



3rd Edition - 4th June 2012
International Exposition Yeosu, South Korea

SESSION BRIEFS



Official introductions

Kwang Youle Park, Director General of Marine Environment representing the Korean Minister of Land, Transport and Maritime Affairs, praised the Monaco Blue Initiative, citing its great potential of promoting the universal values of mankind, including human rights. He stressed the importance of conservation, citing its “positive effect on local and regional tourism by promoting and raising fish stocks.” While noting there are challenges that must be taken care of, including conflicts between nations and stakeholders, he nevertheless expressed hope, “I sincerely believe today’s meeting, as an exploratory effort, will have positive results.”

H.S.H. Prince Albert II of Monaco, initiator of the Monaco Blue Initiative, expressed his delight at the convening of the third Monaco Blue Initiative in Yeosu, Korea, where it could “incorporate our approach into the context of the Yeosu International Exposition, dedicated to the key subject of the life of the oceans and coasts,” as well as “widen the audience of the Monaco Blue Initiative and include distinguished personalities.”

He set forth the three challenges facing the Monaco Blue Initiative: reconciling the future of both the seas and man; reconciling ecological demands with economic needs; and identifying and studying the difficulties that the development of marine protected areas (MPA) are facing in terms of definition, creation and management. He spoke at length about the need for maritime protected areas, which “offer ways in which to improve man’s relationship with the sea, for the benefit of everyone” by allowing sustainable development of marine resources. He cited the need to protect threatened natural heritage, the ability of marine protected areas to restore damaged ecosystems, and their role in increasing fish stocks.

Highlighting the spirit of dialogue and effectiveness that would characterize the day’s meeting, H.S.H. said, “Once again, I believe that the issue of the seas, which presents itself in similar terms in Yeosu and Monaco, can help us make real progress in the huge task of preserving our planet. Because it gives us the opportunity to move forward together, and realizing that, in the powerful words of President Obama speaking at the UN, ‘we come from many places, but we share a common future’.”



SESSION 1: Current Overview of Marine Protected Areas

Moderator: **Sebastian Troeng**, Vice President of Conservation International, Marine Program

In his keynote address, **Francois Simard**, Deputy Head and Senior Advisor for Fisheries, IUCN Global Marine and Polar Program, warned that while the road map established by the UN Convention on Biological Diversity and the World Summit on Sustainable Development calls for the designation of 10% of the world's total coastal and marine areas by 2020, that target would not be reached until 2047 if we continue at the current rate. "We have to go faster," he urged. "We don't want to go business as usual. We have to really do something to reach the target." One problem of particular note is the lack of legal tools needed to establish protected areas on the high seas, a concern that may be addressed in upcoming negotiations on strengthening the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS).

François Simard called for protected areas to be conserved through "effective and equitable management." Capacity building and sharing best practices are essential. Possible tools to do this include a "Green List" of areas that are being protected well and a program to certify managers of marine protected areas. This should help establishing a well-connected system of protected areas completed by other area based management rules in the framework of marine spatial planning. He noted that lots of economic activities could take place in connection with marine protected areas, but mapping human activities at sea was very complex, in no small part due to the time factor. "Everything is changing. Human activities at sea are not permanent," he said.

The other keynote speaker, **Kohei Hibino**, Manager of the Centre for Regional Sustainability Initiative (CRESI) and Regional Coordinator of IUCN WCPA Marine Northwest Pacific region, discussed the unique situation of marine protected areas in Northeast Asia. Here, coastal populations are high and demand for sea resources has been great. There are not many sanctuaries in the region but, nonetheless, there are many existing marine protected areas and marine managed areas, not all of which are known internationally. Japan, for instance, has 6,000 such areas, accounting for 8.3% of the country's EEZ, even if many of these are not registered on the global database.

Countries in the region have differing standards and approaches when it comes to marine protected areas. Kohei Hibino noted, "Although there are not many ideal MPAs, these systems have developed locally and gone through the test of time, and should be valued more," and suggested we may need new marine protected area categories beyond the existing IUCN's. In Northeast Asia, the primary focus has been the sustainable and equitable use of resources, not the preservation of nature. Kohei Hibino admitted that the marine protected area is an ideal form, but said, "[O]ne thing we learned from the failure to reach the target is that it is difficult to set up a modern MPA. It is also difficult for communities to understand an MPA. But sustainable development is a well understood concept in the region." He also noted that, due to population pressures, marine protected areas alone won't solve the problem, and regional cooperation---of which there is very little, despite the many commonalities shared by nations in the region---is important. High coastal population also means that Integrated Coastal Zone Management should also be a target.

The panel discussion began with **Lida Pet-Soede**, Director of WWF Coral Triangle Global Initiative, who noted that grassroots efforts may be better than formal marine protected areas. Targets may be helpful, but should then be more specific than the general definition of Marine Protected Areas. Since many developing countries rely on fishing for food, she also asked how we might

move “beyond business as usual” to produce more fish through marine protected areas.

Roy Palmer, CEO of Seafood Experience Australia Ltd., looked at marine protected areas from the perspective of the fishing industry. In particular, he cited the need for communication and transparency. Those in the fishing industry look at marine protected areas as another cost of doing business, so communication is needed to promote MPAs. Transparency, too, is important—he noted the fishing industry is frequently locked out of meetings on marine protected areas. “We assume things are bad behind that door,” he said, adding that while the industry might need to be dragged into such discussions, it still needs to be done.

Roy Palmer also noted that marine protected areas may put more pressure on remaining fisheries, requiring a consistent approach of MPAs and fishing regulations. And if we’re going to establish marine protected areas, we need to invest money to enforce it properly, “or we encourage poaching and piracy.”

Yihang Jiang, Project Manager UNDP/GEF Yellow Sea Project Management Office, pointed to the serious differences in marine protected areas in Europe, Asia and the Pacific region. Even within individual countries, multiple ministries may designate marine protected areas and legislate preservation-related laws. He cited the example of Thailand, where there are three national laws dealing with mangrove protection, all three at odds with one another regarding utilization.

Jiang also stressed the importance of enforcement and management, as well as the need for large and coherent MPAs that would be useless if divided improperly in different sectors. He also raised the need to determine who the end consumers of seafood are, often far from the fishing zone, and how such food is being used. He asked, “Does anyone pay attention to who are major users of seafood? Who consumes seafood? They are not local people. Who are the consumers of local production?” He also noted that in China, for instance, 70% of banquet food is wasted, and that this was a serious issue that needed to be discussed.

Finally, **Christophe Lefebvre**, IUCN Global Ocean Councillor and Coordinator for European and International Affairs for the French Marine Protected Area Agency, took issue with calls for new categories for marine protected areas. We need common global standards, he said, noting that you could conduct fishing activities in all but one of the existing categories. Instead, countries should reclassify their existing marine protected areas.

Lefebvre cited the importance of effectiveness. For better management of marine protected areas, we need guidance and tools for training MPA managers, with specific certification criteria. Networking among managers would allow them to share expertise and management skills, as well as spread knowledge. He also cited the development of communication activities to facilitate stakeholders and involve them in the management of marine protected areas.



SESSION 2: Marine Protected Areas and Fisheries

Moderator: **Patricio Bernal**, Project Coordinator of Global Ocean Biodiversity Initiative

H.E. Mr. Anote Tong, President of Kiribati, highlighted the importance of the sea to his island nation. “Our ocean is the source of our livelihood, providing us with about 90% of our protein. The ocean is also a major source of our income, both at the individual and national levels. 80% of our people make their living through fishing,” he said. He also addressed the poor state of said ocean, saying, “The health of our world's oceans is affected by centuries of unsustainable patterns of consumption in pursuit of economic development,” and that “an integrated ecosystem-based approach to marine management is essential to restore the health and vitality of the ocean and its ecosystem for the survival of present and future generations.” He warned, “Now we have to focus on action. The cost of inaction is catastrophic.”

H.E.Mr. Anote Tong pointed to his own nation’s Phoenix Islands Protected Area (PIPA), UNESCO’s largest World Heritage Site. Designated in 2006, PIPA is comprised of 400,000 square km of ocean, or 11% of Kiribati’s EEZ. The closing off of this space to fishing was a difficult decision, given the importance of the sale of fishing licenses to Kiribati’s economy. To make up for the lost revenue, the Kiribati government has asked for international support and partnered with Conservation International and the New England Aquarium to set-up a non-profit PIPA Trust. The goal of this is to allow Kiribati to create the PIPA without adversely affecting national expenditures for health, education and social welfare. “The designation of PIPA is a very loud statement at the height of the climate change debate to say that indeed sacrifices can be made if there is a will and commitment,” H.E.Mr. Anote Tong said.

The panel discussion began with **Daniel Pauly**, professor at the University of British Columbia Fisheries Centre, who reminded the conference that what made it possible to have fisheries over the centuries was that we could not fish everywhere. Technological development, however, has made it possible for us to fish everywhere we want, at any time. This has major implications, most notably, that sustainability has gone from something imposed on mankind to something we must work for. “Giraffes exist because humans decided they should,” he remarked, adding that fish are now like the giraffes.

Daniel Pauly explained that fisheries have gradually expanded from the north to the waters of the Antarctic; from the 1960s, there was a large increase in the catch, but catches stabilized in the 1980s and are now stagnating or declining. The implication, he said, is that we leave nothing untouched, that we are “losing the giraffes.”

Serge Garcia, Chair of Fisheries Expert Group of the IUCN, pointed out that, on land, we’ve tried to save animals by protecting areas, but that this has often failed. Protecting areas by kicking people out has not worked, he argued, and at any rate, it would impossible to kick people out from coastal areas, where six billion people will soon live. He pointed out that fostering the collaboration between fisheries management and biodiversity conservation within multiple-use MPAs could assist in conserving biodiversity as well as ecosystem structure and function while regulating the quantity of fish that are caught, but also the access to fish of the different categories of fishermen.

Garcia criticized the lack of data. The question for a fisheries manager is whether an MPA will be useful in fisheries management. The social and economic data is even poorer - hardly any data is collected on the community as a whole. He noted economic analysis has often been conducted by

those who've established marine protected areas; not surprisingly, most of the resulting analysis is positive. Opportunity costs to fishermen are not considered. "Imagine kicking people out of an area and saying the opportunity cost is zero," he said. The challenge, according to Garcia, is making marine protected areas value to the community. There's a long tradition of bringing tourists into protected areas, but tourism revenues often go to the capital, not fishing communities in coastal areas. "If the life of fishermen is a nightmare, so will be life of the MPA," he warned. The value chain between fishing and eating the fish should be carefully studied to maintain local revenue or compensate any loss. But who is going to pay for this compensation

Mr. **Prathapa Chandra Shetty**, Executive Director of Emirates Star Fisheries, pointed out that there are few marine protected areas in the Arabian Peninsula region. He believed that well-managed marine protected areas are key, and that well-managed marine protected areas can see dramatic differences from country to country. For instance, the situation in Somalia has led to a recovery of local fisheries.

Victor Gallardo, Vice Chairman of International Steering Committee of the Census of Marine Life, explained that we still have no answer to a very important question---what lives in the ocean today? What we know about marine life in Chile, for instance, is that 6,548 species live there---just one species per 600 square km of sea.

If the sea has so little economic relevance, how do you convince governments to fund censuses? Gallardo cited supply and demand---we should increase production of organisms in the sea we have but may not know. If we speak more of marine production, politicians and the public will support it.

The question of assigning resources was raised. Professor Pauly was quite direct. "It's not rocket science. If you don't do something, you get consequences." As for whether marine protected areas can play a role in access rights, Daniel Pauly noted the bizarre circumstance in which fishermen in some parts of the world regard such areas positively, yet scientists in Europe and North America oppose them.



SESSION 3: Economic Opportunities in and around Marine Protected Areas

Moderator: **Pierre Erwes**, President and Founder of BioMarine

Keynote speaker **Roy Palmer**, CEO of Seafood Experience Australia Ltd., expressed the opinion that we could do much more economically in and around marine protected areas, but that, in his experience, politics gets in the way. He stressed the importance of aquaculture---"If we don't have a vision for aquaculture, we don't have a way forward." In particular, he cited the importance of algae in energy. "It's seen as the new oil, without anything like the pollutants of oil," he said. Roy Palmer also presented ecotourism as an option, but counseled caution regarding the coastal development we create for such tourism to take place. Ultimately, however, we must ensure that seafood remains available and affordable.

Asked about the best opportunities for local communities around marine protected areas, Roy Palmer expressed a liking for shellfish aquaculture. "You don't need feed; they grow easily in marine parks, which are often in rural areas; and there are services that can be applied alongside," he said. He also noted one problem experienced by fishermen in Australia is the time needed for

environmental impact studies and political decisions. Clear and quick decisions are needed. “We might have to pay more,” he said, “but at least we can go in with confidence.”

Donna Petrachenko, Chief Advisor International Biodiversity and Sustainability & Australia’s Commissioner to the International Whaling Commission within the Australian Government Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, said that, in order for investors to get opportunities, governments needed to work with them to tell them of opportunities. This process was not just about marine protected areas, she said. It was about reducing costs, building certainty and protecting areas.

A trained economist, **Teuea Toatu**, Executive Director of Phoenix Islands Protected Area (PIPA) Trust, explained PIPA’s unique integrated approach. Unlike many marine protected areas, the Phoenix Islands were uninhabited, so there were no displacement costs. There were no human activities save for fishing from distant nations. PIPA yielded unorthodox economic opportunities, too, including the licensing of naming rights for undersea mounts. This has been significant in terms of the multiplier effect for health, education and infrastructure, he said.

Teuea Toatu explained that for developing nations like Kiribati, funding is the biggest constraint. As Kiribati President Anote Tong explained in the morning session, PIPA is managed in partnership with Conservation International and the New England Aquarium, but Teuea Toatu said they would like to invite the fishing industry because “while they lose in the short run, they gain in the long run.” For instance, PIPA is an important spawning ground for skipjack tuna.

Richard Kenchington, Professorial Fellow-Australian National Centre for Ocean Resources and Security, explained the need for planning. Step 1 is presenting a vision---how do you want the marine protected area to be in 25 years? Step 2 is identifying objectives within that vision. “Not just yours,” he said, “but everybody’s.” He also noted that spatial planning involves temporal planning. He reminded that all social expectations should be satisfied or compensated.

Finally, there is the outlook report, which draws together the result of monitoring. The report says to the decision-making process, “Under business as usual, this is where we will be in 25 years.”

Takashi Ichioka, General Manager of Ocean Policy Research Foundation, said marine protected areas were working to revitalize ecosystems to preserve fisheries in some areas. Leisure boats and leisure fishermen were appearing in fishing grounds; they could be seen as free riders as they don’t cover the cost of preservation, but they do contribute to the local economy by staying in hotels and eating in restaurants. He also said the Japanese government was studying ways for fisheries to coexist with off-shore wind farms, including wind farm facilities that could function as artificial reefs to raise more fish. Local citizens, including fishermen, could be involved in using these new sea areas, he said.

Later in the session, Takashi Ichioka said harmonization of preservation and use was critical to the success of marine protected areas. Integrated coastal management was one possible solution---they could be coordinated by local governments, but include various stakeholders. Richard Kenchington, meanwhile, expressed both hope and fear: hope that we can pass the enthusiasm and urgency to the next generation, but fear that just as no country is meeting its obligations under the UNCLOS, the same will go for further resolutions.



SESSION 4: Governance and Social Development

Moderator: **Lisa Speer**, Director of International Oceans Program, Natural Resources Defense Council

Keynote speaker **Hugh Govan**, IUCN WCPA Marine Regional Coordinator South and North Pacific, Locally Managed Marine Area Network, discussed locally managed marine areas in the Asia-Pacific region. He noted that many of the countries are poor, with low government effectiveness and high dependency on marine resources, as well as very strong rights of access to marine resources. The result was a “resounding failure” of Western conservation methods, with lots of so-called “paper parks.”

Locally managed marine areas are a response that involves local communities in the planning, implementation and monitoring. There’s been a decade’s worth of progress---there are currently over 500 locally managed maritime areas, in contrast to just 200 of the conventional top-down areas. The question is whether such areas work. According to Hugh Govan, they do---plans implement local priorities and needs. They’ve resulted in cultural recovery, incentives and connections with the government, too. He noted, however, they should be viewed as “contributions to conservation rather than its main objective.”

Sundari Ramakrishna, Conservation Director, WWF-Malaysia, stressed the need for post-implementation planning before funds from overseas are gotten---when the funds are gone, there’s nobody around to continue sustainability. She suggested local conditions should be changed to ensure sustainability, and said benefits should return to the community. Unless benefits devolve to the local community, there will be inequality. Special care should be taken with technology. Such technologies as sustainable aquaculture require a lot of money and know-how that only big players can provide, so they do not benefit local people.

Anne McDonald, Professor at Sophia University’s Graduate School of Global Environmental Studies, cited the need to “integrate traditional knowledge with modern science and technology.” “I don’t think anything will work unless social, cultural and historical relevance is addressed right from the beginning,” she said.

She cited the example of Japan, which is now considering ways to integrate traditional approaches---and traditional synergies---into managing marine areas. Old Japan realized the connection between land-based activities and maritime activities---for instance, fishing communities not just composed of fishermen, but foresters, too. How are land-based activities impacting the maritime environment, she asked, noting that if we integrate better, we will improve marine protected areas.

Anne MacDonald emphasizes how important it is to bring local people along in MPA projects and create a sense of ownership that triggers a longer-term, more sustainable behavior.

Hiroshi Terashima, Executive Director Ocean Policy Research Foundation, said it was perhaps more useful to discuss maritime protected areas under the wider framework of governance in which all the related stakeholders cooperate. In Japan, they’ve implemented 12 basic measures, including conservation of the marine environment, management of the EEZ and coastal zones, conservation of management of islands, promotion of marine industries which carry on and use ocean conservation, and marine education. It’s this broader framework that will help marine protected areas to proceed.

Bernard O’Callaghan, Regional Program Coordinator for IUCN Oceania Regional Office, pointed out that we lack a broad governance structure for the Pacific Ocean, the world’s largest geographic feature and from which two out of every three fish in the world come. He noted that two to three million people live on the ocean, but many more live along its rim. He asked, “Who is responsible for the sustainability of the Pacific?” While countries in the Pacific are taking very great steps, how can countries as small as Kiribati manage in the long run? And who are they doing it for? Some interesting experiences exist though, like the Nauru agreement between countries to manage tuna stocks in the high seas. These efforts provide a benefit to all of us, he observed; the question was how we find broader governance. He also cited an equity issue---we as a global community need to buy into local sustainability efforts and support them.

Michel Petit, President of the Oceanographic Institute, Foundation Albert I Prince of Monaco, reminds that marine biodiversity is still little known. The recent creation of the Intergovernmental Panel on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) could be an opportunity to raise the awareness of policy makers on the threats to marine biodiversity and promote research and monitoring.



Perspectives and conclusions

Moderator: François Simard, Deputy Head and Senior Advisor for Fisheries, IUCN Global Marine and Polar Program

Jay Nelson, Director of Pew Environment Group’s Global Ocean Legacy Project, stressed that working with local people and local governments is a must, as ultimately “it’s the government that makes a decision on whether to preserve an environment.” He also pointed out that “marine protected area” is “an incredibly imprecise word”. “We cannot have standards so easy to achieve that governments can achieve them with a word,” he said, stating that without minimum standard, it’s not very useful to have marine protected area targets.

Tony Haymet, Director for Marine Sciences at Scripps Institution of Oceanography, observed that technology has developed---and gotten cheap enough---to allow for efficient research, as well as easier, effective enforcement, thanks to satellite tracking and pictures. Still, countries have to be able to use these technologies to fight illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing. We know perfectly well what areas we need to protect. He also expressed exasperation with the lack of movement on protecting high seas areas, saying, “Part of me wants to say we know what needs to be done. We should get a coalition of the willing together and declare some of these areas marine parks.”

Donna Petrachenko, Chief Advisor International Biodiversity and Sustainability & Australia’s Commissioner to the International Whaling Commission within the Australian Government Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, said, “You really have to understand what you are trying to protect.” “We need to take a real sustainable view about it,” she remarked. “That’s the environmental, the economic and the social. In order to do that, we have to come back to a discussion from the morning about costs and benefits and evaluation. And one of the problems we have, not just in MPAs, but with oceans more generally, is how do you value the oceans?” Delving further into this, she added, “We also need to look at the costs of natural capital itself. The cost of the intrinsic asset which is the ocean. The benefit of that is what? So it’s not just when we have consumptive use that then gets into the market that we should value it, but by leaving it there untouched, it has values today, and values for future

generations that we don't know yet. We need to look at it within the context of intergenerational equity and oceans are the epitome of that. So we need to look at it from a long-term sustainability view. And if that's the vision, MPAs are the win-win to enable us to do that for future generations.”

Christophe Lefebvre, IUCN Global Ocean Councilor and Coordinator for European and International Affairs for the French Marine Protected Area Agency, pointed out another important reason for the marine protected areas, which is a cultural one. “We need to make a link between man and the ocean. The MPA is a very good tool for getting the message to the public.” He also cited the need for dedicated bodies. “Before the creation of the French Marine Protected Area Agency in 2006, only 0.001% of France’s EEZ was MPA. Now it is 14%. We expect it to be 20% by 2020.” A greater collaboration with economic actors is now needed to go further.

Jihyun Lee, Environmental Affairs Officer, Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), United Nations Environment Program, noted that “effective ocean governance is constrained by sectoral approaches, and we need integrated ecosystem-based management for marine biodiversity conservation and sustainable use.” She also said countries are collaborating, under the framework of the CBD, “step-by-step” to provide scientific information for describing ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs) within and beyond national jurisdiction through a series of regional workshops around the world. Such scientific information can be of great use and facilitate the current discussion among policy makers on international agreements for biodiversity conservation in areas beyond national jurisdiction. Citing the upcoming Conference of Parties meeting of the CBD (COP11, Hyderabad, India), she said when “policymakers are ready; they can move ahead and make informed decisions.”



Closing remarks

Robert Calcagno, CEO of Oceanographic Institute, Foundation Albert I, Prince of Monaco, thanked participants for listening to divergent viewpoints. “Dialogue is not always easy between the different stakeholders and the different countries, but I think it is really essential,” he said. “And right now, I'd like to thank everybody in the room, not only for their input, but perhaps more importantly, their listening and their willingness to understand the point of view of others, which is perhaps even more difficult.”

He stressed the importance of action. “Dialogue is important, but it's not enough. Dialogue needs lead to action,” he said. Summarizing the day’s discussions, he acknowledged that localities were important, that we needed to take into account economic, social, cultural and historical matters, and that we should develop local economies as much as possible. Still, he noted, the local, while important, is not enough to ensure effective action. “We don't want to oppose bottom-up and top-down approaches, but we need to combine both of them,” he said.

H.E.Mr. Bernard Fautrier, plenipotentiary minister and CEO of the Prince Albert II of Monaco Foundation, finished the day by calling on participants to spread the word. “Everyone here must disseminate the work and exchanges we had here to make progress in this field,” he said. “I believe all these opportunities will be seized to speak about what has been exchanged today. I am sure your work today will be of value for all these events and I'd like to think that each of us in our own way can become an ambassador of the Monaco Blue Initiative.”

