

OSPAR Workshop

How to assess management effectiveness of Marine Protected Areas?

Summary

OSPAR 2013 endorsed terms of references for a workshop to develop suitable procedures to assess, by 2016, whether the OSPAR MPA network is well managed, to enable assessment against the target set by Ministers in 2010.

The workshop, hosted by Sweden, was open to all Contracting Parties and Observers. Participants had specialist knowledge and experience in the field of MPA management and assessment of MPA management. The objective was to develop the elements for suitable methods that will be needed to assess whether the network is well managed and then determine whether these elements (a) exist (b) were achievable and (c) within the timeframe for assessing the target.

As well as exploring procedures to assess whether the OSPAR MPA network is well managed the workshop explored how the new OSPAR MPA database could be used to help deliver such an assessment.

The workshop found the concept challenging. It was difficult for the workshop participants to find consensus concerning the concept of management effectiveness and how to assess it.

The workshop identified the elements that would be needed for assessing management effectiveness, however the workshop participants could not see a complete correlation between the elements proposed and the information currently available in the database. One of the follow up tasks therefore was to evaluate the potential usefulness of the OSPAR MPA database for the assessment of management effectiveness.

Two different approaches were presented that differed significantly, both in level of ambition and degree of detail and the data input requirement. In addition, the workshop learned that individual Contracting Parties are developing their own methods for assessing management effectiveness.

The two approaches that were presented were as follows: Germany presented a methodology based on the assessment of conservation objectives which included a scoring, through expert judgement, of the degree to which MPA conservation objectives have been achieved.

Sweden presented an adaptive management based approach which seeks to understand if the measures taken in the MPA lead to a reduction of threats inside the MPA.

The workshop agreed the approaches were complementary and could both be used to serve different needs. However, with the limited time allowed for this assessment the workshop proposed that the methodology presented by Germany would be selected as it seemed to be a less time consuming method. An ambition was set that this method would be implemented to deliver information on all OSPAR MPAs nominated by 2012 by mid-2016.

The workshop also identified gaps and additional questions. For example, the workshop identified that there was a need to identify objectives for MPA management effectiveness on a network scale in order to address the question - "Is obtaining ecological coherence a result of an effectively managed network of MPAs?" It was decided that the task group should draft OSPAR network level objectives, based on existing OSPAR products.

Another example was how to handle management effectiveness and ecological coherence. Some of the workshop participants wanted to separate the question of management effectiveness and ecological coherence, others saw a clear connection between the two assessments.

A roadmap, with agreed actions and task leads was agreed by the workshop to set out the steps that would be necessary to deliver an assessment by 2016. The progress made would be presented to ICG-MPA 2014.

Report from Workshop on the procedure to assess, by 2016, whether the OSPAR Network of MPAs is well-managed.

Gothenburg, Sweden: 8-10 April 2014

1. Introduction

OSPAR 2013 endorsed the terms of reference to hold a workshop to develop suitable procedures to assess, by 2016, whether the OSPAR MPA network is well managed, to enable assessment against the target set by Ministers in 2010.

The objective of the workshop according to the terms of reference (ANNEX 6, Ref. §4.28):

- To develop the elements for suitable methods that will be needed to assess whether the network is well managed. Then determine whether these elements (a) exist (b) are achievable and (c) are within the timeframe for assessing the target.

This workshop should be seen as a starting point for discussions on management effectiveness rather than selecting a method on how to assess management effectiveness.

The workshop agenda was adopted by OSPAR ICG-MPA and BDC and the workshop was planned by a Task group consisting of Sweden, Germany, France, Belgium and the OSPAR secretariat. 16 participants assisted and the following CPs were represented; Belgium, Germany, France, Netherlands, Sweden, United Kingdom. Other representatives were from Oceana, WWF and MedPAN. See participants list¹ for details.

2. Session 1: Identifying the elements for assessing management effectiveness

The first part of the workshop was used for setting the scene for further discussion on management effectiveness. It included the background from an OSPAR point of view on the task of the workshop as well as some thoughts on what elements could be useful for making a management effectiveness assessment. The new OSPAR MPA database was presented with the mindset on how it could support a management effectiveness assessment.

Presentation 1: Establishing the OSPAR context², presentation by Emily Corcoran, OSPAR Secretariat

The terms of reference for this workshop and the agreements in OSPAR supporting this work were presented. Also earlier work and other relevant international agreements were taken note of as well as the scope of the assessment for the 2016 target.

Presentation 2: Suggested elements³, presentation by Lena Tingström, Sweden

The presentation was intended as a starting point for further discussion and a number of elements were suggested as suitable for assessing management effectiveness both on individual MPAs and on the network of MPAs. All relevant information is available in the presentation.

¹ Annex 1 – List of participants, OSPAR workshop on management effectiveness

² 2_WKMAN context

³ 2_ OSPAR elements

Presentation 3: The OSPAR MPA database⁴, presentation by Benjamin Ponge, France

The presentation was intended as a starting point for discussions on whether the data/information to support the suggested elements exist?

2.1 Discussion of the elements:

A number of elements needed to assess management effectiveness were discussed and an exercise of scoring the elements was done with the possibility to mark what element is important (pro) and what element is not so important, or not even needed (con). The participants were given the opportunity to add elements and to rate the importance of the different elements. The elements written in italics are elements proposed by the workshop participants. The exercise during this session made it possible for the participants to rate the importance of each element by tagging them as important or not important for management effectiveness assessment. The figures in the brackets give an indication of which elements the participants highlighted. The exercise was done first on individual MPAs then on the network or clusters of MPAs.

Elements needed to assess management effectiveness of individual MPAs:

- Information related to the conservation objectives of the MPA (9 pro)
- *Monitoring*(9 pro)
- *Status* (5 pro)
- Description of management measures taken (6 pro 2 con)
- Information on main threats (5 pro, 2 con)
- Information related to the generic features of the MPA (3 pro)
- Information related to management, preconditions for adaptive management of the MPA (3 pro 1 con)
- *Cost/Benefit* (2 con)
- *Measures outside MPA*
- *Enforcement*

Elements needed to assess management effectiveness of MPA network/Clusters of MPAs

- Conservation objectives of the MPA network (13 pro)
- MPA network features (7 pro, 2 con)
- Threat reduction objectives for main threats to the MPA network (5 pro, 1 con)
- Coherence in measures taken across MPA (6 pro, 2 con)
- Preconditions for adaptive management of the MPA (5 pro, 3 con)
- *Enforcement and monitoring* (1 pro, 1 con)
- *Governance of network*

Discussion of objectives:

- Conservation objectives lacking on a network level – It is not clear what the conservation objectives on a network level are. This makes it very difficult to assess management effectiveness. A discussion arose on whether one of the objectives of the MPA network is to obtain a good environmental status for the OSPAR maritime area. If the MPA network is

⁴ 3_OSPAR MPA database

effectively managed, would that also mean that the OSPAR network of MPAs is ecologically coherent?

2:2 Data availability discussion:

There was a discussion on what data is available in the OSPAR MPA database. The group concluded that some of the data could be found in the database but there is still work to be done to refine the database to be able to use it for management effectiveness assessments. Some data needed could be found in the habitat database or in the EEA-database for the Natura 2000-areas and it would be interesting to see if a linkage between the databases could be established.

Individual MPA in the OSPAR MPA database - discussion

- Species: In the database, it is advantageous that it is clear if the species that is reported has been reported as “present” (only occasionally appears in the MPA) or if the species justify the designation (OSPAR or other)? There could be a problem if the CP’s report in different ways when comparing data in the different MPA’s. The database enables to tag the species that justified the designation.
- Official objectives and additional objectives: needed in more detail, by species or ecosystem. The objectives don’t match with official OSPAR objectives. There is a confusion on official objectives and additional objectives
- Some of the generic information (designation and additional designation) is not available in the MPA database
- The conservation objectives are not common and comparable. There is a variation in local objectives and indicators
- Threats in the database are more on the level of activities than impact and it is not clear whether the threats are influencing the species or habitats negatively
- Status of species and habitats is not available in the database other than if the species or habitat is listed (OSPAR, Natura 2000, IUCN redlist). The database does not tell if a certain species or habitat in the specific MPA reaches good environmental status.

MPA network

- Lack of data, but perhaps better with some figures with caveats? – Often there is a problem of data on species and habitats in MPA (area of a certain habitat or number/distribution of a certain species).
- Eunis level 3 could be adequate for reporting habitats – a discussion on what would be the appropriate level of detail.
- The Quality Status Report- could this assessment of principle pressures be used as threats in management effectiveness assessment at a network scale?

3. Session 2: Introduction and testing of approaches on assessment of management effectiveness

Two different approaches were presented. To be able to compare the two approaches a set of assessment criteria questions was formulated and posed to the approaches.

Presentation 4: Introduction of a methodology based on the assessment of conservation objectives⁵, presented by Henning von Nordheim

At the ICG MPA meeting in December 2013 a weighted scoring system to assess management effectiveness was presented. For this workshop a simplified version was presented since the original system was found to be too work intensive and complicated to be applied to the whole network of MPAs.

The approach is based on the assessment of the achievement of conservation objectives. The degree to which conservation objectives of the MPA are achieved (in percentage) could be based on expert judgment. The methodology includes the following steps:

1. Define conservation objectives for each MPA
2. Assess the status of conservation features for each MPA at the time of designation
3. Identify status improvement or decline over time through regular monitoring
4. Analyze the degree to which conservation objectives have been achieved (e.g. through expert judgment)
5. Degree of conservation objectives achieved [%] = management effectiveness

The percentage achievement of each conservation objective of an individual MPA is averaged to give an overall score for the according MPA. If the individual MPA achieves its objectives to a certain degree (e.g. 80-100%) the MPA is considered to be well managed.

The management effectiveness of the MPA network (%) results from calculating the average management effectiveness, meaning the degree to which conservation objectives have been reached, of all individual MPAs (%).

3.1: General discussion on the methodology based on the assessment of conservation objectives

In the discussion the group found the benefits in the feasibility of the system. CPs could report the figures to ICG MPA. A task group could then scale up the results to a network level. However, the system does not allow for backtracking the reasoning behind the score. Furthermore, without having a comparable score of a previous assessment, we will not be able to tell if we are moving towards or away from the conservation objectives, nor will we know what is needed to take the next step for better management. The method would also allow assessing conservation objectives at the network level (e.g. conservation of a species) as further explained in slide eight of the according presentation. The precondition certainly is that OSPAR formulates and agrees on OSPAR conservation objectives on the network level.

The approach is:

- addressing conservation objectives and taking them as assessment basis

⁵ 4_Weighted score

- problematic if information is lacking
- not addressing the conservation objectives directly; assessment of the indicators rather than conservation objectives per se.
- giving an indication if “something” is wrong, but not necessarily what.
- giving an indication on how far we are in achieving the conservation objectives of individual MPAs.
- delivering a figure per area, the figure is based on expert judgment. The expert judgment should be transparent so that it can be shared between others. However the methodology does not define how this could be resolved. Data should be accessible to all. The methodology does not assess species and habitats other than through the expert judgment.
- not addressing explicitly the relevant threats.

The data and data management required for this approach should be available from the OSPAR MPA database concerning the conservation objectives, as well as the status of species and habitats. Unfortunately this is not present there. Some of the data could be found in other types of reporting, for example in the Natura 2000-reporting.

Presentation 5: Introduction of Adaptive Management Approach⁶, presented by Ilke Tilders

The approach sets out to understand if the measures taken in the MPA lead to reductions of threats inside the MPA. Does this reduction contribute to improving conservation status? Are successes inside the MPA overtaken by impacts from outside the MPA? In more detail: which measures are leading to reduction of a particular threat? Which measures works, which don't, under which circumstances?

3:2 General discussion

The approach contains most/all of the elements discussed earlier for management effectiveness assessment. However the approach is very ambitious and there is a risk that CPs will have problems in delivering the data. There was also a discussion on a need for a common language. We use different languages within OSPAR, Natura 2000 and MSFD. Targets, objectives and goals are defined differently within different organizations. In JAMP a comparison between the languages in the directives and conventions will be made, a good idea would be to include the management effectiveness vocabulary in this comparison.

- This approach shows how to (through identification of targets, objectives and threats) assess and improve status and should be, and in several cases already is, included in the ordinary work of an MPA manager.
- Addresses ongoing threats but not potential, future threats.
- The transparency of this approach shows what is needed to be done in order to improve management.
- This approach is more of a management system than an assessment system.
- By addressing both conservation objectives and threats this adaptive management approach could give the bigger picture.
- More time and resource consuming but probably delivering more useful results.

⁶ 5_Introducing the AM approach

3:3 Testing of the two approaches in group sessions.

The two Swedish MPAs Kosterfjorden-Väderöfjorden and Havstensfjorden were chosen for testing the two approaches. The group discussed whether it would be fruitful to also test an area beyond national jurisdiction, but decided against it due to knowledge gaps in the background information. Still it is important to note that the information concerning these elements should be made available.

Presentation 6: Management Effectiveness from a National Perspective⁷, Presented by Benjamin Ponge

In France the national framework for management effectiveness assessment is illustrated by a dashboard showing the status of standardized indicators and the evolution (improving-stable-degradation) of the status. Individual MPAs are assessed according to their objectives, and the indicators are selected to match local priorities (e.g. reefs, estuaries, large shallow inlets and bays; socioeconomic indicators also exist). An important work is carried out in parallel to harmonize the indicators, so that assessing the effectiveness of MPAs could be done both on individual MPAs, and on networks of MPAs through the aggregation of common indicators. The results of the assessments are a key driver for management, at local or national level. Indeed more resources (human and financial) are dedicated to the features assessed to be in a bad status.

It should be noted that a significant preliminary work was realized to set up the bases of this framework. This basic work consisted mainly in clearly defining the legally-binding objectives for each kind of MPA category.

The French presentation should not be seen as a third method to choose between but rather as an illustration of a national initiative.

Session 3: Comparison and way forward

Comparison between the two different approaches

General conclusion:

The objective of the workshop was, according to the terms of reference to:

- Develop the elements for suitable methods that will be needed to assess whether the network is well managed
 - Do these elements exist?
 - Are they achievable?
 - Are they within the timeframe for assessing the target?

The workshop has identified a number of elements and ranked their importance for assessing management effectiveness. The workshop has discussed the possible sources for these elements including the OSPAR MPA database, the reporting of OSPAR listed habitats and the Natura 2000-article 17 reporting. Some, but not all, of the elements exist and the different CPs have different abilities or ambitions in reporting.

The two approaches presented and discussed during the workshop differed in many ways. Concerning the question if they are achievable, the approach presented by Germany includes data

⁷ 6_French dashboard

assessments through expert judgment. The methodology assumes that all relevant elements were included and available at the designation of the MPA. This is true for some MPAs or in some of the CPs, but not for all. The assessment of management effectiveness by using this approach could probably be done according to the timeframe (2016) but the assessment may suffer from lack of data supplied and it does not assess the way forward to reach an effectively managed MPA network if the network is not effectively managed today.

The adaptive management approach focuses on the relationship between management effectiveness and the basic theory of change related to an MPA. It tries to answer which measures are leading to reduction of a particular threat, and which measures work, which don't, and under which circumstances. However, this approach could probably not be used according to the timeframe (2016). The workshop agreed on the need to develop guidelines on using the adaptive management approach in scoring.

The workshop agreed the methods were complementary and could serve different needs.

For more pragmatic and time shortage reasons it was agreed that the methodology based on the expert judgment assessment of conservation objectives, with a few amendments, would be used by CPs and delivered by 2016. At the end of 2016 there will be an aggregated overall score of the network made by ICG-MPA. In addition the group decided to start the work of drafting guidelines on using an adaptive management approach; however the timeframe for delivery of the management effectiveness assessment would be too short to make such an extensive assessment. Moreover a few countries were willing to test the guidelines and deliver test cases.

See ref. Summary session OSPAR workshop for further information.

Road map proposition

- The Task group (Sweden, Germany, France, Belgium, the OSPAR Secretariat) should draft OSPAR network level objectives, based on existing OSPAR products.
- End of 2014 (draft ready for input to ICG-MPA meeting) – Guidelines on using the adaptive management approach in scoring to be released (Sweden and Belgium)
- End of 2014 (draft ready for input to ICG-MPA meeting): develop proposal on method and data handling (perhaps via database?) (Germany)
- By mid 2016 – all MPAs have delivered the score (some CPs will test disaggregation per conservation objectives e.g. habitat/species and rolled up in total). To get to that score all CPs will need to think about conservation objectives and threats at minimum but recommended additional tool is offered.
- After testing management effectiveness assessment on MPA level: Assessment on potential usefulness of the OSPAR MPA database for this assessment (Germany and France)
- By end of 2016 – aggregated overall score of the network.
- If possible: a) more concrete objectives perhaps for habitats and species b) more concrete objectives tied to Ecological coherence (connectivity, representativeness, resilience)

The OSPAR Secretariat is to set up 2 progress meetings via WebEx (all that have a role to be invited) one end of September, one end of November.

Some main discussion points of the OSPAR Workshop on Management Effectiveness

Method 1: A methodology based on the assessment of the achievement of conservation objectives

The percentage or score indicates the degree to which conservation objectives (COs) defined for the MPA have been achieved. In the method it is assumed that if conservation objectives are met to a certain degree– management is effective.

Elements taken into consideration	Issues	Potential solutions	What does the method provide after solution?	Agreement
<p>On MPA level:</p> <p>Elements: % of the COs that have been achieved.</p> <p>Gives the average achievement of all COs of an MPA that contribute to the OSPAR aims but without differentiating between the levels of COs.</p>	<p>The % score is static and without having a comparable % score of previous assessment does not tell us if we are moving towards or away from our COs.</p>	<p>Complement it with a trend (since designation!). Perhaps complemented by “distance from CO”. (Think of French example – colour coding of “status”+ arrow for direction of change</p>	<p>Insight on extent to which (since designation) the MPA is moving toward or away from reaching its conservation objectives</p>	<p>All agree</p>
	<p>It is hard to express the degree of achievement in %. Without proper guidance this could result in a too rough estimate which might not be useful.</p>	<p>Refine method by introducing either guidance or clear categories. (again, think of those used in the French method or the 5 categories used in N2000)</p> <p>Provide clear guidance on what MPAs need to do if there isn't enough data a judgement or cannot be made.</p>		<p>All agree</p>

Some main discussion points of the OSPAR Workshop on Management Effectiveness

	<p>Can any CO be taken into account? If that is the case, there might be a danger of losing the OSPAR perspective.</p>	<p>Clarification: No because, the method is meant to select those COs that contributes to the three overall aims of OSPAR.</p>		<p>All agree</p>
	<p>Do we need to be able to “report” on how and if MPAs contribute to OSPAR habitats?</p>	<p>Option 1) no – national reporting on the occurrence of OSPAR habitats is disconnected from the MPA work</p> <p>Option 2) yes, because in the future they might be linked</p>	<p>Insight on if MPA contributes to conservation of OSPAR habitats (OSPAR recommendation for the protection of species and habitats, OSPAR JAMP)</p>	<p>For this phase we will not make it obligatory. We all agree the ME assessment would be more useful if we would report on the contribution of MPAs to OSPAR habitats.</p> <p>For this phase Sweden, France, UK each are going to test how this would work . (Coordinate across features)</p>
	<p>The method could be strengthened by taking into account changes in threat levels. Expert judgments could be used in the absence of data.</p>	<p>Develop clear guidelines for MPAs that would take changes in threat levels into account.</p>	<p>Insight on if since a management measure is put in place, threats are decreasing or avoided and the status of the CO is improving.</p> <p>If combined with reporting against OSPAR habitats and species (and N2000): Insight on if since a measure is put in place the threats to the N2000 & OSPAR species and habitats</p>	<p>Agreement that this is important, though for practical reasons should be optional.</p> <p>UK to develop guidance on threats</p>

Some main discussion points of the OSPAR Workshop on Management Effectiveness

			are decreasing and the status of the N2000/OSPAR species & habitats are individually and collectively moving towards the desired value	
	Not clear how ME score is aggregated and how it can be disaggregated later if no % score is used	Needs to be clarified		All agree
	Not clear how the ME Score be used?	Depends on the detail of the analysis behind it. This is up to the MPA itself		
<p>On OSPAR level:</p> <p>Gives the average management effectiveness, meaning the degree to which COs have been achieved, of all OSPAR MPAs</p>	The method does not focus on the assessment of individual OSPAR features & selection criteria	For practical reasons we accept that for the 2016 ME assessment	<p>Accepting this implies that this ME assessment cannot say anything about the extent to which the network has been able to conserve individual OSPAR habitats and species.</p> <p>We realise that this limits the usefulness of the ME Assessment on OSPAR level- and this should be clearly acknowledged in the assessment outcome.</p>	<p>All agree</p> <p>Action: trial aggregation exercise by UK, France, Sweden others (done end of 2015)</p>

CO=Conservation Objective

TRO =Threat reduction Objective

ME=Management Effectiveness

Some main discussion points of the OSPAR Workshop on Management Effectiveness

Method 2: The Adaptive Management approach <i>Gives insight in relation between (1) measure and threat reduction (2) threat reduction and status (3) features of the MPA and the effectiveness (2) management quality and effectiveness</i>				
Elements taken into consideration	Issues	Potential solutions	What does the method provide after solution?	Agreement
<p>On MPA Level:</p> <p>Looks at the relationships between management measures and threat reduction; threat reduction and status change of conservation features of the MPA.</p>	<p>For practical reasons and in the short term the method (full package) is too ambitious / demanding. It is feared that most MPAs will not be able/ willing to use the method and thus this is not helpful in delivering the ME assessment in 2016. However, the method does help MPAs to assess and improve their ME and set them up to practice adaptive management.</p>	<p>Develop simple spread sheet as “tool” behind the more simple scoring method (method above) including at least:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. COs, current status, direction of change II. Threat reduction objectives, current status of threats, direction of change III. Description of management measures taken in the MPA in relation to 1 & 2 <p>Use should be optional. Member countries might have their own system already.</p>	<p>Links between: (1) measure and threat reduction (2) threat reduction and status. Would make visible what measure work and what not. Would allow for useful exchange between areas if harmonized language were used.</p> <p>This might encourage MPAs to increase the quality of their management plans, data, reflection</p>	<p>All agree</p>
	<p>The method does not provide an</p>	<p>Adjust the table to roll up in</p>	<p>Not sure on MPA level, but might help</p>	<p>Some</p>

Some main discussion points of the OSPAR Workshop on Management Effectiveness

	overall end score – or conclusion - indicating ME.	colours or scores. It is hard to imagine though, the meaning of a score across so many variables.	roll up to network level?	agreement
	The spread sheet seeks alignment between OSPAR & N2000 habitats and species. There is no consensus that this is the way to go. Note: the spread sheet is developed as an example tool, i.e. does not equal the method! There are many tools out there including professional software such as Miradi and MiradiShare.		Not discussed in much detail, needs further thinking	
On OSPAR level: Looks at the relationships between reduction of overall threats on MPAs and change in status of conservation target.	Absence of SMART Conservation objectives for the network. This disables you to get to real ME questions and assess usefulness of the method on this level. Please note that the method as been used in other parts of the world to assess ME of MPA networks.		Not discussed in much detail, needs further thinking	

Some main discussion points of the OSPAR Workshop on Management Effectiveness

Fundamental issues (many of which need further discussion with other working groups)		
ISSUE	Options	Conclusions & Actions:
There are no (SMART) objectives for OSPAR on the network level. Without this it is hard to really say something about the management effectiveness of the network.	OSPAR could formulate detailed and SMART objectives for certain OSPAR habitats, species, ecological processes and functions.	<p>This would help to conclude if as a network the OSPAR MPAs are achieving more then as the sum of the individual MPAs.</p> <p>This would help assess the OSPAR network in a more meaningful way. Note: having such objectives should not lead to extra objectives for the MPAs.</p>
There are no clear objectives regarding eco coherence – partly because we don't know well enough what it is	We need to work with the other working group to better formulate what ME questions we would need to answer in relation to these objectives in the future	<p>For the 2016 evaluation we will need to accept that taking eco coherence as goal to judge ME is too ambitious.</p> <p>We need to acknowledge how little we know and commit to beefing up the knowledge in the future.</p>
If ME is interpreted as an expression of the extent to which COs are met, then what does it mean that by 2016 the network will be managed well? That we have reached the network objectives?	Agree to interpret the 2016 objective to be: "by 2016, MPAs <u>will demonstrate</u> the extent to which they have reached their objectives and if by 2016, the OSPAR MPA network shows a positive trend in the status of OSPAR features.	All agree
The ME questions on network level are not clearly defined. This makes it hard to	<p>Some questions to be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How effective has the designation 	

Some main discussion points of the OSPAR Workshop on Management Effectiveness

<p>assess ME, in particular since the network objectives are also not very detailed.</p>	<p>process been in creating a representative coherent network? How can we improve?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If we look across OSPAR Species and habitats – is their status improving since OSPAR MPAs are designated. • Are the main threats in the OSPAR area decreasing? • How effective are MPAs outside national waters? What can we do to know this better? 	
<p>In the TOR text for this workshop “managed well” is mentioned. How does this differ from managed effectively?</p> <p>This is also stated in the recommendation so it is an issue that needs to be clarified.</p>	<p>Option 1: Whether or not a site is managed well has to do with if governance, clarity of aims, budget, extent to which it monitors etc.</p> <p>Option 2: With well managed we meant: “ managed effectively”, i.e. to what extent measures are leading to achievement of goals and objectives of MPAs</p>	<p>All agree on option 2.</p>
<p>The OSPAR network comprises of sites that are individually designated as OSPAR sites, but also designated under other conventions or directives (e.g. Natura 2000 etc.).</p> <p>What are we assessing exactly: the extent to which we are achieving OSPAR Objectives? Or more generically if the</p>	<p>Option 1: we need to focus the ME assessment on the added value of OSPAR</p> <p>Option 2: we cannot focus the ME assessment only on OSPAR, simply because we have no way to separate OSPAR and non-OSPAR in a meaningful way. Also: the OSPAR habitats and</p>	<p>Most agree that the ME assessment should focus more generically on the question of whether the network of MPAs that is designated under OSPAR contributes to the overall ecological status of the MPA network in the OSPAR maritime area</p>

Some main discussion points of the OSPAR Workshop on Management Effectiveness

<p>network of MPAs that are designated under OSPAR contributes to the overall ecological status.</p>	<p>species were never meant as objectives.</p> <p>Option 3: we need to understand how OSPAR objectives interrelate with other objectives</p>	
<p>What is the exact “scope” of the ME assessment</p>	<p>Option 1: assessing how effective the network has been in achieving the network Objectives – and how effective individual MPAs have been achieving theirs.</p> <p>Option 2: assessing how effective MPAs are or if the MPA network is as measure among many others to improve the overall ecological status of the OSPAR maritime area</p>	<p>For practical reasons most agreed on option 1 that the 2016 ME assessment should assess the effectiveness of the network against its own objectives.</p>

OSPAR Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic
Workshop on the procedure to assess, by 2016, whether the OSPAR Network of MPAs is
well-managed (WKMAN)
Gothenburg, Sweden: 8-10 April 2014

List of Participants

CHAIR

Dr Laura Piriz*
Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management
Box 11930
SE-40439 Göteborg
Sweden
Tel: 00 46 702744430
E-mail: laura.piriz@havochvatten.se

BELGIUM

Mr Geert Raeymaekers
FOD Volksgezondheid,
Veiligheid voor de Voedselketen en Leefmilieu
Victor Hortaplein 40, box 10
B-1060 Brussels
Tel : +32 2 524 96 75
E-mail: geert.raeymaekers@environment.belgium.be

GERMANY

Dr Henning v. Nordheim
German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation
Isle of Vilm
D-18581 Putbus/Rügen
GERMANY
Tel : + 49 3830 186 120
E-mail: henning.von.nordheim@bfn-vilm.de

Ms Kerstin Hübner
Nature and Biodiversity Conservation Union (NABU)
Isle of Vilm,
D-18581 Putbus
GERMANY
Tel : + 49 3830 186 118
E-mail: kerstin.huebner@nabu.de

FRANCE

Mr Benjamin Ponge
French Marine Protected Areas Agency
16, quai de la douane 29200 Brest
F – 29200 Brest
FRANCE
Tel : +33 2 98 33 33 05
E-mail: benjamin.ponge@aires-marines.fr

NETHERLANDS

Mr Joost Backx
Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment
Postbox 17
NL-8200 AA Lelystad
THE NETHERLANDS
Tel: +31 6 22243415
E-mail: joost.backx@rws.nl

SWEDEN

Ms Lena Tingström
Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management
Box 11 930
SE-404 39 Gothenburg
SWEDEN
Tel: + 46 10 6986091
E-mail: lena.tingstrom@havochvatten.se

Ms Maria Kilnäs
County Administrative Board of Vastra Gotaland
SE- 403 40 Göteborg
SWEDEN
Tel: + 46 10 22 44 721
E-mail: maria.kilnas@lansstyrelsen.se

Ms Anita Tullrot
County Administrative Board of Vastra Gotaland
SE- 403 40 Göteborg
SWEDEN
Tel: + 46 10 22 44 742
E-mail: anita.tullrot@lansstyrelsen.se

UNITED KINGDOM

*Ms Kylie Bamford
Department for the Environment Food and Rural
Affairs
Nobel House
17 Smith Square
London
SW1P3JR
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel: +44 207 238633
E-mail: kylie.bamford@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Ms Laura Cornick
Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Monkstone House
Peterborough
PE1 1JY
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel: 00 44 1733866932
E-mail: Andrew.scarsbrook@defra.gsi.gov.uk

OBSERVERS

OCEANA

Mr Nicolas Fournier
OCEANA
39 rue Montoyer
B-1000 Brussels
BELGIUM
Tel: +32 472604228
E-mail: nfournier@oceana.org

MedPAN

Mr Bruno Meola
48, rue Saint Suffren
F - 13006 Marseille
FRANCE
Tel: + 33 4 91 58 09 62
E-mail: bruno.meola@medpan.org

WWF

Dr Sabine Christiansen
WWF NE Atlantic Programme
Am Güthpol 11
D-28757 Bremen
Germany
BELGIUM
Tel: + 49 421 65846 28
E-mail: christiansen@wwfneap.org

OSPAR Secretariat

Ms Emily Corcoran
Dr Darius Campbell
OSPAR Commission
Victoria House
37-63 Southampton Row
London WC1B 4DA
Tel: +44 207 430 5200
E-mail: emily.corcoran@ospar.org

Facilitator

Ms Ilke Tilders
Ilke Tilders Environmental Consultancy (ITEC)
Foundations of Success (Europe)
Sumatralaan 20
1217 GR Hilversum
The Netherlands
Tel: +31621840922
E-mail: ilketilders@gmail.com