

Annex H: Improvements to question suggestions from survey

N.B. Please refer to Annex A containing the original survey, to connect question numbers to survey questions.

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

Set-up
I have little idea what has happened since the MCZ designation, so I have based my reply on situation then & hearsay.
Provide more information on the sites themselves!
Needs a question(s) on the process for identification of MCZs - around the question was it a balanced process that took account of all of the features that were rare, scarce, in decline or threatened with decline or that were representative and preferably the best.
Q10. Identification of stakeholders. The Lundy MPA has assumed the mantle of MCZ after a period of evolution: from voluntary MNR to statutory MNR, SAC and now MCZ, with a NTZ thrown in for good measure! Most relevant stakeholders were identified when the voluntary MNR was established, and contact with these (or the organisations they represent) has continued. So for the Lundy MCZ (which is what this Questionnaire relates to), no formal process of identifying key stakeholders was undertaken - they were there already. The allocation of the MCZ 'title' was a 'fait accompli'.
On some of the questions I have an idea of how to respond but as I'm not 100% certain this makes it difficult to commit - it would be useful to capture that somehow?
Involving people
Aimed at an already invested green lobby. Another box ticking exercise to show pro-active in consultation.
No apart from I don't know enough to really comment on the last two questions as the MPA seems to be quite well hidden and needs to engage with tourism to ensure its protected as tourism and leisure grows
Would be good to have a note on page 1 stating that stakeholder participation is explored in more detail here. (ps typo of stakeholder on Q28)
Well, no one ever really talks about it and when they do they just state they exist without really knowing the features that they're supposed to be protecting. So more education about the MPAs would be good and give a reason for people to care.
Review for typos (see question 8). Could also ask what your interest is as a stakeholder in the North Devon MPA's?
Rephrasing some of the questions, e.g. 'are you aware of (active and inclusive) opportunities ..' 'Would you like to have involvement with MPA management?'. Neither satisfied or dissatisfied option.
the questions aren't that clear....the statement at the top is a bit odd. I.e. 'how well are we doing involving people?' - who is 'we'? the WWF? what is people? - everybody, society, only stakeholders or interested people? same for qu. 7 - are 'people' aware? - does that mean the

general public....if so, i'm not sure how me as an individual would know what the rest of the public think/know.
The options miss the points I would like to make. Do we have an MPA process, is it separate from Pioneer or parallel? Public education is my concern, but there is little so far.
Needs a question on whether you (relevant only to users) actively inform your members/guests/customers of the MCZ?
Surveys of this kind are difficult to respond to as an individual - a group approach where knowledge about a site can be pooled is a better way of getting a truer picture. But a questionnaire will nevertheless yield some useful information. For Lundy, it would be good to do a joint exercise going through the questionnaire with the two committees. The next meetings are around Oct 4th
Q8 and Q9 are hopelessly woolly. For example, when the Estuary Plan was being drawn up, real attempts were made to consult and communicate. But nothing since and I'm not aware of any significant budget for implementation of anything.
Plans & Management Objectives
They appear simplistic and geared towards the general public, many of whom have little, if any knowledge of what socio-economic effects MCZ's have upon sectors of our commercial fishing industry.
Maybe one question asking for further comments about the management of the specific site, before question 25 on general comments. It would be useful to compare MPAs across countries in future versions, as some countries will place more emphasis on different aspects that it would be useful to compare.
I am aware of what should happen when designating and managing an MPA but I am unsure if these processes have been applied or completed for these specific MPA's.
Some background as to who is doing what locally. Basic info re where our MCZ is at, so that our responses don't feel so inadequate.
Include something on monitoring and adaptive management.
I am very uncertain on my responses to these questions - it would be much better to do these in a group situation with individuals who are familiar with the various aspects of the management plans. I have probably "undervalued" the effectiveness of the management plan, but there are definitely some problems to be resolved so cannot award full marks
Having a n/a option
Socio-economic factors cannot be taken into account for SAC designations.
Again, too woolly. Q16, suggested zones do exist but there is no encouragement to observe them. Q17, EU "FLAG" money was available for enabling more sustainable fishing but I am not aware of its being used for the purpose.
Q 23 there has been investigation of finance options - but there is no option for that
Decision making
Explain benefit sharing or what you mean by rules to increase clarity of response to Q37
Not sure about the bold emphasis - is there a reason for this?
Q24 needs to be clearer- valuable question to ask.
Re-order & elaborate the questions to establish how much/little respondent knows about process early on & help them know where you are coming from.
I'm finding these questions quite hard to pick. I think it's because I cant explain my answer - that might be useful
Resourcing
More impartiality in their structure. Questions appear to be leading.

48 and 49 haven't really started for this MPA yet as far as I'm aware. I can't really answer this. Ask the IFCA and NE
Maybe distinguish between inshore and offshore sites (or tailor questions appropriately) given different resource needs (e.g. in terms of survey)
I am actually unsure of most questions
I hope my negative responses re N Devon are just because it is too soon.
A series of questions on the type of person/team need to manage would be helpful.
Question 28 lacks sufficient gradation - the third bullet would be better worded "insufficiently maintained" as in many cases there will be some maintenance but not enough
I'm a little unsure about what you mean by infrastructure and also staff - if staff is IFCA, MMO etc, I wouldn't have a clue if they've performed a capacity assessment.
Monitoring
Leading questions removed
If there is no management plan or monitoring, then the survey could skip these questions. These questions are quiet wordy and could perhaps be simplified. Q 46 could perhaps be separated as sometimes biological factors would be monitored but not socio-economic issues (or vice versa)
They seem addressed to properly resourced MPAs unlike ours & my responses reflect my frustration at this..
Results
Why bold on some questions and not others - may introduce bias
Maybe a "too early to say" option for sites recently designated or where management plan is in development.
I hope I am wrong about some of the above. These telling questions would be better up front
Should include an open question on how to assess how the MPA is 'doing'. Also, an open question on how the MPA and the reasons for notifying it can be promoted.
This doesn't allow for MPAs which are recent and don't yet have management or monitoring in place.