

Annex G: Comments and suggestions provided for each set of themed questions

N.B. Please refer to Annex A containing the original surveys to connect referenced question numbers to survey question.

Link to [The Compass Pilot Report for North Devon](#)

Set-up
<p>ground-truthing habitat types with other stakeholders and data sets as a tool to build common ground and shared interests in the resulting area. Once agreed there will be a basis for all future discussions and negotiations, as well as clearly founded social capital with a collective desire to see good management put in place. The management process needs to be one of co-production of knowledge and measures, resulting in co-management and collaboration across the board. Using a different narrative and language frame of reference will also help, as this can be used constructively to create a shared understanding and 'story' for any given site. It would be good to use the language of 'wilding' in marine contexts, as this could then open up notions of non-intervention (with no-take at the heart of this) and letting the marine environment recover what it will. The key with the Biosphere is that there is an opportunity to join up wilding with terrestrial processes as run-off from land is a factor in altered ecology, as is the removal of shellfish, fishing, tourism and other interventions. Scale is also an issue. I appreciate that Lundy is a no-take reserve and it could be interesting to communicate this through the lens of re-wilding.</p>
<p>Defra dropped the ball during the regional Finding Sanctuary process. They should have allowed the regional stakeholder groups to set management measures post identification of sites. This never happened, people got jaded, site designation has therefore meant little, and interest and support has therefore waned. Poor work by Defra when Finding Sanctuary was doing so well (up until 2010). Let stakeholders be supported by finance to more fully integrate with regulators (e.g. IFCA's) in decision making. Also make sure that the input of stakeholders is balanced (not biased towards those who shout loudest), and ensure that civil society that don't use the sea that much is also factored into decision-making process. Furthermore, enable funding of economic modelling of scenarios of management. For example, if trawling is banned, and potting and gill-netting allowed, what are the economic ramifications. What also are the tourism benefits of bag limits for recreational angling? Are there economic benefits that arise from such measures etc. i.e. Don't (as is the current case) create depressing economic impact assessments of management decisions based on economic loss of restriction, but instead balance this with the gain for those that will be enabled to use the site, and benefit from greater biological richness at the site.</p>
<p>Consistent opportunity for engagement i.e. through ongoing Taw-Torridge Estuary Forum</p>
<p>Depending on the location and nature of the MPA, the underlying reasons for setting up the MPA need to be as clear as possible, and MPA authorities need to be bold in promoting the need (including legal need) for their establishment. Often MPAs are introduced to stakeholders almost apologetically.</p>
<p>The present processes are necessary to allow all stakeholders to have representation</p>
<p>Greater academic input from universities, the MBA etc</p>

The MCZ process was flawed in three main ways: 1. It used the Ecological Network Guidance as a prescriptive tool and that tool was developed to satisfy the scientifically indefensible goal of an 'ecologically coherent network'. 2. Commercial interests were brought to the fore very early in the process and experienced scientists were generally not able to contribute substantially (sometimes because of lack of availability). 3. Any deviation (that may have been meaningful) from the ENG was not permitted.

Lundy should be used as a model - stakeholders must take ownership of an MPA for it to be successful.

Better research and science to support the reserve status, rather than just taking anecdotal evidence

they should be seen as a whole not a set of features.

Involving people

Direct discussion with users and feedback to know whether anything has been taken onboard

Listen to fishermen and learn from their knowledge

Get this linked up with all the other marine and tourism groups

Co-production, co-management and co-creation of ideas surrounding future plans for the MPA

use the Community Voice Method

Communicate the MPA as clearly as possible, making it relevant to their connection with the site. Be bold with your case for the site. Keep engagement regular (eg through monthly updates) even during quieter periods.

Needs more communication to general public about MPA - why it exists what are it's aims and objectives

Cross-channel England and Wales management group/committee with public engagement/outreach agenda

Better interpretation. Engage with groups that are regularly engaging with the public ie. National Trust, AONB, Biosphere, interest groups and give us tools to engage better with the public. This could be videos for social media, interpretation displays in educational centres etc.

More information available for the public onsite about the designations and reasons for the designations

Run stakeholder engagement events to discuss the progress of the MPA's in North Devon around the implementation cycle (designation, management, monitoring).

Public awareness of marine protected areas is a major issue. There is not enough awareness of the existence of sites. If people knew the sites were there then they would be more inclined to show an interest in how they are managed.

Better connection with other organisations that have an ethos of protecting the environment, such as RSPB, English Heritage, Ramblers.

not sure really how to engage with more people, better awareness, social media, campaigns,?

Tell them about it, the who what where why and when. Guide them about options, don't assume we know anything about what's been going on, most don't.

Scheme(s) to endorse the activities of commercial organisations that play an active role within the MCZ - either as users or promoters - endorsement schemes.

Q30 - hard to say, although I suspect few stakeholders feel ownership or responsibility for the MPA

Lundy might be unusual in having both the Lundy Management Forum and the MPA Advisory Group which means a lot meetings and efforts to co-ordinate across groups but it seems to work well and has good participation - so a useful model for other MPAs
Public newsletter
De-mystify the 'subject area'. A lot of people do not feel technically qualified to engage in protection conversations (myself included) without any background knowledge of species, marine life, pollutants, disturbances etc.
Advisory groups work very well as do accreditation schemes for local operators as it gives them a sense of purpose and ownership
Stakeholder workshops once a site is designated, where the basis of the site is explained and management needs are described, followed by input from stakeholders on the best way to manage. Measures will always be more successful if those affected have been involved in development.
Have an effective Estuary Officer covering the whole estuary. He or she would have clout to help make policy and would be the public face to communicate that policy and enforce where necessary.
Perhaps the existence of the Advisory (Stakeholders) Group could be better publicised to a wider public. However, there is only space for so many at the meetings! make it more interesting - help general public to understand their purpose
Plans & Management Objectives
No take zone completely around the island as that is what most of our customers think
It's become glaringly obvious over the years that IFCA's are NOT there to help the fishing industry or listen to their concerns. Indeed, their agenda appears to be quite the opposite. They criminalise our fishermen and seem only interested in prosecutions. They certainly don't work alongside the industry which is vital for a sustainable fishery. Trust within the Industry towards the local IFCA's is at an all time low. Most of them seem to comprise of graduates with a marine biology degree who know nothing about the fishing industry and who operate with their own green agenda regardless of the socio-economic costs to the fishing industry. Conservation needs to be more proportionate, something our IFCA's appear to have little interest in achieving.
I would like to know more when its finished
Co-production of knowledge, measures, communications and benefits.
Start by doing one!
Management plans must be developed through an open transparent process, involving early stakeholder engagement. Better to do it right than do it quick but stakeholders must be engaged throughout the process. Site objectives need to clearly link to the scientific reasons for establishing the site and the features being protected. It should be clear how the objectives relate to/influence management action to reduce the pressures threatening these objectives. Management plans should have a simple, accessible front-end, available on mobile phones. Any zones should have clear boundaries that can be accessed or are visible on the water. Management is only as good as the monitoring and enforcement. Resources for these should be considered during the site identification phase (but should not be used as an excuse not to take sites forward), based on sustainable finance mechanisms
How can the plan allow for small sustainable and 'artisan fisheries' which get caught up in blanket bans
Conservation advice packages and condition assessments of sites should be produced by Natural England. They are the starting blocks for management plans. Lack of resources and funding hinders the productions of such products.
Yes. Are these processes underway, if so by whom and to whom are they reporting, could they include local interest groups and the media.

The well-established hierarchy of goal(s), objectives, tasks in a management plan need to be addressed and populated.
[Talking about Bideford] Q17 - MCZs do not have a management plan but currently have management advice package from Natural England or JNCC - this in itself is a problem as this leads to interpretation issues of the designation. This site still does not have NE management advice notes two years since designation. Q18 - The site does have a 'general management approach' for each environmental factor identified in the designation. However, these do not constitute objectives as there are no clear criteria or measures of success. These are also very unambitious - of 20 protected feature types only 2 have a 'recover' GMA. It is difficult to ascertain how many environmental factors have not been protected by the MCZ. Q19 - socio-economic factors were taken into account at both the Finding Sanctuary and consultation phases of designation - how 'ambitious' these were is hard to say. I would prefer to see socio-economic factors being removed from the designation process and instead applied at the implementation phase - if a site warrants designating for environmental reasons, it should be designated regardless of socio-economic impacts, but these can be mitigated through other processes later. Q21 - while the protected features are mapped and protection revolves around these, there is not defined zonation for this MPA. However other MPAs (e.g. Skerries Bank MCZ in South Devon) do use a form of zonation based around historical fishing agreements.
If they exist these need to be accessible to all those who may be responsible for any part of delivery/activity around a marine area. This may have to be presented in a format that people can identify, or have already been identified, as owners of actions within the plan.
Not all MPA plans need to consider a business plan - it depends entirely on the
Depends on the driver for the site - there is more opportunity with domestic-led MPAs than international designations which follow a prescribed format. We should focus on an integrated plan rather than just on individual sites as a standalone project.
Decision making
IFCA's need a governing body. At the moment they investigate themselves
Make them more visual and apparent to visitors and locals
MMO does regulation and major industry licensing. It works reactively. IFCA does fisheries, and probably (given track record of Cornwall/Devon IFCAs) do it pro-actively and well with fisheries stakeholders. However, the MMO is really poor when it comes to regulating recreational activities that damage habitats that are rare or threatened inside OR outside MPAs (such as seagrass beds).
Make one organisation responsible for overall site management and consideration of cumulative impacts. Each pressure is currently being considered separately for most English sites.
Too many agencies involved. One stop shop access to decisions etc, charged with publicising outcomes & raising public awareness
An MCZ authority is needed for each MCZ. That 'authority' may be one or several existing statutory authorities. It is informed by 'a user group'. It has a process for receiving reports (monitoring etc.) and other submissions and feeding those into adaptive management. It is able to commission studies and monitoring to inform adaptive management based on the objectives developed.
If it doesn't exist already, a single entity should have responsibility for decision making.
This would need thought and discussion with the various organisations involved in management. Question 24 is very unclear - what is meant by "rules to help share access to benefits"?
An Estuary Officer, as above.
Resourcing
private funding
Public body. Funds are readily made available

There are so many small groups all doing similar rolls in North Devon and they need to be under one umbrella
Tax the users of the sites. Car park fees to marine management. Boat access fees to marine management. Fishing, ports and other fees to marine management. We tax for many things, but not use and protection of the marine environment. IFCAs are too stretched, and need further capital and personal capacity to monitor activities at sea. LAs could do with wardens that monitor terrestrial access, and use by recreational users.
Local taxation (e.g. Somerset Rivers Authority)
Local officers for coastal and inshore sites funded jointly by local and central government. Contribution to resources from other government departments that license activities with an interest in the site. A long-term institutional investment fund for MPA management and an independent MPA management delivery body (?) Consideration of long term resource needs (not just socio-economic impacts) from an earlier stage in the designation process.
Devon and Severn IFCA need more staff to police these sites.
The IFCA and Natural England need more staff and access to inshore survey vessels and equipment to carry out effective monitoring and enforcement.
Partnership with other like minded organisations.
No. I lack knowledge.
Management needs to be supported by staff with relevant knowledge and experience of the ecology and special features of the area. If not available, that information needs to be obtained. Financially, there may be subscription schemes but, really, management needs to be resourced through Government organisations.
Q42 - there are no dedicated staff to this site, although I'm sure the staff of individual organisations are well skilled in their own sphere. The only UK designations I am aware of that have resulted in staff being employed to directly manage are NNRs and Natura 2000 sites. Where staff are employed to directly manage the sites and enforce the designation, it generally results in a better environmental outcome.
I am not aware that there is sufficient resource to fully implement an MPA management plan and all of the needed actions.
Endless discussions about this in all the management committee meetings!
More staff and funding is needed to support the MPA.
Need to consider better use of resource - kill two birds with one stone rather than trying to do everything independently. e.g. monitoring of one thing may also be suitable for monitoring of another.
Monitoring
better funding
Are you serious? Fishing vessels are tracked, monitored and prosecuted on a regular basis, even if the evidence is spurious to say the least.
Require central sharing of relevant information where possible. Ring fence monitoring resources and secure wider funding options where possible. Use citizen science programmes where relevant.
Proactive surveillance, iVMS being rolled out and stakeholder engagement increased to promote trust and increase reporting of infringements.
Presumably IFCAS is the main agency at work here but hardly relevant to inter-tidal MCZ, & we lack any local marine expertise to lead and promote drive for monitoring
'Monitoring' should include quality (biodiversity features), compliance and governance.
Q46-7 - the IFCA monitor some fishing activity and I believe there is some environmental monitoring done periodically. Q48 - there is no management plan Q49 - there is no mgt plan although IFCA do enforce their byelaws

I am not aware if there is sufficient resource to fully protect marine areas through surveillance.
Another ongoing topic of discussion
Funding and resources are needed to ensure effective enforcement, however if all stakeholders are engaged effectively then they self-police the MPA.
Need to approach from a marine spatial planning approach and work on a wider scale rather than site by site.
Use stakeholders that use the MPAs: Fishers, divers, surfers, etc
Results
The situation with this - and many MPAs speaks for itself. Indeed, one IFCA chief once put it to me that we need to 'operationalise' our MPAs. i.e. show they are working, doing something for someone, or something. That has happened in a few 'key' MPAs, and we need these geographically and politically selected such that the efforts of the 'node' or 'key' MPAs can spill-over into adjacent areas (perhaps). i.e. every 500km of coast 'needs a lundy'.
How can there be delivery of improved ecology and socio economic benefits unless there is a baseline and ongoing monitoring (Q36 / 37) There is not enough communication with public about MPA aims objectives and what it is trying to achieve (see Q1?)
Get tougher.
The questions are comprehensive and cover a large range of aspects, so to collate a good overall picture will require participation by a range of organisational representatives.
Yes start work on the MPA and publicise it
Communication regarding value and the success of the MPA is largely undertaken in relation to whether (or not) conservation and management objectives are being achieved.
Q52 - there is no mgt plan and no clear objectives. It is unlikely the site is in favourable condition as it was only recently designated with 'recover' GMAs included. Q53 - there are no clear objectives. However it has changed some fishing activity (e.g. that affecting spiny lobster) which is an important impact of the designation. Q54 - this question is unclear - the designation is moving things in a good direction in terms of environmental protection (e.g. limiting take of spiny lobster) although hard to say in terms of broader 'effect'.
I am not aware of were to look for this type of information - as a member of the community it doesn't appear in places that I go - i.e. local community hubs, local newspapers/social media sites etc.
Still early days.
Diving in the MPA is as good as it ever was I have noticed no improvement or deterioration in sites dived on an annual basis