends
  o Biological
  o Human use
  o Sectors / uses
  o Driving forces likely to shape future developments
  o Administrative and jurisdictional boundaries

Discussion
• Different countries have different ways to represent data, different resolution, different sensitivity
• Open source data: not all of it is useful
• Went through all the websites to access all datasets
• Conducted an analysis of usefulness / reliability
• Question: Storing data and information
• Question: Updating the information; who looks after it, who drives the update?
• Vanuatu: national geospatial data policy – looking for a centralised agency where it can be housed
• Cook Islands – several agencies want a central geoportal but don’t want to share because data are sensitive – developing metadata standards, spatial data sharing policy, data sharing agreements, developing a template for recording who keeps what data
• Palau: Problem of not sharing data is that everyone has to start from scratch – waste of time and money – in Palau all data are shared
• SPC offers almost all data as open source. BUT there are no metadata – downgrading the detail in the data can make it less sensitive

• Solomon Islands: Government internal data portal (SolGeo) – all different Ministries can upload data and define access levels to data. Needs to be made available for multi-sector planning process, which is a challenge. Information needs to be shared to be usable.
• Fiji (Ministry of Economy): An important part of development plan is having targets. The second most important part is collecting data for M&E. The most important thing at policy level is that data are trustworthy. There is a perception that data from the Ministry of Fisheries is the most reliable.
• Q: How did Vanuatu integrate local data with national open source data?
• Vanuatu: Clarification of the difference between ocean policy and MSP. Vanuatu has developed and ocean policy, but not yet MSP. Some data have been collected, but not integrated within context of MSP. A GIS user group exists. For the next stages of consultation, we will start with data already compiled and include local information. An issue that has been identified is that fisheries data are housed with SPC.
• Tonga: At very beginning of the data collection process, there was a high level of resistance in releasing commercial information.
• Samoa (CI): Curious about where the information is banked for Tonga (and other countries), and how to routinely update it.
• Vanuatu: This is a big issue in Vanuatu. We are working on a National Geospatial Data Policy, which will inform where to house data, who is mandated to drive and update it, etc.
• Cook Is: Doing similar thing in the Cook Islands. Several agencies want a centralized geoportal, but are not willing to share data with other agencies. Started drafting Spatial Data Management Policy. Just finished situation analysis – recommendation for metadata standards, various levels of confidentiality and licensing agreements – will give confidence to agencies that data they want to be protected will be so on the portal, templates, ToR for GIS User Group
• SPC: If you google PacGeo from SPC, SPC data are all open source. Includes FFA boundaries, hazards, land use, MACBIO data.
• Locate open-source tools to be able to maintain data into the future. Eg. Quantum GIS - https://qgis.org/en/site/ - discussion about software.

Opening Cocktail (Hosted by Oceans 5, Waitt Foundation and Waitt Institute)
The process of identifying special and/or unique marine areas (SUMAs) uses existing data to identify areas that are considered special or unique, both expert scientific and traditional knowledge is used. SUMA can inform government decision-making about what types of ocean zoning/what level of protection should be afforded to which parts of the marine environment. SUMAs can be used by government staff, not just in marine spatial planning, but when considering permitting and licencing decisions and conditions, in environmental impact assessments, policy development and governance processes, in coastal and ocean development planning and in assessing risks associated with various intended uses in particular locations. SUMAs are rated according to a country-specific system that is not officially or globally recognised, but is nationally relevant.

**Main points**

- Solomon Islands has >400 community-based resource management areas, of which >200 are marine areas. Some examples are:
  - EBSAs – very broad, not useful for national planning
  - IBAs – focused on bird habitat rather than areas with important overall biodiversity
  - KBAs – mainly terrestrial, but identified through a rigorous process according to international standards. But in the Solomon Islands there is not enough information to validate more KBAs according to international standards
- Used marine experts – NGO partners and researchers (most familiar with inshore areas), plus local knowledge, multiple government sectors (especially with knowledge of offshore areas). Workshop held in 2017.
Came to a collective understanding that the SUMAs were a tool to assist with MSP process.

- SUMA has 4 criteria: justification, geographic explicitly, info sources, national obligation
  - Each criterion received 3 points; total possible score was 12
- SUMA report published in September 2018, with 65 areas identified (12 offshore)
- Building on the CBRM mapping exercise done in 2012 by TNC
- Offshore was divided into 3 regions – Western, Central, Eastern
- Important to note that none of these SUMAs are recognized under the Environment Act. SUMAs may be submitted as protected areas either under PA Act or FMA Act

**Discussion**

- Palau: Will the Solomons develop an implementation plan to follow the creation of SUMAs?
- Agnetha: The SUMAs were submitted to sector agencies to note on charts to inform EIAs, and to the Maritime Sector for development planning. The longer-term plan is to use the information for MSP.
- Palau: Would that include legislative support to make SUMAs recognized?
- Agnetha: Yes, the Ocean Policy (currently under development) will clarify what SUMAs are. There is also room for legislation to provide recognition for SUMAs beyond just dissemination to sectors, and room to incorporate them into sectoral planning

- Vanuatu: How does NBSAP play a role in this?
- Agnetha: Part of the commitment is to protect 10% of the marine environment by 2020. This is an NBSAP target. All the protected coastal areas now add up to 0.13%. SUMAs would add to percentage targets if they’re set up as protected areas.
- Vanuatu: Emphasizes that the MSP is the people’s plan (not MACBIO, not government). Emphasizes the need for consultations, particularly to gather information from the public in order to build ownership.
- Leanne Fernandes, MACBIO: Notes that all countries are presently managing their marine environment in one way or another. Having a MSP is another part of the puzzle of managing marine environment. Inasmuch as current management are not able to fix boundary problem, MSP will also not fix boundary issues; this needs to happen through political discussions through the UNCLOS process. If we wait until boundaries are fixed, we will be waiting for decades. MSP can proceed in the meantime. UNCLOS likes to see countries actively managing their ocean – it provides weight to submissions for boundary formalization.
- Nauru: As a general comment, it would be interesting to see if a costing could be done, perhaps through MACBIO, of the investment required for
different MSP steps. Would be useful for all countries to have this background as they think about initiating the process.

- Leanne Fernandes, MACBIO: This has not been done to date. The MACBIO project is much bigger than just the MSP component. A realistic estimate is about US $0.5M for each country over 5 years. This does not include investment contributed by country governments. The MACBIO project did not collect new data; it used existing data. Requesting research vessels to obtain data for Government (particularly in deep sea areas where there is so little information) is strongly recommended. Mining companies often collect information on biophysical features, so if they find something, they won’t have to collect information again for EIA. Sometimes mining companies include clauses into agreements that they do not have to share information, but Governments should push back on this.

- Cook Is: What is the success rate of using SUMAs in other places, and what lessons can be shared?

- Leanne Fernandes, MACBIO: To be clear, SUMAs are not designed based on global standard – they use locally relevant information. Designation is only based on biophysical data, with no cultural or social input. This would be an additional data layer.

- Niue: Countries are judged through CDB, not just on meeting percentage targets, but also on their worth to the globe in terms of global biodiversity. This influences resource allocation through the GEF. SUMAs (and the data behind them) could help with readjusting weightings and influence resource allocation. Baltic states have done just that.

- Solomons: (Responding to “how do you store all of the data?) Solomons has several data portals within government and outside of it. Part of her work is to make it known and guide its use in the country.

- Cook Is: In the Cooks, there have been a lot of difficulties getting a centralized GIS portal established – part of reason is the decision on which GIS software to use. They have been gifted ArcGIS software with expectation that they would later pay for a license. Other people suggest to use QGIS, but with Government infrastructure, they need “serious” GIS software because QGIS keeps changing and plugins become no longer usable. Curious as to what other countries think about advantages/disadvantages of QGIS.

- TNC: Has been spoiled through ArcGIS suite – we’re used to this software. Finds QGIS a bit clunky and some dialogues are obvious. Comment about the plugins actually also applies to ArcGIS – so he would not use this as a blocking point. The whole ESRI platform is becoming more and more dependent on internet access, which has some challenges for the Pacific. There’s a great user community for QGIS.

- Hand Wendt, IUCN: They did an assessment before recommending QGIS for MACBIO, enquiring at Lands Department and other departments. They found that some departments are using ArcGIS, but licenses are being paid by projects, and there are concerns that they would no longer have access post-project. QGIS does a new release every 3 months. Technology continues to improve. We can now get help online and find plugins online. We Have had no problem transitioning from ArcGIS (used in studies) to QGIS.
Session 10 – Defining Ocean Zones

Presentation by: Tahiri Hokafonu, Principal Biodiversity Officer, Tonga Department of Environment

Ocean zoning guides human behavior in different parts of the marine environment. Ocean zones can help to separate conflicting activities, and fulfil a country’s social, economic and ecological objectives. Globally accepted zoning protocols can easily be adapted within a country’s EEZ, especially in coastal areas so that it can be adapted for local or traditional management.

Main points

- Tonga’s management areas (zones) must contribute to the country’s vision and objective for the ocean.
- MSP Vision: Ecologically, socially and economically sustainable development of Tonga’s oceans for the benefit of all Tongans
- MSP objectives: sustainable development, food security, biodiversity conservation, minimizing use conflicts, climate change resilience, protect and rehabilitate environment
- The word “zone” can be an alien concept for Tongans, and is not seen as a process informed by the people – Tonga uses “ocean management areas” to denote shared resources rather than pieces of property. The word was therefore deliberately removed from national plans and policy documents, and was replaced with “management areas” instead. This comes from how people talk about land, which is all either owned by Crown or local people, so the land cannot be “zoned”.
- The objectives, however, tend to be similar
- National frameworks (various acts and NBSAP) mirror international obligations
- Sectoral management plans still exist (e.g. SMAs, Fisheries laws, shipping guidelines, whale watching guidelines)
- Community consultation includes the translation of technical / scientific terms into laypersons’ terms
- All activities currently banned remain banned across all management areas – zoning does not replace existing management measures
- SMAs are community-specific and currently exist in the Fisheries Management Act (for inshore, community management only). All other management areas apply outside community reef areas. This includes: General Use, Commercial Fisheries (allows sustainable commercial
fishing but no mining), Local Use (protects food security and livelihoods); Habitat Protection (protects habitat integrity); Highly Protected (No-Take); Special, Unique (protects specific species, habitats or cultural values).

- SMAs operate similarly to LMMAs – rules are specific to each community. Rules for other management areas will be standardized wherever they apply, except for the Special, Unique areas. Ocean management areas will be enacted in law.
- After the development of a zoning table, it needs to be translated into local language that the public can understand.
- Have matched zones with IUCN classification system. Only includes matches to categories II (No-take), IV (Unique), V (Limited Use, Habitat Protection).

**Discussion**

- What are the advantages and disadvantages of using nationally standardized ocean zones?
- How do you combine national standardized zoning with individual community-driven designations?
- Tonga: communities are given local maps and larger scale maps during consultation
- Activities that need to be licensed could be standardized. Also, activities unique to each village are listed, allowing some flexibility within a standardized situation
- Nauru has a very limited inshore resource area, which is publicly owned. An SMA system wouldn’t work. Everyone fishes offshore, and for the community to dictate who can fish where would be difficult. Zoning may address that, but it will be difficult in practice.
- It is important to share information with the community to empower their decision-making. They usually have knowledge that will help define zones / areas
- Inshore fisheries management is easier to implement – offshore management is more challenging because of the conflict between commercial and small-scale fisheries
- Where there is customary marine ownership, management is easier to implement. SMAs in Tonga were difficult at first – uniting the community is difficult when there’s not an existing culture of stewardship or ownership. The only thing that is standardized in SMAs is the registration of fishers and boats
- A comprehensive legislation review was conducted in Tonga, including 91 instruments – each states which part of the ocean is being used. Compliance is still an issue offshore
- There is a need for communication strategies that work across different groups
- Cook Islands: customary conservation belongs to the people – there is a very traditional system in place, and contemporary law and customary law are both sanctioned by the constitution. Ridge, reef and ocean are all under customary ownership. Landowners own land and make final decisions about inshore marine use. 47 rau’i were established by landowners and local communities. MSP is a new idea. Outside coastal areas, customary ownership is mixed with government ownership, and decisions about these areas must be joint.
• Question: Have standardized ocean zones been defined for use in your ocean?
• Solomon Islands has 6 zones, and is currently planning to apply them to all marine waters. Sectors have been briefed about uses determined by different zones, but they have not yet decided where the zones will go. Synchrony and conflict between sectors need to be established first
• Question: If not, do you need them?
• Fiji (CI): Clarity is needed about how zones operate at different scales. How to take offshore zoning to community level is unclear.
• Tonga (Tahiri): Clarified that communities have the final say over inshore areas. But in many cases, communities also fish offshore, so they should have input into the designation of offshore zone placement because they access at least some offshore resources, particularly adjacent to their community areas. They should also have input on issues such as ships anchoring near areas where they fish.
• Kate Davey, IUCN: Referring back to the question of what happens inshore and how it fits with offshore: the idea with zones is that rules will vary by community. There are options for communities to use the same types of offshore zones within their community managed areas, where same rules apply, so that rule about what is allowed is clear to outsiders.
• Tonga will be in a better position to answer in December, after consultations have been undertaken. There will be better knowledge of potential issues and conflicts.
• Niue: Nuie has the same issues around inshore management and zoning. Some standardized conditions exist of what is allowed and not allowed in inshore areas, but communities can add or subtract other activities on a case by case basis. This adds some flexibility for uniqueness, but standardizes some key things aligned to national objectives.
• Nauru: There is a very limited inshore resource area in Nauru, which is publicly owned. The SMA concept may work. For offshore areas, there will potentially be more conflict in determining who is allowed to fish where. There is also the issue of fishers using different types of transport or gear; this needs to be addressed in zone regulations. In practice, it will be difficult to tell fishermen that certain zones are just for certain fishers with certain gear types.
• Samoa (CI): In her former job as a fisheries officer, it was easy to implement fisheries management with communities in inshore areas, but in offshore area there was often conflict between the offshore commercial fishing industry (particularly international) and the artisanal fishing and domestic fleet.
• Tonga: From the experience working with SMAs, the challenges raised by Nauru are understood. In Tonga, chiefs just own the land, but the Crown owns all sea areas. When the SMA program started, it was very difficult. The first SMA took 1.5 years for community agreement. The only thing standardized in the SMA process in Tonga is the registration of fishing vessels.
• Tonga (Tahiri): Learning from offshore is possible, for example through legislative review. Having such a review provides a way to communicate at the intersection between sectors and their management.
• Tonga: There is also a need for effective communication that works across sectors and for different audiences.
Solomons: In the Solomons, zones have been developed. The next step is to liaise with other sectors as well as the communities, to discuss how the zones might be applied. Zone typology is another tool with which to have a discussion with stakeholders about who is operating where. There is legislation that covers establishing zones in the Solomons, but it is seen as a useful management tool for sectors.

Group activity results

Rapporteur: Mavileko Ramoica, Fiji
Participants: Tonga (1), Nauru (2), Fiji, Solomon (4) total of 8
- **Advantages and disadvantages of zoning**
  - Fiji has similar zones to the ones presented
  - Tonga have community consultation, and the community chooses what to prioritise
  - The Solomon Islands did it at the national level
  - **Advantages** – the principle of zoning is to protect resources, and therefore is an instrument of protection and includes people’s safety. It provides a management framework for uses of marine areas, and helps to map out MPAs
  - **Disadvantages**- It restricts fishing intensity and fishing techniques, so it becomes a threat to fishing pressure. Monitoring compliance is difficult

Rapporteur: Stacy Jupiter, WCS
Participants: Vanuatu
- Vanuatu has already developed a zoning typology – slightly different from the Tongan typology.
- Toney Tevi appears to be floating the idea of the whole EEZ as covered by sustainable use zones. General Use zone was the only one which was problematic at the time of creating the typology, as it was not clear which activities would be sustainable in this zone.
- **Disadvantage**: unclear how it will intersect with other areas declared or registered under other Acts

Rapporteur: Jenny
- In Fiji, coastal areas are often managed by local clans; some traditional fishing boundaries have multiple clans controlling them so a larger zoning process might create some conflict
- SMAs/LMMAs are not uniform in their activities, offshore instead will be uniform in what types of activities are allowed or not (at least nationally - regionally it may vary)

Rapporteur: Hans Wendt, IUCN
- Ocean zones can be overwhelming if not presented clearly
- Enforcement issues – in Samoa and Tonga, there is difficulty in resolving enforcement issues with the Police
- Penalties need to be strengthened
- Zoning inshore is easier to enforce – offshore zoning is difficult to enforce because of commercial fisheries
- There is a challenge of Government endorsing developments that are incompatible with zoning regulations.

Session 11 – Bioregions & Ecologically representative marine protected areas

Bioregionalisation is the classification of the marine environment into spatial units that host similar animal and plant communities. Bioregions are areas with relatively similar assemblages of biological and physical characteristics without requiring complete data on all species, habitats and processes. This means, for example, that seamounts or seagrass beds within a bioregion will be more similar to each other than seamounts or seagrass beds in another bioregion. An ecologically representative system of MPAs can be built by including examples of every bioregion within the system. Defining bioregions across a country mitigates against ignoring those areas about which no or little data are available.

Main points and questions
- “Bioregions” is a new term for many people in the room
- Cook Is: What was the basis for merging or splitting the bioregions in the workshops? Country participants consulted during the workshops have knowledge on how to do this. What about data on really deep parts of the ocean – none of the data that went into the bioregion analysis was for physical parameters deeper than 1000m. Comprehensive data are available
down to 1000m, so this was used, but for deeper areas it was possible to use proxies such as seamounts.

- TNC: a bioregion doesn’t need to be contiguous
- The normal scale is 1:10,000, and 9x9 km grid cells for the SW Pacific – can this be sized up to share with the community? No – the revised bioregions are useful for the communities
- Note that the boundaries can be changed as more knowledge is gained in the future
- How do you weight the data? Within each bioregion there’s a description of factors that went into the analysis, and that can tell you which variables were more important in driving the clustering
- Was any ground-truthing done? No, but real (existing) data were used for reef-associated bioregions
- Can bioregions be correlated with use? Yes
- Nauru: Nauru only has deepwater bioregion(s), which would not be very useful for planning.
- IUCN (Hans): There are reef-associated bioregions for Nauru. In the report is a description of the data and its weighting; this will help understand which factors were driving the clustering.
- Fiji: Echoed the appreciation for the comprehensive information in the presentation. Was there any groundtruthing of any specific areas?
- IUCN (Hans): Groundtruthing was not done, given time and budget restrictions. The only validation was through expert-driven workshops in the individual countries.
- Palau: What kinds of bioregions might mining companies look for? What types are more suitable for fisheries productivity? Could we overlay information to see if there are sectoral correlations with bioregions?
- IUCN (Hans): As I understand the question, how do we link bioregions to users? The classification is neutral in that context.
- IUCN (Leanne): It is possible to do a correlation, but because bioregions represent composites of information, there might not be a perfect match. There might be a stronger correlation of uses within particular data layers. For example, SPC presently has a large program to look at which environmental variables can be used to predict tuna catch.
- IUCN (Kate Davey): Correlation is more likely between uses and geomorphological features.
- SPC: What is the most common bioregion here in the Pacific?
- IUCN (Hans): It is important to note that there are only so many colours that can be displayed on the entire SW Pacific bioregion area. So even though, for example, it looks like there is a lot of area covered by this lime green bioregion, they are actually different bioregions. Across the SW Pacific there are 262 bioregions.

Session 12 – Placement Guidelines (biophysical and socio-economic management guidelines)
Presentation by: Mr Vatu Molisa, MACBIO Project Liaison Officer, Vanuatu
Guidelines are not rules in the legal sense, but are a series of directives, drawn from the best scientific knowledge available, that guide the placement and size of ocean zones. They're important when embarking on MSP that needs to meet a series of social, economic and ecological objectives. For the first time, these guidelines have been developed for offshore marine areas. Social and economic guidelines are combined with ecological guidelines to account for all objectives.

**Main points**
- Guidelines are not rules
- Vanuatu has an Ocean Policy Implementation Committee
- ‘Spatial equity of opportunity’—the considerations within the guidelines are not just ecological, but also social and economic; 4 principles that guided their activities:
  - Fewer larger zones are preferred over lots of small ones
  - Include at least 20% of each bioregion in no-take areas
  - Ensure each bioregion is in at least 3 replicates)
  - 20-40 year duration

**Discussion**
- Are seabirds included? Yes
- Why the 20-40 year timeline? Because it allows for complete recovery of the species
  - In Cook Islands, only took 5 years to restore populations within the rau’i; “the clams just multiply”; the rau’i is a food basket and is intended to sustain the lives of the community

**Session 13 – MSP / MPA consultations/community involvement**
Presentation by: Ms Jacqui Evans, Marae Moana, Cook Islands

**Main points**
- Using the example of Marae Moana Cook Islands Marine Park
- The success of this park is giving hope to the teams from other countries. People are inspired
- In Niue there is the problem of people reaching “workshop fatigue”. People will stop turning up when many groups are running workshops
- Various groups use the area in different ways: canoes, sports fishing, diving, whale protection NGO – there was a need to get everyone’s viewpoint and facilitate an agreement. There was very limited compliance and enforcement capacity. For example, line of sight to FADs was used as an access measure to protect canoe fishermen, and offshore FADs to compensate for fishing losses
- There was reflection on the spiritual connection of the people with the ocean
- Kevin Iro (local rugby celebrity) originally proposed it and was its champion, which was part of its success
- The park was introduced in 2010; consultations began in 2012 (Oceans 5 funded this in 2013); in 2014 it expanded to the northern islands; in 2015 the MPA Task Force was established; in 2016 legislation drafted; in 2017 it passed parliament

**Discussion**
Lilette liked the approach taken by Marae Moana because it reflects the culture and sentiments of the people; there was the supportive aspect of visiting the outer islands; ‘passion needs to be translated out of technical jargon’

Finding a footballer to be the champion was seen as a master stroke

Give the politicians all the ammunition they can get; especially pass on what communities have said

Session 14 – Maritime compliance
Presentation by: Ms Rosamond Bing, Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources, Government of Tonga

In the context of MSP, compliance refers to the whole range of compliance activities, which include education, the provision of incentives and deterrents, surveillance and enforcement. Most countries have some combination of compliance assets across different Government Ministries. However, in many cases systematic, centralized compliance systems are lacking.

Main points
- Within the context of MSP, this is part of Step 7: the legislation review
- Legislation is pointless without compliance capacity
- When MSP is in place, the compliance legislation also needs to be in place
- Using environmental valuation can help
- The judiciary doesn’t understand environmental crime. It is possible to train the judiciary; it’s important because even a small environmental crime can set a precedent for other and bigger crimes
- Compliance in Fiji: there is a budget for the inshore fisheries division – usually conservation officers are “wearing two hats”
- Compliance in the PIPA, the world’s biggest MPA
- The coastal fisheries officer is responsible
- VMS is managed by the FFA and Fisheries, and detects vessels entering the boundaries
- Observers on boats are responsible for reporting illegal activities
- Patrol boats are a possibility but the area is very remote and huge
- Australia and NZ extend their surveillance to PIPA boundaries
- Niue has mechanisms to protect the reef, but no control on passing yachts
- How many violations occur in PIPA? Are they documented? Are they pursued? Data exist on these activities, held by FFA
- The officer based in PIPA has no resources and can only collect data
- Using technology is a possibility: satellites could provide a record of the frequency of entry, and data can be used to target compliance activities

Discussion
- There is a problem with the police not knowing about laws or crimes related to fisheries; they need some education
- Vanuatu: there is an example of volunteers that have been trained in compliance for inshore violations
• The Cook Is has a patrol boat and assistance from NZ, Australia, and the US; this results in 100% observer coverage in their EEZ
• Palau has observers but limited VMS
Day 3
Field trip to Yanuya Island

On the third day of the workshop, participants travelled to Yanuya Island. The objectives of the field trip were:

1. to build relationships with other MSP practitioners in the Pacific;
2. to reflect and discuss previous days of workshop;
3. to experience Fiji as the host country;
4. to refresh and re-energise;
5. to gain an increased understanding of Fiji’s Locally Managed Marine Area network work on-the-ground; and
6. to increase awareness that local communities engage in local-level marine spatial planning.

The MSP workshop field trip was preceded by an advance scouting trip, where the team traditionally announced the MSP Workshop field trip to the village community and discussed logistics. They also discussed the importance of the Yanuya marine management plan and governance structure, and prepared the village to present it with their lessons learnt to participants.
Day 4

Opening prayer

Debrief from Yanuya Island field trip

Discussion – priority areas for improvement when working with communities
- Communities are the key to MSP
- The presentation was good, but it came from someone like us – the NGO’s work is dictated by their project objectives
- In villages, scarcity of water and other difficulties take precedence over environmental protection; this must be taken into account when visiting
- Half of the community was doing the catering – they were the people who should have been in the room
- What if we bring the refreshment rather than the other way around? That might improve participation
  - Reply: this community chose to do the catering so they could be paid for it
- Lack of actual community representation in meetings
- Lack of women: it is common throughout the Pacific for women to be sidelined. Other community members – young men, youth – were also absent: the timing meant they were out working or at school
- Some communities (esp. women) have hospitality as their main source of income - they’re out working in the hotels
- Getting visitors mingling with the communities could encourage dialogue. For example, women visitors and women in the village could prepare food together to provide a space to freely chat about conservation work.
- To accomplish what’s planned, more time is needed in the village
- One or two people could stay on after the official consultation – that’s when people open up and talk more about the actual issues. Going on Sunday, using church time, is another idea
- Meetings with donors are needed to make them understand the concept of “village time”
• People working in offshore environments don’t get to see their sites
• We need to be clear in our requirements of the attendees – the focus was on the guests
• The traditional knowledge of as many stakeholders as possible should be captured, making sure that our science and traditional knowledge merge. It could be useful to use GIS to map out traditional knowledge and overlaying it with science.
• Engage one champion or several in the community who’s passionate about conservation and resource management.
• Helping leaders (e.g. chiefs, chiefs advisors, village headman) to understand the value of conservation work at the village level
  • Consideration of the number of visitors (too many yesterday)
  • In Tonga, the government officials bring the food, so it’s an enticement to come to the SMA discussion
  • Discover the needs of the village has when gift-giving
    o Reply: this was done during the scouting trip

Comments on best practice consultation from around the room

Caveat: this field trip was not a consultation

• Maximise community representation in the early stages of project planning.
• Rather than stay in capital cities, make efforts to visit communities in regional areas.
• A formal setting can be intimidating for some; informal forums often elicit better information and feedback.
• Need to reflect on how the skills and knowledge we bring can be better merged with the community, and how we can encourage people to share their views, rather than be overpowered by those with a better education.
• Spend as much time as possible with the community, ideally overnight; although this must be balanced with time and budget constraints (it was also noted that philanthropic organisations are generally more flexible about time spent with communities than big institutions like the UN).
• Improve representation of women in consultation / meetings (e.g. bring food so that women do not have to spend time catering and hosting).
• Ensure the target audience is clear and choose consultation time carefully (e.g. after hours when people are back from work).
• Get your hands dirty – participate in tree planting, rubbish collection, etc.

Session 15 – Institutional Arrangements for Developing MSP
Presentation by: Ms Agnetha Vave-Karamui, Solomon Island
Developing MSP needs to be preceded by the political will to look after the ocean, and a strong team to guide the process.
Main points

- Vision introduced at the 2015 Inaugural Ocean Summit: “healthy, secure, clean and productive oceans which benefits the people of the Solomon Islands”
- IOG (integrated oceans governance) precedes MSP
- The Oceans 12 developed 5 priorities and set targets for 2020 (for MSP and IOG), including:
  - National Ocean Policy (PM’s office) is being developed in 2018
  - Legislation jurisdiction (Foreign affairs ministry)
  - Capacity Development (SI maritime authority)
  - Sustainable Financing (National Planning ministry)
- The Technical Working Group does the work; government ministries and other groups are part of it (soon will also include provinces)
- “Sitting allowance” is not part of their program, but food is provided
- Mentioned that Oceans 12 being analogous to the 12 disciples
- Oceans 12 has been operating in a closed-door context so far (even the MACBIO staff weren’t allowed to talk)
- There’s a need to gain and maintain support from the political leaders and key players – e.g. briefing Cabinet.
- Important to secure cross sector buy-in – does the opposition support the policy or program?
- Account for regular staff changes (and therefore corporate knowledge loss) to working groups and partners.
- Understand the context of the stakeholders.
- Aim for consistency, good coordination and continued momentum.
- Harness the power of religious institutions, where appropriate.
- Bring passion and ‘heart’ to the task; we are dealing with people.

Session 15 – Institutional Arrangements for Implementing MSP

Panel discussion
Panelists: Josie Tamate (Ministry of Natural Resources, Niue); Jacqui Evans (Marae Moana, Cook Islands); Lolita Gibbons-Decherong (Palau Conservation Society, Palau)
Niue
- Saw similarities and differences with Solomons, and stressed the importance of lessons learned by other countries
- Importance of having a team
- An NGO was important to implement the ocean planning project in Niue
- Niue has a population of 1600 people, so there’s a capacity issue
- There’s a Memorandum of Understanding for government to work with NGOs, ensuring that there are enough people to bring knowledge together. This also helps in coordinating overlap and avoiding duplication
- Bringing together existing legislation
- Could do better in having champions and the personnel to push an integrated project forward

Cook Islands
- The council is made up of different people representing society, which includes both the president and the leader of the opposition, traditional leaders, religious leaders and NGOs
- They approve MSP developed by the technical working group
- The groups need to communicate better
- Religious leaders are better at communicating and leading than government
- Government policies change every election cycle

Palau and PAN
- There’s a protected areas network that is both marine and terrestrial
- PAN sites are managed by the state, technical support is provided by government and NGOs
- There’s presidential encouragement for marine protection
- However, there’s a disconnect between sectors in Palau

Discussion
- Tonga raised funding issues
- Tuvalu raised the issue of monitoring offshore waters. VMS has been added, but there is no reporting or actual information, only rumours about foreign illegal fishing. There’s a total lack on information on fishing, uses, MPA boundaries and
their effectiveness; there’s concern about the level of fishing and the harvest of coconut leaves for FADs. They need a legal practitioner to help define inshore and offshore boundaries from a fishing license point of view. The community owns the lagoons.

- PNG mentioned that there is not a good connection between the provinces and national government. An Integrated Ocean Policy exists, and there are some activities under SEPA

- A question for the Solomon Islands: how have you engaged communities?
  Answer: There’s a National Plan of Action for community engagement

Session 16 – MSP Group Activity

*Marine Spatial Planning Offshore*

Task: This activity enables participants to use the knowledge gained and shared over the last few days. Each table was provided with a scenario and asked to draw a spatial plan in an offshore EEZ.
Examples from the groups

**Group 1:** Table participants: Palau: Fabio, Lolita, Darlynne, Joyce, Fiji: Saiasi Buluta, Brucilla, Aus: Nate Peterson

Mining: Nate
Community: Brucilla and Fabio
Conservation: Fiji representatives

- Began with a visual check of the scale to assess how much is 20 % per bioregions
- Discussion of requirements: 2 seamounts per area; 2 seamounts per bioregion.
- Questions: does it make sense to have representation of 2 bioregions in one tabu area? Decision: yes, as per Principle 8 of guidelines
- Why is there a maximum limit to no take zone? Why not work on the principle that bigger is better? Palau’s EEZ is 500,238 km², and Palau
declared 80% as a no-take zone; fishing licenses will be phased out by 2020. The domestic fishing zone is 104,025 km$^2$, which is 20% of the EEZ; this area (on the current map) is bigger. To accommodate the loss of revenue Palau created a fisheries trust fund (100$ per airline ticket goes to this fund)

- We should recognize and include migratory routes of marine wildlife.

Adding the human use map:

- FADs were not included in the data.
- Fishing vessel routes are going directly through the no-take zones. There will be conflicts in this area, including harvesting area and fishing vessels.
- Mining seems to be fine, as it is mainly outside the no-take zones
- Discussion on the distinction of travelling through a no-take zone; how to control whether vessels when travelling through
- Is there an option to change the areas?
- What is the solution to the conflict of fishing vessels and tuna harvest hotspots in the no-take area?
- Improved enforcement and policing will be needed; who is paying for this? Cannot rely on government funding
- FFA can be appointed as the controlling and patrolling agency, based on the time required to cross the area. If this is longer than the estimated time, it is likely that they are fishing.

**Group 2:** Latu (Fisheries), Yumi (Mining), Lilieta (Community), Ta’hirih (Conservation), Rosamond (Government), Coral (Sustainable Finance)

- The government representative tabled commitments of at least 30% no-take protection for discussion
- Conservation of both permanent and flexible no-take zones
- How should it be financed?
- Finance: cost-based analysis on MPA decision to ensure sustainability and effectiveness of MPA
- Fisheries: does the exercise include coastal areas? If the community enforces coastal regulations, who will enforce offshore waters?
- Conservation: use of systems from Navy, VMS, satellite data, sector monitoring. Funding is available for technical capacity
- Mining: tenements are in the yellow and green bioregions, and must be set against permanent MPAs
- Bioregions by colour: Blue – MPA 200km, Green MPA – 200km, Yellow – 200km
- Local community – objections to cutting off areas from fishing in the green bioregion and requests that government subsidise these fisheries.
- Suggestion of a 50km zone around the island group to protect community fisheries for sustainable livelihoods, where mining is prohibited. Decided on two designated areas
- There are conflicts between mining, fishing and MPA placement
- Fisheries decided to move the MPA for ease of monitoring and enforcement
- Local Government suggests avoiding canyons in the yellow zone tenements
- Finance: locate MPAs in close proximity to lower the cost of enforcement and monitoring

Adding the human use map:
- The team identified the different use areas, and there was some concern about the difference in area between the green fishing lines and the blocks designated for tuna harvest.
- Shipping traffic is identified traveling through potential areas from fishing
- Fisheries can monitor fishing vessels much more easily than fish stocks, but it is the stocks that should be conserved
- The group was able to negotiate a continuous no-go zone through all three bioregions and meet all the targets set in the activity.
- The key lesson learned was that MSP is a difficult task. Throughout negotiations, political and other stakeholder interests are bound to influence the final product, so from a conservation perspective an MSP process should start by aiming for the best possible biodiversity outcome, based on scientific evidence.

Session 19 - MSP Toolkit Recap

Opportunity for comments and revisions on the MSP Toolkit.

Instructions for feedback:
- The toolkit needs to be short and to the point – each step has references for more detail.
- Before gaps are identified, please look at the list of things the toolkit is not addressing in detail. Some of you in the room are experts in these points – we are looking for useful references for each one.
Launch of Fiji's Special, Unique Marine Areas Report 14 September 2018
### Appendix 1 – Participants

**Regional Peer to Peer Learning Workshop on Marine Spatial Planning in the Pacific**  
11-14 September 2018  
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<td>Tofia Niue</td>
<td>Niue</td>
<td><a href="mailto:coral.pasisi@icloud.com">coral.pasisi@icloud.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Fabio Siksei</td>
<td>Fisheries Coordinator</td>
<td>Palau Conservation Society</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1811 Koror, Palau 96940 Palau</td>
<td>(+680-488-3993)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City, Country</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Joyce K Beouch</td>
<td>Conservations Planner</td>
<td>Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment &amp; Tourism - Prot. Areas Network Office</td>
<td>P.O. Box 100, Koror, Palau 96940</td>
<td>Palau, Palau</td>
<td>(680) 488-3125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Lolita Gibbons-Decherong</td>
<td>Program Manager - Conservation &amp; Protected Areas</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1811, Koror, Palau 96940</td>
<td>Palau Conservation Society</td>
<td>Palau, Palau</td>
<td>(680) 488-3993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Darlyanne Takawo</td>
<td>GIS Officer</td>
<td>Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment &amp; Tourism - Protected Areas Network Office</td>
<td>P.O. Box 100, Koror, Palau 96940</td>
<td>Palau, Palau</td>
<td>(680) 488-3125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Beatrix Oni</td>
<td>Senior Officer - Conservation Officer</td>
<td>Bougainville Bureau for the Environment</td>
<td>P.O. Box 322, Buka, Arub</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>(675) 720885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Maria Satoa Peni</td>
<td>Principal Marine Conservation Officer</td>
<td>Ministry of Natural Resources &amp; the Environment</td>
<td>Private Bag, Apia, Samoa</td>
<td>Samoa, Samoa</td>
<td>(+685) 67200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Telesia Sila</td>
<td>Senior Mapping Officer</td>
<td>Ministry of Natural Resources &amp; the Environment</td>
<td>Private Bag, Apia, Samoa</td>
<td>Samoa, Samoa</td>
<td>(+685) 67200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Marolionel Polataivao</td>
<td>Marine Ecosystem Conservation Officer</td>
<td>Ministry of Natural Resources &amp; the Environment</td>
<td>Private Bag, Apia, Samoa</td>
<td>Samoa, Samoa</td>
<td>(+685) 67200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Maria Sapatu</td>
<td>Programme Associate Officer</td>
<td>Conservation International</td>
<td>P.O. Box 2035, Apia, Samoa</td>
<td>Apia, Samoa</td>
<td>(685) 21593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Agnetha Vave Karamui</td>
<td>Chief Conservation Officer, Protected Areas</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management &amp; Meteorology</td>
<td>P.O. Box 21, Vavaya Ridge Honiara, Solomon Islands</td>
<td>Solomon Islands, Solomon Islands</td>
<td>(677) 26036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Anja Gross-Kemp</td>
<td>Development Advisor</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management</td>
<td>P.O. Box 21, Vavaya Ridge Honiara, Solomon Islands</td>
<td>Solomon Islands, Solomon Islands</td>
<td>(677) 23031 / 23032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Mathew Walekoro</td>
<td>Principle Planning Officer</td>
<td>Ministry of Development, Planning &amp; Aid Coordination</td>
<td>Mendana Ave Honiara,</td>
<td>Solomon Islands, Solomon Islands</td>
<td>(+677) 758541 / 8 or (+677) 382555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Rachel Bare-Anita</td>
<td>Communications Officer &amp; Principal Marine Officer / Manager</td>
<td>SimSA/Ministry of Infrastructure and Development</td>
<td>Solomon Islands Maritime Safety Administration PC Box G32, Solomon Islands</td>
<td>Solomon Islands, Solomon Islands</td>
<td>(+677) 21353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Phone Numbers</td>
<td>Email Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Veira Pulekera</td>
<td>Project Liaison Officer, Solomon Islands</td>
<td>MACBIO Project</td>
<td>P.O. Box 21, Vavaya Ridge Honiara, Solomon Islands</td>
<td>(677) 23031 / 23032</td>
<td><a href="mailto:v.t.pulekera@gmail.com">v.t.pulekera@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Trevor Ramoni</td>
<td>Assistant Secretary</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs &amp; External Trade</td>
<td>Melanesia Pacific Haus, Mendana Avenue, P.O. Box G10, Honiara, Solomon Islands</td>
<td>(+677) 21250 / 21251 / 21252 / 21253</td>
<td><a href="mailto:trevor.ramonii@mfaet.gov.sb">trevor.ramonii@mfaet.gov.sb</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Ivory Akao</td>
<td>Assistant Director Fisheries</td>
<td>Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources</td>
<td>Kukum Highway, P.O. Box G2 Honiara, Solomon Islands</td>
<td>(+677) 39143</td>
<td><a href="mailto:IAkao@fisheries.gov.sb">IAkao@fisheries.gov.sb</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Tahirih Hokafonu</td>
<td>Principal Ass., Secretary (Principal Biodiversity Officer &amp; Head of Biodiversity Division Chief Executive Officer)</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment &amp; Climate Change</td>
<td>Department of Environment Building</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:tfifitahokafonu@gmail.com">tfifitahokafonu@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Rosamond Bing</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources Government of Tonga</td>
<td>PO Box 5, Nuku'alofa, Tonga</td>
<td>(+676) 23 611</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rosamond.bing@gmail.com">rosamond.bing@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Karen Stone</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources Government of Tonga</td>
<td>P O Box 160, Neiafu, Vava'u</td>
<td>(676) 8446897</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@vavauenvironment.org">info@vavauenvironment.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Yumi Casualina Nafe</td>
<td>Assistant Geologist</td>
<td>Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources Government of Tonga</td>
<td>PO Box 5, Nuku'alofa, Tonga</td>
<td>(+676) 23 611</td>
<td><a href="mailto:yurnicasunafe@gmail.com">yurnicasunafe@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Lilieta Takau</td>
<td>Senior Project Manager</td>
<td>Department of Environment Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:lilieta1@gmail.com">lilieta1@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Latu Aisea</td>
<td>Coastal Community Development and Advisory Section</td>
<td>Ministry of Fisheries</td>
<td>Sopu, Nuku'alofa, Tonga</td>
<td>(+676) 21300</td>
<td><a href="mailto:latu@tongafish.gov.t">latu@tongafish.gov.t</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Auiluma Lotoala</td>
<td>Traditional Knowledge &amp; Cultural Biodiversity Officer</td>
<td>Tuvalu Association of Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
<td>PO Box 136, Funafuti Tuvalu</td>
<td>(688) 20759</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lloto12@gmail.com">lloto12@gmail.com</a> or <a href="mailto:tuvalucso@gmail.com">tuvalucso@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Teoleke Peleki Lauti</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funafuti Kaupule</td>
<td></td>
<td>(+688) 20422 / 20424</td>
<td><a href="mailto:televilauti@gmail.com">televilauti@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title/Position</td>
<td>Department/Project</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Contact Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Vaiguna Penieta</td>
<td>Local Leader and Focal Point for Funafuti Conservation Area</td>
<td>Funafuti Town Council</td>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
<td>(+688 20422/20424) <a href="mailto:vpsetema@gmail.com">vpsetema@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Donna Kalfatek</td>
<td>Senior Biodiversity Officer</td>
<td>Department of Environment Protection &amp; Conservation</td>
<td>PMB: 9063, Port Vila, Vanuatu</td>
<td>Vanuatu: office phone: (678) 25302: (678) 777864 48 <a href="mailto:dkmoli@gmail.com">dkmoli@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Toney Tevi</td>
<td>Director Maritime Division</td>
<td>Department of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>PMB 9051, Port Vila</td>
<td>Vanuatu: office phone: (678) 22247: (678) 554294 8 <a href="mailto:ttevi@vanuatu.gov.vu">ttevi@vanuatu.gov.vu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Vatumaraga Molisa</td>
<td>Vanuatu MACBIO Project Liaison Officer</td>
<td>Department of Environment Protection &amp; Conservation</td>
<td>PMB: 9063, Port Vila, Vanuatu</td>
<td>Vanuatu: office phone: (678) 25302: (678) 777864 48 <a href="mailto:vatumaraga@gmail.com">vatumaraga@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Tony Kanas</td>
<td>Acting Surveyor General</td>
<td>Department of Lands</td>
<td>PMB 9024, Port Vila</td>
<td>Vanuatu: office phone: (678) 22427 <a href="mailto:tkanas@vanuatu.gov.vu">tkanas@vanuatu.gov.vu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Henderson Tagaro</td>
<td>Senior Finance Officer</td>
<td>Department of Finance</td>
<td>PMB 9031, Port Vila, Vanuatu</td>
<td>Vanuatu: office phone: (678) 24543 <a href="mailto:htagaro@vanuatu.gov.vu">htagaro@vanuatu.gov.vu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Trevor Mele Trief</td>
<td>Senior Finance Officer</td>
<td>Department of Finance</td>
<td>PMB 9031, Port Vila, Vanuatu</td>
<td>Vanuatu: office phone: (678) 24544 <a href="mailto:tmtrief@vanuatu.gov.vu">tmtrief@vanuatu.gov.vu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Rolenas Tavue Baereleo</td>
<td>Senior Conservation Officer</td>
<td>Department of Environment Protection &amp; Conservation</td>
<td>PMB: 9063, Port Vila, Vanuatu</td>
<td>Vanuatu: office phone: (678) 25302 <a href="mailto:rbaereleo@vanuatu.gov.vu">rbaereleo@vanuatu.gov.vu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Jayven Ham</td>
<td>Senior Marine Biologist</td>
<td>Department of Environment Protection &amp; Conservation</td>
<td>PMB: 9063, Port Vila, Vanuatu</td>
<td>Vanuatu: (678) 25302 <a href="mailto:jayven04@gmail.com">jayven04@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>George Amos</td>
<td>Fisheries FAD &amp; Livelihood Development Officer</td>
<td>Department of Env. Prot. And Cons.</td>
<td>PMB: 9063, Port Vila, Vanuatu</td>
<td>Vanuatu: (678) 25302 <a href="mailto:gamos@vanuatu.gov.vu">gamos@vanuatu.gov.vu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Nate Peterson</td>
<td>GIS and Conservation Information Manager, Pacific Division Maritime Boundaries</td>
<td>The Nature Conservancy</td>
<td>Suite 2.01, 60 Leicester Street, Carlton, Victoria 3053</td>
<td>Australia: (+61 73214 6919) <a href="mailto:npeterson@tnc.org">npeterson@tnc.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Malakai Vakatauwal e</td>
<td>Maritime Boundaries Advisor</td>
<td>Secretariat of the Pacific Community</td>
<td>Private Mail Bag Suva, Fiji</td>
<td>Fiji: (+679 337 0733) <a href="mailto:malakaiv@spc.int">malakaiv@spc.int</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Kathryn Mengerink</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Wait Institute</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1948 La Jolla, CA 92038-1948</td>
<td>USA: (+1 619 635-4945) <a href="mailto:mengerink@waitinstitute.org">mengerink@waitinstitute.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City, State ZIP</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Jacob James</td>
<td>Managing Director</td>
<td>Waitt Foundation</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1948</td>
<td>La Jolla, CA 92038-1948</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Jennie Dean</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Waitt Foundation/UCLA</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1948</td>
<td>La Jolla, CA 92038-1948</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2 – Agenda

#### Monday, 10th September, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:00 – 5:00pm</td>
<td>Registration and per diem/travel allowance collection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DAY ONE  
Tuesday 11th September, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 – 8:30</td>
<td>Arrival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 – 9:30</td>
<td><strong>Official Opening</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Blessing for successful workshop by Mr Hans Wendt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Address by Mr Mason Smith, Regional Director, IUCN Oceania Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Address by Ms Sainimili Bulai, Ministry of Waterways and Environment,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Address by Dr Jan Steffen, MACBIO Project Director, GiZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 – 10:00</td>
<td><strong>Session 1: Workshop Objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Welcome &amp; Housekeeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Workshop objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 10:30</td>
<td>MORNING TEA (Group Photo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 – 11:30</td>
<td><strong>Session 2 - Group Activity – Marine Spatial Planning - inshore</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task: Each table will be provided with a ‘scenario’ to complete a marine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spatial planning exercise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 – 12:00</td>
<td><strong>Session 3 – Marine Spatial Planning Overview</strong>, Dr Leanne Fernandes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MACBIO Senior Project Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Why MSP and what is MSP?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Short MSP Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• MSP Tool kit overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 – 12:30</td>
<td><strong>Session 4 - Marine ecosystem service values</strong>, Dr Jan Steffen,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MACBIO Project Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What are marine ecosystem services and why do they matter in planning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 – 1:00</td>
<td>**Session 5 - Integrated Ocean Governance (IOG) and Marine Spatial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning (MSP)**, – Mr Toney Tevi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Introduction to the concept of IOG and how MSP is just one component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of it. Profile - Vanuatu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 2:00</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 – 2:45</td>
<td><strong>Session 6 - Ocean threats, conflicts and challenges – What is the role of MSP?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Country panel discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 – 3:45</td>
<td><strong>Session 7 - MSP / MPA Objectives, Ms Mere Lakeba</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What are Fiji Governments’ MPA Objectives, and how were they developed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45 - 4:15</td>
<td><strong>AFTERNOON TEA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15 – 4:45</td>
<td><strong>Session 8 - Data needs, Mr Hands Wendt, Senior GIS Officer, MACBIO Project Officer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What data is needed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What data is available?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45 – 5:00</td>
<td><strong>Wrap up and Close</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6pm – 8pm</td>
<td><strong>Cocktail Event</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dances and celebration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• food and beverages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DAY TWO**  
Wednesday 12th September, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 9:30</td>
<td><strong>Welcome Plenary:</strong> Recap of Day One and overview of sessions for Day Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 – 10:30</td>
<td><strong>Session 9: Identifying Special, unique marine areas, Ms Agnetha VaveKaramui</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Special, unique marine areas – what are they and how did the Solomon Islands identify them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 – 11:00</td>
<td><strong>MORNING TEA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 12:00</td>
<td><strong>Session 10: Define ‘Ocean Zones’, Ms Tahiri Hokafonu</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What are Tonga’s ocean zones / ocean management areas and how did they develop them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 – 1:00</td>
<td><strong>Session 11: Bioregions &amp; Ecologically representative marine protected areas, Mr Hans Wendt, Senior GIS Officer, MACBIO Project</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What are Bioregions and how are they used in spatial planning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 2:00</td>
<td><strong>LUNCH</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DAY TWO cont...
**Wednesday 12th September, 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:00 – 2:45</td>
<td><strong>Session 12 – Placement Guidelines (biophysical and socio-economic management guidelines),</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 – 3:30</td>
<td>Mr Vatu Molisa, MACBIO Project Liaison Officer, Vanuatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 – 4:00</td>
<td><em>What are Placement Guidelines and how are they used in spatial planning?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 – 4:00</td>
<td><strong>Session 13 - MSP / MPA consultations/community involvement,</strong> Ms Jacqui Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 – 4:45</td>
<td><em>National Consultations for our Oceans – Cook Islands</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45pm – 5:00</td>
<td><strong>Session 14: Maritime compliance,</strong> Ms Rosamond Bing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Tonga: How is Tonga tackling the issue of marine compliance?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Wrap up and Close</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DAY THREE – Field Trip
**Thursday 13th September, 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:30am</td>
<td><strong>Bus pick for field Trip.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>7:30am - Tanoa International Hotel – Vuda Marina</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>7:45am - Tokatoka Hotel – Vuda Marina</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL DAY EVENT</td>
<td><strong>FIELD TRIP:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30am – 6:30pm</td>
<td><em>Boat transfer to Yanuya Island</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Return from Yanuya</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Bus departs Vuda Marina at 6:00pm for Hotels</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15 - 8:30</td>
<td>DAY 2: Change of Venue – all participants must catch the bus to Tanoa Skylodge Hotel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 800am - Bus departs Tokatoka Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 815am - Bus departs Tanoa International Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 9:30</td>
<td>Welcome Plenary:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recap of Day Two/Field trip and overview of sessions for Day Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 – 10:30</td>
<td>Session 15: Institutional arrangements to develop MSP and implement MSP,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 7 – MSP</td>
<td>Ms Agnetha Vave-Karamui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toolkit</td>
<td>• Profile: What has Solomon Islands done re: role of government, consultants,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>government commitment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implementation governance arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Country panel Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 – 11:00</td>
<td>MORNING TEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 12:30</td>
<td>Session 16: Group Activity – Marine Spatial Planning - offshore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 8 &amp; 10</td>
<td>Task: Using the knowledge that participants have learnt and shared over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step – MSP</td>
<td>the last few days. Each table will be provided with a scenario and asked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toolkit</td>
<td>to draw a spatial plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 – 1:30</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 – 3:00</td>
<td>Session 17: Next steps MSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Breakout groups: Gather in country groups - What is in place, what’s not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in place, next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 – 3:30</td>
<td>AFTERNOON TEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 – 4:00</td>
<td>Session 18: Remaining issues from the “parking lot” and from suggestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 – 4:15</td>
<td>Session 19: MSP Toolkit Recap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15 – 5:00</td>
<td>Session 20: Talanoa – Workshop Wrap up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6pm – 8pm</td>
<td>Closing Cocktail Event</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3 – MSP Group Activity Day 1

Rapporteur notes

**Rapporteur Name:** Anja

**Date:** 11/09/18

**Session 2:**

**Session Name:** Group Activity - inshore - MSP

**Table participants:** Palau: Fabio, Lolita, Darlynne, Tokabwebwe, Martin, Alfred, Joyce, Fiji: Joji,

**Notes**

Rotuma Island

Lolita = facilitator.


Martin: on the map are the different uses, we should discuss how this all connects. We should think about what each of the persons wants, focuses on.

Focus areas: Turtle nesting. Hotel. Dive sites, Gleening areas (important for women), grouper spotting.

Natural resources can’t be changed. So first off, mark this on the map.

Yellow_turtle nesting sites

Grouper spotting areas (G) green demarcated

Gleening areas where communities can find shellfish and sea cucumbers – pink color (GL)

A lot of things are not clear -> Demarcated the village-. (house) gleening area close to the village

Mangrove cleaning areas for crabs demarcated as well.

Dive sites for tourists (DS): outside the reefs – blues – depending on the weather (time of year)

Issue with dive sites: Dive sites are in the main passage to the island

How are tourists coming in? where are the shipping routes/airport? – no information available.

Hotel areas: pink stripes. (H)

Where would be good important fishing grounds? Past the reef: green FG

Cultural sites, sacrerd sites. Pink CS, special feast sites: spear fishing near the mangroves

Activities in the 6 different zones (see extra paper)

Discussion: on roles, how did we reach consensus. (No- one asked me.)

As a chief: everyone coming to the village area need a consent from the village head (no payment necessary), which is the traditional way in Fiji. We do respect the village and the island. There are different ways. – without consulting communities, nothing can happen

Alfred: Multiple layers in Micronesia. Very similar to Fiji, you need consent from the village.

“We should have get more into a role play of each with different request to the spatial area”

“We set up an environment and we should now talk about the roles.”

Getting into the role play: main conflict between tourism and the village gleening site and the turtle nesting site.
Martin: from tourism: I want more tourists to come: I want a wharf a port somewhere, everyone comes in by flight. Has the village a problem with this? In this specific area.
Fisherman: We want more fishing grounds. The tourists are far away from us. – no further discussion evolved here due to time constraints.
Is there a beach close to the hotel—maybe this nice sandy beach (demarcated as nesting site of turtles).
Chief: we can allow, because there is a seasonal spawning. So we can have seasonal allowance.
Fisheries officer: this is a critical turtle nesting areas: we cannot put a tourist site in the nesting areas. Not recommend a wharf everyone here. Because it is a critical nesting area, turtles will be disturbed. You have to invest more to put it in another area.
Suggestion from NGO: other site of the island is better suited, it is not getting too shallow. There are other limitations that need to be considered as well.
Naming the Island: Rotuma island.
Roles: Chief Rotu, NGO, #Womenarefisherstoo, Tourism: investment group, Pray for rotuma, Rotuma pearl fish coop.
  - More fish in former times
  - Change in fishing styles from spear and nets to the use of FADs
  - Fishing: Longer times and less fish

Keep balance between traditional areas and development and conservation area. Also as basis for sustainability.
Planning process is long and tedious. (in order to include all the stakeholders).

Rapporteur Name Andra Whiteside
Date: 11/09/18
Session #: 3
Session Name: Group Activity – MSP - inshore

Notes:

1. Church Leader - Sophy
2. Conservation - Kalesi
3. Village Chief - Puna
4. Women’s rep - Rateiti
5. Local govt - Nate
6. Tourism - Coral
7. Fisherman - Alistair
8. Fisheries Officer - Jackie

5 uses and values
  1. Hotel
  2. Gleaning area (women’s rep) - highlighted in pink on the map
  3. Turtle Nesting Site
  4. Fishing Ground - highlighted in green on the map
  5. Cultural Heritage Site

Marked on the map the important gleaning areas (located by the women’s rep)
• Close to the “villages”
• Where it was evident on the map where the reef seems emerged during low tide

Hotel (situated last)
• Areas of shelter to be where the hotel is that can act as barrier during the storms
• Hotel should be away from protected sites
• Where the “airport” situated
• Eco resort so slightly away from the town and airport area
• Other lodges closer to the turtle nesting site on the east of the island

Fishing grounds
• Protection could be around mangrove areas
• Areas close to the shore (where fishing boats can get out to)
• Entire island designated as a fishing area first as well as the gleaning area before putting up areas of protection
• Fishing areas spread out evenly throughout the island for easy access for all community members

Heritage Sites
• In the interior parts of the island
• 3 sites

Turtle Nesting site
• 2 spots
• Isolated island NW of Turtle Island (most likely to nest here)
Reef gleaning and fishing would happen all around the island and then have designated zone(s) for protection of these areas; resulting in spillover effects
Most likely fishing spots would be around the turtle nesting sites

Areas of protection or No-take
• Within the turtle nesting zones (kept free of any human uses)
• Areas can be circular for easier monitoring and compliance?

How was consensus reached?

• Fair and even distribution.
• Challenge: national stakeholders having these discussions do not own the land. Should be consulting the owners of the land first before starting any MSP process. The chief is paramount to any Fijian community, so he needs to be consulted first
• Need: Put a chief on every committee related to these negotiations on a national level. This is done in the Cook Islands
• Fisheries Officer: Consult the fishermen first before providing advice to where zoning should take place
• More data required before making any decisions (land ownership, bathymetry, turtle numbers, etc.)
• Village council establishment necessary
- Conservation rep: collect data first (turtle nesting for example) and then make these decisions
- Tourism operator: identified first the areas of potential protection before deciding where to place her hotel.
- Areas of diving, etc: conflict issues to identify where tourism operations should go and to respect cultural sensitivity
- Square grids to more properly identify the proximity of habitats would be useful (especially when putting in place buffer zones)

Rapporteur observation: Fair contribution from everyone at the table however, village chief and community member did not seem as vocal. In terms of the exercise, perhaps making participants aware of and familiar with their roles well beforehand may create a more realistic conversation that would cater to their own interests on the island. Everyone at the table seemed to be mostly collaborative because I feel they all come with a conservation perspective despite the differentiated roles they were required to play.

Rapporteur Name: John Kaituu
Date: 11/09/18
Session #: 2/3
Session Name: Group Activity – MSP – inshore

Group 1
Name Country
John Kaitu’u Fiji
Trevor Ramoni Solomon Islands
Beatrix Oni Papua New Guinea
Pita Naidike Fiji
Auiluma Lotoala Tuvalu
Teleke Peleti .Lauti Tuvalu
Vaguna Penileta Tuvalu
Rusila Savou Wara Fiji

Notes
Started with economics relevance:
- Port
  - The Team also took into account depth and coral reef type
  - took into account centrability vs access.

- Hotel:
  - Taking into account location
  - Attractions such as surfing, dive and cultural sites.

Natural Resource & Usage:
- Mangrove
- Sheltered bay
- Easy access
- Also identified as a possible spawning site for reef species and the possibilities seasonal closure.

- Dive site (outer island)
- Possibility higher biodiversity
- Better or healthier reefs.
- Restrictions include no littering, no fishing, no coral harvesting.

- Fishing ground
- Determined through reef type, proximity to village.

Turtle nesting site
- So tracking or access during spawning periods
- No pets allowed on site

Tabu area
- The area includes:
- Turtle nesting grounds which would include a seasonal ban
- Mangrove site-seasonal ban during spawning season of species eg. Coral Grouper and Trout's.

Side Notes;
- Groups took into account the different roles sited at the table.
- Proper consultation with the village chief and various stakeholder
- The village chief representative took the lead role in allocation of sites whilst drawing on surrounding stakeholders.
- The only hesitation that was noted was during the differentiating of a harvesting and non harvesting area of mangroves. The rest were done smoothly.

Rapporteur Name: Mavileko Ramoica Macbio GIZ
Date: 11/9/18
Session #: 2
Session Name: Marine Spatial planning - Inshore

Notes

Participants- Tonga (1), Nauru (2), Fiji,(1) Solomon (4) total of 8
- Comment- MSP is a new thing for Nauru, the first concept and the first question to technical staffs, what is their current understanding and how will they take it (what it is) the second how do we convince the government at the end of the day government will provide financial support for implementation (so awareness is very important) (Nauru)
- Comment- the Diagram on Fiji with busy context, reflection of many different things that need to be considered, known and unknown , challenge to think about national planning to community, national level and even to the individual to better understand the marine system and the stakeholders. Amplify from
regional to sub regional (with the marine system there is a whole new suite and system and taking it to community. (Fiji)

Rapporteur Name: MS Susana
Date: 11/09/18
Session #: 2/3
Session Name: Group Activity – MSP – inshore
Group name: TEFITI- Blessed with its BioDiversity

- Uses- community tabu, important fishing ground for livelihoods, gleaning area, cultural sacred sites, important dive site

- Gleaning for women- mostly on the reefs, intertidal zones, we also need to protect some marine protected site, this is very inshore have a balance to the community for gleaning

- Sacred place- it’s a taboo area, cultural significance, two main areas

- Fishing grounds- we have to consider both inshore or offshore so snappers, pelagic fishing too and trolling

- Tourism sector sites- sandy beaches, islands on snorkeling, near to sacred sites

- Taboo areas- shallow and deeper near for monitoring, extend the area so we could keep the connection from coastal coastline to the ocean, maintain balance. (main thing is to have connectivity), sea birds

- Step 4- gleaning- collection of invertebrates, no using destructive methods like using rakes for collecting sea cucumber, or metals that can destroy, no coral extraction, no scuba and night diving

- Fishing grounds- set up FADS, can do small scale trolling, no recreation activities like sports fishing, no scuba diving, no dynamite, limit the mass size of mass size 2 ½ for every 100 meters, limit the time of using nets, use free dive fishing, ban numbers of the fish fence

- Cultural sites- ask permission from the chief to inform the sues on the important sites, no removals artefacts, not allowed to visit the area without the chiefs permission. Extension for sacred values for connection from the ridge to reef. advisor from the pastor and good partnership, we need to make is balance, custom site we need he church leader to strengthen the area and for more blessing.
- Important dive sites tourism- no anchoring, waste management, monitoring, tourist to pay for the diving sites with conditions, more use of eco-friendly, need more data and a consistent.

- Community taboo- no take zone, permanent zones.

- Report Back- Process- vigilant to include of the chief and church leader (strong committees, there is no overlap)

- Chief- consulted and need to be aware on community needs, NGOs, stakeholders, government or the organization, process to be hosted at the community level transferred interest from bottom to high over His island (Mana island- simply means blessing), aware of the development area, conflict with tourism but request datas to justify objectives.

- Conflict or roles on values, but it needs to be specifically clarified

- If the vanua, church and government work and collaboration, so there is a balance of seagrasses, seabirds

- Rich cultural and values if the area is managed there will be Tefiti- blessed with its biodiversity.

- Good consultation and balance on scientific and traditional and having objectives vision and mission.

Rapporteur Name: Mavileko Ramoica Macbio GIZ
Date: 11/9/18
Session #: 3
Session Name: Marine Spatial planning - overview

Notes

Participants- Nauru 2
- Has each of your countries have defined end objectives for Msp? Nauru Yes they have objectives in line with MsP

- How did they do this- Community consultation and a workshop

- If not how do you think they should do this?
- the coastal fisheries and aquaculture BILL NEED TO BE APPROVED BY CABINET on implementation of the MSP.

Rapporteur Name: Stacy Jupiter
Date: 11/9/18
Session #: 2
Vanuatu table:
Assigned roles. Selected use areas. Some difficulty assigning management rules associated with use areas.
Discussing role of local government officer to assist communities/chiefs in designing plans for their areas. E.g. identify areas important for food security and ensure that they are managed.
Selected tabu area on larger island system across from smaller area identified as important turtle nesting site (not sure this was because acknowledgement of connectivity or just keeping people away or what??)
A: Cultural area.
   a. Tabu area.
B: Turtle nesting area. Can snorkel, can swim. No disturbing turtles or nest. No fishing.
C: Port.
D. Gleaning area. Can collect with certain gears. Can’t use crowbars/metal bars (e.g., for breaking coral rock to get octopus).
E. Hotel
In Vanuatu, cultural sites first things to get raised. Very important for communities. (Think rules not explained for cultural site because these are implicitly known and vary by community/site).
How would we reach consensus if the best suitable place for anchorage was also a spawning ground for grouper?
Need to integrate traditional knowledge with other factors in making decisions.
Chief speaks to public administrator get information on what sites best for what uses.
- Womens representative requests alternative livelihoods in return for limiting gleaning activities
- Rules for aggregation sites exist, but are not always followed
- Sea turtles are generally protected, but consumed at special occasions, creating conflict with tourism operators
- Tourism authority wants to extend tourism, but accepts challenges in regard to power supply (future locations of solar panel area, and wind mills) and sewage treatment

- Group activity - TEAM MALIE (Inshore marine spatial planning)
- This Malie Island community has identified the need to properly manage our Marine Resources.
- Objective:
  - Ensure livelihoods, culture and tradition of our people is maintained through sustainable use and management of our marine resource.
- Malie technical working group
- Margie as village chief and women rep
- Maria - Conservation and local Govt rep
- Baracuda – Fishermen and fisheries officer
- Telesia – Church leader
- Lionel - Tourism officer
- Activities (can/can’t occur)
  - 4 Mangroves, 
  - 2/4 is protected
• No harvesting of mangroves
• No mudcrab fishing
• 1 Port area
• Buffer area for shipping
• No discharge in our marine environment

• 8 fishing areas
• Gear restrictions
• Quota and sessional ban
• 1 Hotel
• Reaching consensus: Few rounds of thorough consultations and stakeholders engagement
• Challenges: Ports and establishment of Hotel

• Observations:
• Consultation process is important
• Balance between human uses and biodiversity features
• Making sure culture and traditions are captured at all levels
• Data needs – particularly fine scale oceanography data
Appendix 4 – Back-to-office report from Yanuya scouting trip

IUCN Back-to-Office Report

1. In accordance with the STO below, dated 30th August, 2018 I visited Yanuya Village, Yanuya Island – 31st August, 2018

2. The main purpose of this trip was to:
   - Traditionally announce MSP Workshop field trip to the village community
   - Discuss logistics and the importance of the Yanuya marine management plan, governance structure and prepare the village to present it with their lessons learnt to participants
   - Collect information/data – Yanuya Island

3. Summary of Results:
   - Final tentative programme for the field trip
   - Draft pamphlet

   The key outcomes of the trip and next steps are summarized below:

4. Meeting

   **Objective 1:** Traditionally announce MSP Workshop field trip to the village community
   - Date for trip confirmed - Thursday 13th September 2018
   - Confirmed number of visiting party – 70
   - Confirmed that the Participants will not only be from Fiji but from the Pacific
   - Confirmed that $30 per participant will be paid to the village for the Meals of the day
   - Confirmed boat fare - $5 one way per person
   - Scoping team briefly discussed MSP and its relevance to the village

   **Objective 2:** Discuss logistics and the importance of the Yanuya marine management plan, governance structure and prepare the village to present it with their lessons learnt to participants

   **Tentative Program**
   - 8am to 10am – Travel from Denarua to Yanuya (Charted vessel) and from the Vessel to the island (Fibre Boats)
     - 7-10 passengers in a Fibre Boat depending on the size and the weather
     - Weather of the day will be the main deciding factor of where the Chartered Vessel will drop the visiting team off
   - 10am to 11am – Settling in and Sevusevu
   - 11am 12pm – Discussion and morning team
     - Participants to have morning tea whilst in the discussion
     - 1 Representative from the village for the discussion
     - NNYMST & MES to also present on the work they have done in Yanuya and link of local governance
   - 12pm to 1pm – MPA visit
     - 3 sites to visit
- 2 Rescue Boats and a tour guide for each site
  - 1pm to 2pm – Lunch
  - 2pm to 3pm – Village tour and Tatau
    - Village school
    - Village nursery
    - Women’s Handicraft
    - Tour Guides from the village
    - Tonoriki Island
  - 3.30pm to 5pm – Travel from the island to the Vessel (Fibre Boats) and to Denarua (Charted vessel)

**Objective 3:** General discussion - Collect information/data – Yanuya Island

- About the village - Yanuya Village, Tikina Malolo, Yavusa Yanuya, Turaga na Tui Lawa
- MPA has existed for One Year and 4 months
- Issue of depleting supply from the village Qoliqoli was brought up and discussed at the Bose Vakoro.
- MES/FLMMA/Provincial Office assisted the village in setting up their MPA
- MPA lies within the area which is visible to the village as it is easy for them to manage and protect from Poachers
- The village have a Community-based Tabu/Tara MPA set up for 5 years
- Issue of empowering Fish Wardens was brought up by the village elders in one of the Government Minister’s visit but was not considered as the MPA was not Gazetted. Villagers have seen this as a limitation for their “Vakatatabu vakavanua”.
- Positive indicators of their MPAs - Villagers have seen some fish species which were missing from their Qoliqoli for a while. *(Need to get confirmation on the types of species)*
- MES has the map of the MPA and also the Management Plan.
- The Village has a Committee for the MPA *(Need to get more information on the roles and responsibilities of the committee)*
- Yanuya is known as the “Dromudromu ni Matanisiga”
- Movies such as *Cast Away* and *Survivors* were shot on the nearby islands
- Village has Solar as their energy source which was donated by a Tourist who came to the island for the Village Tour program *(Need to get more proper info)*
- Water source is from Rain water which are stored in Water Tanks in the village and a Borehole which is located further away from the village.
- Major issues are the Water Source and the poor fertility of their farming land
- Way Forward:
  - Coral planting and Giant Clam Projects for their MPAs to help further enhance the initiative of enriching their Qoliqoli
  - Snorkeling at the MPA to be an additional activity for their Village Visit Program for the Tourists

**Next Steps:**
- 50% deposit for meals & fibre boat fare
• There is a request for tour guides to be paid

Observation
• The villagers were referring to MES whilst answering most of the questions.
• MES have most of the information and I suggest that the Scoping Team work more closely with them.
• My concern is the transfer from the big boat to the island – the sea can be really choppy given that we will be riding against the wave. But need to know where MV plans to anchor
• MPA have just been one year four months old - hopefully a lot to share but I think they will learn a lot more success stories from the participants.