

WP3 TECHNICAL MEETING REPORT

September 6th & 7th 2012

Lisbon, Portugal

Final version

Authors:

Amandine Eynaudi, Fanny Le Fur, Agence des aires marines protégées – France
WP3 technical group – Atlantic arc

Contents

Attendees List.....	1
Work plan of the meeting	2
Minutes of the Technical Meeting	2
Reminder of the 3_1 Objectives agreement AAMP	2
Page to page review of the report 3.1 All attendee.....	2
Listing of missing question and results in the report 3.1 All attendee.....	3
Standard form for results presentation All attendee.....	3
Detailed index All attendee	3
Work organisation and calendar	6

ATTENDEES LIST

1	ES/CM	Francisco FILGUEIRA
2	ES/CM	Jorge RIBO LANDIN
3	ES/UDC	Inma ÁLVAREZ FERNANDEZ
4	FR/AAMP	Fanny LE FUR
5	FR/AAMP	Amandine EYNAUDI

6	PT/IPIMAR	Yorgos STRATOUDAKIS
7	PT/ICNF	Miguel HENRIQUES
8	PT/ICNF	Teresa LEONARDO
9	FR/AGLIA	Marion PANHELEUX

Sophie Elliot and Roger Covey were available by Skype but have not been contacted.

WORK PLAN OF THE MEETING

1/ Reminder of the 3_1 Objectives agreement

2/ Page to page review of the report 3.1

3/ Listing of missing question in the report

4/ Standard form for results presentation

5/ Detailed index of the report

Please note that points 1 to 5 are only dedicated to the results presentation

6/ Analysis and discussion

⇒ **The global objective of this meeting is to finish the work on the 3.1 report before beginning any other work of the WP3.**

MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL MEETING

Reminder of the 3_1 Objectives agreement

AAMP

Speaker:	Amandine Eynaudi (AAMP)
Document(s):	▪ 3 rd of July email from AE

Specific objectives for Action 3.1 Management plan review and comparison

Context reminder

To do this task a questionnaire (called 'questionnaire 3.1') has been developed and completed to analyse how are designed the management plan documents for MPAs in our 4 countries.

- ICNB, AAMP, NE and XG-CM/UDC completed it for numerous documents.
- A important batch of raw data are available
- Data collection is supposed to be over since September 2011, but NE sent one more questionnaire in August 2012.

Objective

To get a:

- complete presentation of the results of all data collected,
- global report presenting results and analyses / discussion (specificities, differences and similarities, gaps) regarding management plan documents developed for MPA in the Atlantic arc by the 4 countries of the partnership.

This objective has been reminded during the meeting and validated again by all attendees.

Page to page review of the report 3.1

All attendee

Speaker(s):	All attendees
Document(s):	▪ Report 3.1, 4 th September version provided by UDC ▪ Report 3.1, Corrected version sent by AAMP the 31 st of July

The 3.1 report version send on September the 4th by UDC has been reviewed page by pages.

Comments, corrections, have been made by all attendees.

Agreement has been achieved for 'Methodology', 'definitions' and 'main concept' used in the document.

UDC is invited to integrate all these corrections and remarks in the final version of the report. The major part of them is already available in the version corrected by AAMP and sent the 31st of July.
For each result it has been précised if it must be presented by country/ by designation/ globally for the 4 countries.

The whole dataset (including the 4 countries data) will be sent by Inma to all MAIA partners, data providers might wants to have a global view of the dataset.

Listing of missing question and results in the report 3.1 All attendee

Speaker(s):	All attendees
-------------	---------------

Once the global review has been made page by page, attendees agreed that all results must be provided in the report.

For instance: management plan cost, legal framework, conservation values, threats, duration of management plan, etc

To avoid any forgetting we adopt a detailed index which respect the questionnaire order (please see further).

Standard form for results presentation All attendee

Speaker(s):	All attendee
-------------	--------------

WP3 technical group agree to adopt a standard form to present all the results (presented below).

- a) Quote the question and answers offered in the questionnaire
- b) Define key word of the question, what do we mean with this vocabulary? / Remind the "help to fullfil of the questionnaire" if relevant
- c) Systematically provide the sample (for how many answers this result is)
- d) If needed provide the specificity of the data collection (given by the data provider, it's the question interpretation by data provider)
- e) Graph/tables/figures of the results / with unit used, title (with details) and title for abscissa and ordinate
Provide Graph/ tables/figures according to what has been decided during the page by page review:
 - by country
 - by designation
 - global view of the 4 countries of the partnership / Chose what we want to highlight at the MAIA scale (*ie.*: a Spanish reader must be able to find results and explanations about the Spanish results and must also be able to find explanations about the network results.

Detailed index All attendee

Speaker(s):	All attendee
-------------	--------------

■

WP3 technical group agreed on a detailed index which have to be respected for the final version of the 3.1 report provided by UDC.

INDEX/Table of contents

Summary

Introduction

Disclaimer/warning

METHODOLOGIE

I. Definitions

- A. MPA
- B. Management plan
- C. etc.

II. Methodology

- A. How each partner identify MPA sample to answer the study
- B. Management plan collection (who are the data providers, how they work, etc.)
- C. Elaboration of the questionnaire/ web form
- D. Data collection (source of information)

RESULTS

(Any examples when needed/possible to be added in the report)

I. Dataset description

- A. Description of Management plan collected vs MPA (including the marine component of the MPAs)
- B. Presentation of designation of the dataset
- C. Description of dataset (only 1 MPA have been fulfilled for a Management plan recovering several MPAs)

II. Structure and contents of the studied Management Plans

1/General features of the studied Management Plans

- A. Status of the studied Management Plans (implemented or not)
- B. Beginning of the implementation
- C. Duration features of the Management Plans (first, 2nd, 3rd/date of the first one, duration...)
- D. Objectives of the studied Management Plans
- E. OSPAR guidelines compatibility
- F. Conclusion/synthesis inserts

2/Site's description and characteristics

- A. Geographical description of the MPAs in the studied Management Plans
- B. GIS tool in the studied Management Plans
- C. Conservation value description in the studied Management Plans
- D. Legal framework description in the studied Management Plans

- E. threats and conflicts analysis
- F. Lacks of knowledge
- G. Conclusion/synthesis inserts

3/Management

- A. Initial state description in the studied Management Plans
- B. Management Plans objectives (quantitative and qualitative)
- C. Action plans implementation description in the studied Management Plans
- D. Agreements between administration descriptions in the studied Management Plans
- E. Zoning plan and specific regulations of the MPAs description in the studied Management Plans
- F. MPAs boundaries description in the studied Management Plans
- G. Management tools description in the studied Management Plans
- H. Conclusion/synthesis inserts

4/Administration (staff, global cost, budget)

- >Conclusion/synthesis insert

5/Governance (Governance description in the studied Management Plans/Egal representativity, etc)

- >Conclusion/synthesis insert

6/Control and regulation enforcement

- >Conclusion/synthesis insert

7/Management Plans development process

- >Conclusion/synthesis insert

8/Monitoring and evaluation

- >Conclusion/synthesis insert

9/MPAs managers perception

- >Conclusion/synthesis insert

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

When needed: Introduction context before each graph/analyses by data provider and explanation/interpretation of the analyses result by the data provider.

I. Common points and differences

(by DESIG, national/international type/countries.....)

II. N2000 focus

(According what is necessary to get relevant comparisons and results by DESIG, national/international type/countries.....)

Creation of dataset duplication specific for N2000 where only relevant items are chosen and kept

The data has to be presented separately:

⇒ **N2000 only** (without any overlapping designations / different from SAC, SIC, SPA)

Warning for EN: because of the data set, we have only EN data for Natura 2000, but the situation where N2000 overlap with other English designations (SSSI, MCZ) exist in the reality

⇒ **N2000 sites under other designations** (one management plan for several designations overlapping).

III. MCA analysis

[by management plan]

Parameters to cross: DESIG/Objectives/specific MPA regulations/enforcement/monitoring/ duration of the management plan implementation identify the "controlling variables/ identify typologies(s) ?

Warning: Explanation of EN an SP results for MPA specific regulations to be precised

GENERAL CONCLUSION

List of figures and tables

Bibliography

Work organisation and calendar

MAIA partners have to provided remarks, how they answer some questions and first interpretations/explanation of the results to Inma between the 10th of September and the 15th.

- Miguel for Portugal
- Roger for England
- Fanny for France

Inma may ask you specific information, please take a few minutes to answer her asap.

Short term calendar, priority tasks

WHAT	WHEN	WHO
Global dataset (Excel document including FR SP EN PT 3.1 data)	Before 18 th September	Inma
Integration of corrections given during the technical meeting in the report 3.1	Between the 10 th and the 15 th of September	Inma
Data providers explanations integration in the report 3.1 (section RESULTS)	Between the 10 th and the 15 th of September	Miguel, Roger, Fanny according to Inma requests
Final version of the report 3.1, according to the agreed detail index	1 st September	Inma
Re reading and validation of the report	Between 1 st of October and 5 th of October	Francisco, Miguel, Roger, Amandine, Fanny, Yorgos



The 5th of October:

>If the 3.1 report is **validated** by all partners, next task sand step will be defined in cooperation (.ppt presentation for the conference, etc.).



>If the 3.1 report **is not validated** (members of the WP3 technical group must only provide arguments why they didn't validate the report, decisions regarding the dataset and its uses will be taken in cooperation between MAIA partners.

>Please note that 3.2, 3.3 and global WP3 reports are **CANCELED**