

XVI Consultative Committee Meeting on Large Marine Ecosystems and Coastal partners.
Paris (FR) 8-11 July 2014



Summary report

(Final draft – 15OCT2014)

Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Session summaries	4
SESSION 1: Putting the LME Global Partnership in Motion	4
SESSION 2: Knowledge and best governance practices: Tools, data and information	5
SESSION 3: Global and regional networks	10
SESSION 4: Capacity development.....	12
SESSION 5: Communication, dissemination and outreach	14
3. LME Regional caucuses.....	16
4. Conclusions.....	23

Annexes:

- Agenda
- List of participants
- Survey results



Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO Marine Policy and Regional Coordination Section

Rapporteurs:

Hein Rune Skjoldal, Rudolf Hermes, David Vousden, Hashali Hamukuaya, Patrick Debels, Laetitia Langlois, Chloé Orland, Vinicius Lindoso, Marie Kerguelen-Fuchs

Summary report :

Julian Barbière, Alejandro Iglesias-Campos, Joseph Ansong Onwona

Paris (France) 15 October 2014

1. Introduction

This report includes a summary of each session of the 16th Consultative Committee Meeting on Large Marine Ecosystems and Coastal Partners that took place in Paris from 8 to 11 July 2014.

The purpose of the Annual LME meeting was to provide a global forum for GEF-funded marine and coastal leaders and institutions, aimed at sharing experiences and lessons with respect to ecosystem-based governance. In contrast to previous years, the meeting was expanded to encompass not only LME projects, but other marine and coastal initiatives supported by the GEF, including ICM and MPA efforts in keeping with the upcoming Community of Practice (COP) Project in order to:

- **Foster a mutually supportive global network of leaders and institutions engaged in marine and coastal ecosystem based management by providing a forum for project leaders (i.e. LME , ICM, MPA, among others) to discuss experiences and lessons learned;**
- **Mobilize knowledge resources, new scientific applications and tools to support project implementation and organizational action related to priority knowledge topics;**
- **Review the progress of regional marine and coastal projects,, disseminating best practices amongst projects and discuss emerging issues requiring common responses**
- **Share lessons learned from existing efforts with regard to the LME Governance project priorities (i.e. regional networks, capacity building training and twinning) and identify future priorities to help guide the COP Project;**

IOC as the lead executing agency supporting the Community of Practice project and Secretariat for the Project Coordination Unit provided Technical assistance for the Annual LME and Coastal Partners Meeting. A planning committee composed of GEF, NOAA, UNDP, ICES, IUCN, IOC and a small group of LME project managers provided guidance on the development of the meeting programme and identification of speakers and session chairs.

Consequently, the primary objective of the 2014 meeting was to set the framework for the COP Project partnership, operationalising its objectives and expected outcomes and engaging marine and coastal project leaders in meeting those objectives.

Building on the 4 main project components defined in the project document, the meeting was structured according to four building blocks as follows:

1. Building Global and regional **networks** of partners to enhance ecosystem-based management and to provide support for the GEF-IW LME/ICM/MSP/MPA projects.
2. Mobilizing **knowledge**, capturing best LME governance practices, and developing new tools to enhance the effective management of LME, ICM, and MPAs
3. Strengthening capacity and partnership building through **twinning**, learning exchanges and training among LMEs and similar initiatives.
4. Providing **communication**, dissemination and outreach of GEF LME/ICM/MSP/MPA project achievements and lessons learned.

2. Session summaries

SESSION 1: Putting the LME Global Partnership in Motion	
Chair	Julian Barbière, IOC-UNESCO
Experts/Speakers	Ned Cyr, Kenneth Sherman, Leah Karrer, Julian Barbière, David Aubrey, Rudolf Hermes, Hein Rune Skjoldal
Expected outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A common vision of where the GEF-funded marine and coastal community wants to be in 15 years - A brief assessment of the challenges in terms of transboundary management that marine and coastal projects need to address - Engaged marine and coastal project community on the objectives of the LME COP project
Recommendations	See specific recommendations for each Regional Caucus.
General description of the session	
<p>This session was an opportunity to take stock of 16 years of marine and coastal projects and consultative LME meetings, and highlight the progress achieved in advancing ecosystem assessment and management. Through GEF's catalysing support, in several parts of the world, we are experiencing an ecosystem paradigm moving forward from single-species to multi-species to multi-sector management and holistic approaches incorporating the human dimension as part of the LME process. GEF Secretariat provided its vision for the next 15 years of marine and coastal project implementation, highlighting opportunities and challenges. The objectives and expected outcomes of the Global LME COP project was presented, providing a framework for organizing present and future annual consultative meetings.</p>	
Brief summary of each presentation considering the main messages and those references which can be applicable in the LME context	
<p>16 years of LME assessments <i>Ned Cyr, Kenneth Sherman, NOAA</i></p>	<p>Mr. Sherman described and summarized the recent progress in LME (history, meetings, workshops, symposia, publications, projects) as the strong scientific foundations (both natural and social) to support ecosystem-based management (EBM) of LMEs. He also described the modular assessment for sustainable development and LME governance breakthroughs. He concluded by announcing future plans to assist the LME Network in EBM coordination and integration of an estimated \$3.5 billion in GEF supported EBM projects in fisheries recovery and sustainability, pollution and ecosystem health, habitat recovery, Marine Protected Areas (MPAs), Integrated Coastal Management (ICM), Marine Spatial Planning (MSP).</p>
<p>GEF Support to LME Projects: Vision for the future <i>Leah Karrer, GEF</i></p>	<p>Ms. Karrer provided a general overview on how the GEF works and what is new in terms of focal areas and integrated approach by describing the IW Transboundary Regional Projects (Cross Project Knowledge Building & Sharing: IWLearn & TWAP & LME Governance) and of the LME Governance Project (activities and priorities).</p>
<p>LME Transboundary governance issues (drawing from Al Duda's paper on IW governance) <i>Julian Barbière, IOC-UNESCO</i></p>	<p>Mr Barbière presented the results of the paper on IW Governance prepared by Dr. Alfred Duda with recommendations on transboundary governance, more specifically related to outcomes & outputs of the Global Governance Project to improve governance in GEF LME projects in the International Waters focal area and integrate ICM/MSP/MPAs into them. The IW Governance paper included an introduction of the LME Governance Review Paper and the GEF International Waters Focal Area with a summary of the GEF Strategy for International Waters in which the LMEs provide a framework for ecosystem-based approaches to management of LMEs at multiple scales.</p>

<p>Overview of the GEF Global LME Project on Governance and audience <i>David Aubrey, IOC-UNESCO</i></p>	<p>Mr. Aubrey presented the objectives, project components, budget and management arrangements of the project proposal “Strengthening Global Governance of Large Marine Ecosystems and Their Coasts through enhanced sharing and application of LME/ICM/MPA knowledge and information tools”. Among the most relevant objectives, the project will improve global ecosystem-based governance of LMEs and their coasts by generating knowledge, building capacity, harnessing public and private partners, and supporting south-to-south learning and north-to-south learning.</p>
--	---

-

SESSION 2: Knowledge and best governance practices: Tools, data and information	
Chair	Ned Cyr, NOAA
Experts/Speakers	Charles Ehler, Patricio Bernal, Amy Rosenthal, Jeff Adkins, Peter Edwards, Rudolf Hermes, Kristen Honey, Albert Fischer, Ward Appeltans, Kadji Okou, Marc Taconet, Sherry Heileman, Dan Laffoley, Simon Costanzo, Kenneth Sherman, Keith Lawrence, Steven Lutz
Expected outcomes	<p>For the 2014 meeting, 4 topics have been identified, which are of importance to the LME community, these are :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EBM tools to support LME/ICM/MPA with emphasis on Marine Spatial Planning - Economic valuation tools - Data and information management for marine and coastal projects - Incorporating climate change/OA models in marine and coastal management
Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Many ecosystems approaches were not available twenty years ago - The LME projects have been successfully innovative (as have the sciences outside the project) - Not one size fits all
General description of the session	
<p>This session provided the context to incorporate knowledge and science application into policy making; it captured best LME practices on governance and the development of new methods and tools to enhance the effective management of LME. The aim was to have a discussion about tools: Ecosystem-based tools (emphasis on MPA), Economic evaluation, Data, How to incorporate climate change models (OA) into the LME project. A discussion (in panel format) on the application of these tools in each particular thematic area was initiated.</p>	
Brief summary of each presentation considering the main messages and those references which can be applicable in the LME context	
<p>Marine Spatial Planning in Practice <i>Charles Ehler, IOC Consultant</i></p>	<p>Mr. Ehler emphasized the need to work across levels of government through MSP, which is not a tool, but a process, that has already been in practice for about 10 years (in some places 15 years), and today there are 40 countries that have initiated projects in MSP. IOC organized 9 years ago the first international workshop on MSP yielding the proceedings and common definitions of what the MSP community of interest was trying to do. Nowadays, many drivers of MSP have little to do with fisheries as other drivers such as wind farms or MPAs have been identified.</p>
<p>MSP in Practice: Transitioning from Planning to Implementation <i>Hannah Thomas, UNEP</i></p>	<p>Ms. Thomas cites that the challenges that prevent countries from implementing MSP have to be identified to ensure effective implementation. It is also noted that the challenges faced by</p>

	<p>practitioners are consistent in both developed and developing countries. Among other enabling factors a strong stakeholder engagement, good data and tools, sufficient resources, good legal framework and a well-designed process should be considered.</p>
<p>IUCN Toolkit of Toolkits <i>Patricio Bernal, IUCN Consultant</i></p>	<p>The IUCN toolkit of toolkits guides users through a rich variety of ecosystem based management tools for coastal regions. It helps in the selection of best alternatives for field interventions. Mr. Bernal also informed that the self-contained, 5 chapter guidance document is available for mapping guidance. And the IUCN with diverse membership and an executive council of 40 members have made them adapt it to a varied group of users. This diversity has sharpened their ability to produce these kinds of tools</p>
<p>Integrating Nature's Values into Coastal management: Using InVEST in Belize <i>Amy Rosenthal, WWF</i></p>	<p>Ms. Rosenthal presented the InVEST Project as a reference to build capacity and exchange knowledge. InVEST integrated valuation with a toolbox integrating 20 ecosystem services (terrestrial, freshwater, coastal, marine), production function approach by enabling conditions such as policy questions, policy windows, people, pertinent data, and iterative science-policy process. Once these conditions were identified, implementation began.</p> <p>The creation of zones of human activity, with subsequent development of alternative scenarios for Belize's coastal zone: 1) focused on conservation; 2) informed management: blends strong conservation goals with current and future needs for coastal development; 3) development-led vision, prioritizing development needs over long-term sustainability.</p>
<p>Data to monitor the US Ocean and Great Lakes' economy <i>Jeff Adkins, NOAA</i></p>	<p>Mr. Adkins discussed the economic sectors in their scope and the indicators being used for monitoring. With live demonstration he showed how to access the data. With ocean-dependent sector employing more people than most sectors it's important to assess the complex economic process as local and state data differs sometimes wildly from regional data, and it is important to recognize these local contexts and make data available to decision makers and stakeholders. Suggestion: see what statistics are available for your respective countries, and look at what you can do to render that data to make it easier to use.</p>
<p>Application of socio-economic monitoring in coastal areas: Its role in supporting economic valuation ecosystem services <i>Peter Edwards, NOAA</i></p>	<p>The subject of the presentation was the Global Socioeconomic Monitoring Initiative for Coastal Management (SocMon) which is mainly undertaken in tropical developing countries. An important aspect of SocMon is to gather site-tailored information that is validated by the communities. SocMon has good potential for application in EBM: role in ecosystem service valuation, providing stakeholder information for decision-making. SocMon is useful for managers as the manuals can be used for creating terms of reference for consultants. LME Coastal Partners therefore provides an excellent platform for meaningful engagement (institutionalizing socioeconomic monitoring approach, and assisting to scale up monitoring from site level to project level).</p>
<p>Approach to ecosystem services valuation in the Bay of Bengal <i>Rudolf Hermes, BOBLME</i></p>	<p>Implemented and executed by the FAO, and funded by the GEF, Norway and Sweden, the Bay of Bengal LME project includes four Southeast Asian and four South Asian countries, with coverage of 6.2 million square km and 450 million coastal people affected.</p> <p>An economic valuation of ecosystem services is carried out to inform the finalization and future implementation of the SAP, in response to the perceived "undervaluation" in particular of non-extractive ecosystem services, e.g. preventing coastal erosion in Sri Lanka which will lead to</p>

	<p>improved disaster risk reduction and resilience to climate change and natural disasters. Total value of Myanmar coastal mangrove forests is well above 2 billion US\$ per year, while extracted forest products have a value of just 20 million US\$.</p> <p>The economic valuation will include both use values (direct, indirect, and option) and non-use “existence” values and “make the economic case” for investing in actions to address the threats to natural resources and the environment. It will also identify economic policy instruments that can be used to generate finance and incentives for ecosystem conservation and sustainable use.</p>
<p>Best practices for responsible tourism, water-energy nexus and innovative partnership <i>Kristen Honey, AAAS / Stanford University</i></p>	<p>The initiative is to look at “bright spots” examples (i.e. finding what works in a context and trying to replicate it elsewhere), leveraging economic valuation tools and expanding the LME framework with new indicators from trillion dollar industries. The project includes 1) The Capital Project (InVEST and RIOS), for water-shed management; China is using InVEST to do a first-ever national assessment of ecosystem services. Latin American stakeholders helped develop RIOS, 2) Center for Ocean Solutions that works to solve the major problems facing the ocean and prepares leaders to take on these challenges. 3) Water-Energy Nexus through the LME socioeconomics and governance to leverage existing partnerships to tackle the water-energy challenges, and 4) responsible tourism with the Centre for Responsible Travel (CREST): Training on sustainable tourism. In conclusion, different methodologies exist for economic valuation being important to draw as much as possible from peer review.</p>
<p>Ocean Observation and Ecosystem Monitoring <i>Albert Fischer, GOOS, IOC-UNESCO</i></p>	<p>Presentation focused on encouraging LME initiatives to cooperate with the GOOS regional alliances: an observing system in the most general sense can be an important link to the project. GOOS and GCOS provide an overall framework: the idea is to measure more biological elements, but also to integrate new physical and biogeochemical observations. It’s also identifying essential climate ocean and biodiversity variables most feasible to observe and what has the most impact for investment.</p>
<p>Oceanographic Data and Information Systems – IODE support to LMEs <i>Ward Appeltans, IODE, IOC-UNESCO</i></p>	<p>IODE as a network of data centres is a program of IOC established in 1961, to exchange oceanographic data and information with free access for member states. Mainly offering training courses for data providers, it has the vision of coming up with a guideline on conducting the census for marine life. The statistics for each LME are available for access through Oceandocs, OceanExpert, OBIS and Marine Atlases.</p>
<p>ICES Data Systems for Ocean Governance <i>Kadji Okou, ICES</i></p>	<p>ICES is a thematic data centre for regional commission and also provides advice to fisheries commissions. There is no socio-economic data; most of the data is from regional sea commissions. There is the need to move to integrated ecosystem assessment of data which is a possibility to serve as data for LME.</p>
<p>iMarine Project <i>Marc Taconet, FAO</i></p>	<p>IMarine project born in 2011 brings together hardware and software data resources while ensuring a human component through virtual research environment (like in a wiki). This affords a user to load his own data to become open source with the capacity for data analysis with huge processing capacity. There is also the possibility to disseminate information through a mobile application.</p>
<p>GEF Transboundary Water Assessment Programme (TWAP): LME Data Products <i>Sherry Heileman, TWAP-LME Coordinator (IOC)</i></p>	<p>IOC/MPR is leading the Large Marine Ecosystem component of TWAP of which results will provide a better understanding of coastal and marine emerging issues such as overfishing, habitat destruction and pollution that have been identified as among the priority environmental issues in LMEs by GEF LME projects, as well as on socioeconomics and</p>

	governance. For each theme, a number of indicators and metrics are being used in the global baseline comparative assessment of LME status, future trends and associated drivers, and the consequences for humans.
Interactive platform for enhanced LME outreach – Working with Google Earth Layers <i>Dan Laffoley, IUCN</i>	This is about getting better information to many people to promote better decision making and also looking at how LMEs can be brought together with MPA's. The need for policy makers to understand LME was emphasised. Partnership between Google and Mission Blue to bring a regional perspective (LME) calls for the need to prioritize actions and budget them. Work is ongoing between UNEP and WCPA to use map engines to see how LMEs relate to MPAs. IUCN is looking to work with the latest technology, with underwater street view. It is a two way process and the location of all the sites is shown on the website but the user can also put up his own photos in order to get a 100% managed environment.
Information synthesis, communication and dissemination <i>Simon Costanzo, IAN/UMCES</i>	There is a need to get all that information into a fashion that managers can use, the problem is that the relationship between the decision making and the decision making quality is not adequate and there can be an information overload. We are also faced with bridging the divide between scientists and policy. The information that IAN/UMCES is synthesizing is such that they can provide it to politicians and give some ownership of that product. The great scientists were very good at communicating. Ecosystem health card is now being used while synthesizing text and capacity building is ongoing through diagrams to bridge language barriers
Climate Change and Fisheries Biomass Yields <i>Kenneth Sherman, NOAA</i>	Data from NOAA shows a significant increase in global warming on a decadal scale. We found a trail significantly faster than reported by the IPCC which is 82 to 06. Looking at the temperature of three LMEs and plotting the main fisheries biomass yield for the same time period and we see an increasing trend for these three northern plateaus leading to the observation of increasing physical effect of stratification. The LMEs within that belt are extremely important for food security and commercial purposes and stratification is a problem for food security, commercial purposes and increase in sea food demand. Another expert is also predicting an increase in sea food demand as population grows.
Coping with climate change through strong and flexible governance models <i>Keith Lawrence, Conservation International</i>	Conservation International focuses on the response to climate change through the need to integrate flexible and strong governance models by strategic data collection process for decision making and having a high capacity manager. Examples of flexible governance include Panama tourism micro entrepreneurs and Brazil is about strengthening fishing cooperatives and we are starting with RFMO. Also the Bird's Head seascape having a model of sustainable management built on traditional network of MPA. There is also a need for adjustment in management activities concerning fish species and a more trans boundary approach, mitigation approach such as the Blue Carbon initiative.
GEF Blue Forests Project: The Blue Carbon+ concept <i>Steven Lutz, GEF Blue Forests Project</i>	Blue Carbon+ is a new concept; it goes beyond coastal carbon and includes other approaches to support conservation and sustainable management. When coastal habitats, which act as carbon stores, are lost, many other ecosystem services are lost too which becomes a relevant issue in the LME context. .
Filling gaps and creating capacities in the CCLME <i>Luis Valdes, IOC-UNESCO</i>	Luis Valdes presented some initiatives undertaken under the frame of IOC-UNESCO extra-budgetary project <i>Enhancing oceanography capacities on Western Africa countries</i> (funded by the Spanish Agency for International cooperation development). This is a product oriented project and one of its main pillars is <u>Making existing data accessible</u> , aiming to facilitate and enhance the access to scientific data and make it more accessible to scientist, policy makers, industry and civil society. To

this aim, a *Directory of Atmospheric, Hydrographic and Biological datasets for the Canary Current Large Marine Ecosystem* has been elaborated and it contains 100 datasets and databases, including surveys, tide gauges, moorings and time-series sites among others. Another pillar of the project is Analyzing data and delivering information products. In this sense, a prototype of a GIS dynamic viewer has been developed to explore, analyse and compare data with the aim to produce new scientific knowledge. This viewer already has a menu with some analytical tools allowing the user to compare the available data and to obtain environmental and ecological indices. These tools are still in a test phase, and therefore the application will not be open to the public. The third pillar is oriented to enhance capacity building by the organization of Technical Workshops in the CCLME, for instance a dedicated workshop on “Upwelling and environmental indices” was organized and co-funded by IOC-UNESCO and held in Casablanca, Morocco, 08-10 April 2014, which was attended by 15 CCLME scientists.

Brief summary of the main issues of the discussion

Discussion on EBM tools:

- Governance is not a tool problem, it is a process problem. Governance will not improve just because we have a new governance tool. In terms of governance measurement, the Ocean Health Index is a good means of measurement, but needs to separate governance and environmental conditions. Tried to use the various tools available, but came back in the end to using the Ocean Health Index, which works well in a regional analysis.
- Hard for administrations to handle community-input because they are top-down, rather than bottom-up.
- People have different ideas about what governance means, must also think of the legal/political perspective. All of these ideas need to be implemented by the government: more institutional analyses are needed. What about harmonization of legislation through a country or regionally? Must look into sovereignty dynamics further.
- We refer to governance in two ways: 1) institutional arrangement, 2) more general meaning, must consider all of the power-holding forces, not only government, but also economic actors, and civil society members (example: investing in a cash crop aquaculture or in a food security aquaculture). Most countries today would prefer socio-economic development goals. Governance is needed in regards to the political goals you set to yourself.
- We might be in a different place in ten years, but for now the most we could hope for is an incremental step where countries will try to harmonize their national policies.

Discussion on economic valuation tools:

- Any evaluation is great to get discussion going. The first evaluation gives a sense of where the gaps are, for example in Latin America each country used a different methodology. Only in Ecuador did the evaluation translate into policies – ecosystem valuations are a decision-making tool, they can orient decision-making so their methodology needs to be very fine-tuned, must try to integrate as many different approaches as possible.
- Regarding the differences in methodology, it is important to draw from peer-review literature, but journals are biased toward innovation. They don't publish as much cases of re-application of existing methods to a different context. Within any discipline, there will be methodological differences, and even depending on the level of evaluation it is important to discuss all types of methodology.
- How much should we be thinking about a single standardized evaluation methodology? We, as LME CoP, need some basic approaches, but has to come out of exchanges, and needs to be adaptable. We need a diverse suite of tools, particularly for a group of diverse programs. However, the LME program can think about standardized data reporting on metrics. That will give outputs that everyone will understand.
- Nevertheless, if there are differences in the methodology, they should be different on purpose and not because there was no coordination. And if there has to be differences, they shouldn't just be there for the sake of innovation.

- Significant progress has been achieved in these types of economic assessments. The UN has already approved a central accounting framework to assess regular economic value. None of these non-market values are near to being incorporated into regular economic accounting. How far are we from consensus on how to deal with and render acceptable to the political echelons these non-market values?
- We also need to be pragmatic, countries will not change how they do national commodities accounting because of one LME project. The best we can do is to create a policy brief and hope to convince them of the need for change, but it will certainly be a slow process.
- The story telling component is crucial. Who lives on the areas studied? How important are the activities not reported in official accounting to the communities? Count what you can count, describe what you can't count, and think hard about the data.

SESSION 3: Global and regional networks	
Chair	Andrew Hudson, UNDP
Experts/Speakers	Alberto Pacheco-Capella, Merete Tandstad, Lorenzo Galbiati, Lucilla Minelli, Kenneth Sherman, Luis Valdes, Robin Mahon
Expected outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish existing networks based on Caucus discussions - Discuss what has worked and why - Identify future priority needs by region based on Caucus discussions
Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enhance network of partners working to provide consistent management and ecosystem-based methods and technical support to GEF-LME/ICM/MPA projects. - Increase interactions between GEF- LME, ICM, and MPA projects and other marine and coastal initiatives supported by GEF and partner organizations. - Increase collaboration and coordination between GEF-LME, ICM and MPA projects and partners, within the geographic boundaries of LMEs. - Progress towards fully integrated 'ridge to reef' ecosystem-based management of freshwater and marine transboundary water systems, through increased generation of knowledge and enhanced coordination between GEF-IW surface, ground water and LME and ICM projects.
General description of the session	
The sessions established an adequate basis for implementing the major activities and achieving the outcomes of the GEF LME Project by establishing global and regional networks of partners to enhance ecosystem based management and to address marine and coastal project needs, also including climate variability and change. The outcome of this session will inform the implementation of the Global COP project in terms of establishing functional regional networks, and defining means and methods of effective coordination between participants.	
Brief summary of each presentation considering the main messages and those references which can be applicable in the LME context	
Regional Seas Conventions and Actions Plans – A partnership framework <i>Alberto Pacheco-Capella, UNEP</i>	The need to ensure that conventions and action plans are legally binding was stressed. The Marine Coastal Economic Valuation aims to raise awareness about harmonized economic valuation and methodologies for political decisions. SIDS, and the Samoa Conference, is specifically linked with the Green Economy. The World Ocean Assessment aims to strengthen coordination and marine environment reporting at the regional level.
Fisheries governance and linkages to LMEs	EAF tries to strike a sustainable balance between human benefits and ecosystem health which includes its impacts on fisheries. It can be seen

<p><i>Merete Tandstad, FAO</i></p>	<p>as a tool for the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries. The approach is within the context of fisheries management, recognizing conventional approaches to fisheries management that focus on target species (as compared to considering broader ecosystem impacts). The hierarchical tree is one of the key tools in EAF. Based on the scope and values of the fishery, the next step, which is central to the entire EAF process, is to identify all the relevant issues (assets, outcomes, systems and drivers). There are 3 different types of issues. There are issues we MANAGE, issues we INFLUENCE, and issues we just DEAL WITH. E.g. stock that is shared between countries makes target species and by-catch unable to be totally managed. It will need to be influenced, and sometimes just dealt with. The EAF toolbox has been designed to guide users through each of the four main EAF management planning steps and activities. - FAO still works on fishery statistics and a global database on fishery statistics with the member countries.</p>
<p>Strategic Partnership for the Mediterranean Sea LME <i>Lorenzo Galbiati, MedPartnership</i></p>	<p>The main objective of Marine Pollution is developing new MPA's within the LME and MedPartnership area. The result is having 3 new MPAs and national development by 2015. With the Barcelona Convention being the legal framework communication is through focal points in each country. Due to its success EC wants to develop them in other European countries.</p>
<p>Enhancing groundwater knowledge across the GEF IW Portfolio: Lessons learned from the Groundwater Community of Practice <i>Lucilla Minelli, UNESCO-IHP</i></p>	<p>As an IW unique corporate initiative, the IHP-IOC existing collaboration ensures freshwater and marine integrated management also in some governance aspects related with the LME community and the Groundwater team.</p>
<p>Improving the LME Network at the Third Global LME Conference, Swakopmund, Namibia, 8-10 October 2014 <i>Kenneth Sherman, NOAA</i></p>	<p>The objective is to bring together leaders in EBM at the intersection of science and policy with presentations focusing on ecosystem based management (EBM) and assessment of the World's (LMEs). Scientists will share results of LME projects underway by 110 countries. Comment relating to global fisheries statistics will be heard in the conference which is hosted by FAO.</p>
<p>II International Ocean Research Conference, Spain, 17-21 November 2014 <i>Luis Valdes, IOC-UNESCO</i> <i>Robin Mahon, CERMES</i></p>	<p>The conference covers - 16 thematic sessions under 3 main topic: Building Scientific Knowledge, Applying Knowledge for Societal Benefit: Achieving Ecosystem Management and Sustainability, Improving Governance and Building Capacities with 500-600 participants.</p>
<p>Brief summary of the main issues of the discussion</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Data sharing is one of the most important issues and should be the focus from the start of the LME Governance project in order to define the best ways on how to use and share the data between all the actors. - LMEs need to link out to other organizations and groups that work on fisheries, which are important to LME, already some tools and guidance available, both on data sharing and the other tools. For this, we will need a data management agreement, more like a partnership agreement, some examples can be shared in that respect. - Suggestion about a regional seas workshop, something similar to Seascope. We've done a bit of that in this session; it fits well with the goal of governance project. May have given off the idea that nothing was happening, which is not completely true. Hoped that we could bring together the LME and the regional seas, crucial issue to bring the expertise together. But sometimes there are a lot reinventing the wheel, people tend to focus too much on fisheries and we have a massive opportunity to turn the table, we need to work on multidisciplinary and transdisciplinary basis. 	

SESSION 4: Capacity development	
Chair	Peter Pissierssens, IOC-UNESCO
Experts/Speakers	Patricio Bernal, Yvone Walther, Peter Pissierssens, Werner Ekau, David Vousden, Keith Lawrence, Andrew Hume, Lauren Spurrier, Ludovic Bernaudat
Expected outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assist in shaping up the training programme to be implemented under the LME COP Project. - Overview of existing programme and training facilities that could support the needs of the LME COP from partner organization involved in capacity development.
Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify GEF LME/ICM/MPA practitioners' needs on trainings and new techniques and approaches for ecosystem based management, and ocean governance, including mitigation of effects of climatic variability and change in LMEs. - Increase collaboration and learning exchanges South-to-South between the GEF LME, ICM and MPA projects, and North-to-South and South-to-North partnerships with non-GEF marine and coastal initiatives (e.g. Seascales) to build capacity and develop training and education materials. - Propose a set of twinning activities to be implemented through the LME COP project. - Increase capacity of GEF LME, ICM, and MPA project staff and practitioners, to address the new ecosystem-based governance priorities in GEF6 built through portfolio learning, partnerships, and training.
General description of the session	
<p>The session was dedicated to capacity development and partnership building through twinning and learning exchanges, workshops and training among LMEs. There was a presentation about the global survey on capacity development conducted during the LME COP project preparatory phase, interventions from regional caucus chairs to report on the capacity development needs that have been identified by participants on the first day.</p>	
Brief summary of each presentation considering the main messages and those references which can be applicable in the LME context	
Results from LME CoP Survey <i>Patricio Bernal, IOC Consultant</i>	<p>Survey focused on capacity building short-term instruments for training and passing on knowledge (i.e. "know how") vs Capacity development. With 69 respondents (10%). Most respondents affiliated with national or international public service institution. The survey showed some difficulties in implementing LME projects arise from lack of funding; while the other half also say it's due to lack of political will. Strong capabilities in fisheries management and associated disciplines in LME projects; specialists in social science aspects are missing. About twinning initiatives, the respondents prefer to do twinning with projects on similar type of ecosystems and with more advanced projects in the Science to Governance approach. With respect to toolkits the most relevant ones are dedicated to assess topics for governance, social aspects of environmental policy, economic analysis, LME framework toolkit, LME/GEF project toolkit. The survey provided a rich amount of detailed information for activity design; feeling that one needs to tailor applications region-by-region</p>

<p>ICES Training opportunities <i>Yvone Walther, ICES</i></p>	<p>ICES: Science Committee, Advisory Committee, Data and information Services, and Secretariat, holds data for many organizations, which can be of help to LME projects. ICES focuses on building “know how”, “know do” and “know why” – integrated capacity building for EBM. Courses include assisting in building your own assessment methods for your own data. LME training and twinning via ICES: provides training courses tailored to LME needs.</p>
<p>IOC/IODE - Ocean Teacher Academy <i>Peter Pissierssens, IOC-UNESCO/IODE</i></p>	<p>Totalling 15 events per year with 400 lectures, the programme ensures face to face learning. There is the need to train more students in local language, reduce time of travel and focus on local issues. The establishment of a network of 8 regional training centres (RTCs) is in process.</p>
<p>Potential contribution of capacity development in ocean governance to the LME Programme through the International Ocean Institute <i>Werner Ekau, IOI-Germany</i></p>	<p>The core activity of IOI is to carry out Training Programmes in Ocean Governance. Also aims at improving environmental knowledge, increase scientific capacities, strengthen public knowledge and institutions; support university programmes and enhances exchange of information between levels and disciplines. There are plans to push money to sustain the courses so participants are charged for the remainder of the course.</p>
<p>African Centre for Capacity Development in Ocean Governance (AfriCOG) <i>David Vousden, ASCLME</i></p>	<p>The aim of AfriCOG is 1) to provide partnership for recognising, promoting and strengthening existing Pan-African capacity and skills in the delivery of Marine Resource Management and Ocean Governance, 2) To enhance and encourage the use of trained human resources in the sustainable management and use of coastal and marine goods and services. AfriCOG offers a unique Pan-African Partnership that can address the gaps and shortfalls in skill-sets, expertise and information capture in support of pragmatic adaptive management and governance</p>
<p>Private and NGO training opportunities <i>Keith Lawrence, Conservation International</i> <i>Andrew Hume, Lauren Spurrier, WWF</i></p>	<p>An example of a project in Indonesia where they managed to achieve capacity development and lessons from that project was presented. Indonesia’s MPA network covers over 15.7 million hectares in 113 MPAs. The declaration of these MPAs represents significant conservation progress, and the GOI intends to place an additional 4.3 million ha under protection by 2020. The government understands, however, that unless there are competent MPA management teams in place, these MPAs will not achieve the desired conservation and fisheries replenishment outcomes. With thousands of island and non-effective large MPA network, MPA management capacity development program with localized training was introduced bringing in strong implication for fishermen, national parks, and small communities, which are much stronger than government for co-management. The way forward is to produce guides based on this experience.</p>
<p>Successful examples of private sector implication in reduction of land base pollution <i>Ludovic Bernaudat, UNIDO</i></p>	<p>Using the UNIDO methodology to help the private sector reduce their consumption of resources and be more efficient can be a way to involve them in LME and coastal projects. E.g. Textile company in Honduras stopped using very harmful dyes through this process. The private sector does finance the management and also voluntarily. Phase 1 = low cost phase, environmental accounting tool. Phase 2 = show the company what was achieved in money and efficiency without any investment. Phase 3 = finalization. The short term nature of return is an incentive and looking at coastal project with tourism industry e.g. for hotels it is important to reduce energy.</p>
<p>Brief summary of the main issues of the discussion</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is the need for training, with some courses to prioritize. These needs need to be defined locally at LME scale, and there are concerns about long term impact. - Learning from institutions that have a framework, even for lab work, and a functional archive system too. 	

This will help us to evaluate how practical are courses for scientists from developing countries, the value and the options of certification. AfriCOG for example is working with Ocean Teacher to certify better but this could be directly done with African universities.

- Twinning should be linked to science, factual science training, dynamics of upwelling, forecasting for example, not just linked to governance, science is a key issue.
- If one really wants to gain autonomy on resources, they need to think medium to long term as well and face the challenges. Equipment is being used for other things, problem of priority settings at national level. Countries need to think deeply on development of scientific capabilities and need stable scientific institutions to allocate funding/time for research, otherwise extremely difficult, vicious circle.
- GEF: transboundary role, moving to be broader in perspective, more into integrated coastal management, but not an optic to be doing/funding more science.

SESSION 5: Communication, dissemination and outreach

Chair	Wojciech Wawrzynski, ICES
Experts/Speakers	Mish Hamid, Wojciech Wawrzynski, Antoine Blonce, Blake Lee-Harwood
Expected outcomes	In order to strengthen the role of the GEF International Waters portfolio on Large Marine Ecosystems linked with ICM and MPA activities and projects, the session was dedicated to discussing achievements and lessons learnt in communication, dissemination and outreach.
Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Communicate the project's results to stakeholders, increase the awareness of LME issues and engagement in networks through global and regional IW Community of Practices, and IW-Learn - Identify tools for communicating science and assessment results into key messages for policy-makers - Define a showcasing strategy and best practices for LME and ICM/MPA projects to share results among project partners, stakeholders, resource managers, broader scientific community, government representatives, private companies, universities, schools and the public - Encourage global policy discussions informed and impacted by knowledge and experience of GEF- ecosystem based LME/ICM/MPA governance project

General description of the session

The session provided advice on communicating scientific information to the public, as well as on how to disseminate data and reach out to various audiences. Speakers shared their experiences on engaging with the private sector, a procedure which requires a lot of thought and specialization in order to be achieved efficiently. The development and organisation of training courses was also discussed, along with considerations on how to make these more interesting and attractive to trainees, and how to guarantee that the trainees make the most out of those opportunities.

Brief summary of each presentation considering the main messages and those references which can be applicable in the LME context

Evolution of IW:LEARN IV and synergies with the GEF LME Governance Project <i>Mish Hamid, IW LEARN</i>	<p>Mr. Hamid presented the evolution of IW:Learn IV and the new toolkits and guidance materials that are in place to support new partners (UN agencies, NGOs, etc) and to improve the work with GEF funded projects like the LME. The first component concentrates on the information management, visualization of spatial data and guidance, the second component a more programmatic approach to support twinning both within regions and at global level. There has been a lot of investment in economic valuation nevertheless more work will be required to improve the engagement at community level and the support with SAP</p>
--	---

	<p>implementation and regional workshops. In the next phase of IW:Learn more people should be invited to IW trainings due to the successful transboundary cooperation, and the private sector will play a bigger role in the next phase.</p>
<p>Best practices on dissemination of project results to facilitate stakeholders' engagement <i>Wojciech Wawrzynski, ICES</i></p>	<p>ICES provides scientific advice to member institutions but also to external commissions like the EU. The ICES Science Plan now brings integrated ecosystem understanding to the front row, perhaps this will also create some sort of guidance for ecosystem assessment, and should be able to present tangible results within the next 2-3 years. There are 6 integrated ecosystem assessment working groups that are service providers between areas, different seas, and the best option to transfer best practices.</p> <p>There are plenty of joint actions, also with academia, and seminars about EBM. The EU framework programs fund most projects in Europe: first, one must gather stakeholder needs, then must compare the managers' needs with those needs and finally, find the donors. In this context, the European Commission points to the fact that passive communication is not enough, if you want to get funding you must put the impact not only on dissemination but also make sure the knowledge being disseminated is taken on board by stakeholders and managers.</p> <p>Stakeholders and policy managers should be involved from the very start of the project, and asked what they actually need, what their research needs are. Then we shall provide them with the knowledge they need to implement their project properly, and ask for feedback.</p>
<p>The GEF-UNDP-IMO GloBallast Tools: Project's result and communication means <i>Antoine Blonce, GloBallast</i></p>	<p>GloBallast supports developing countries to implement the Ballast Water Management (BWM) Convention. The entry into force criteria is almost met as we now have 43 member states party to the Convention with the recent ratifications from Japan and Turkey (30 needed), that represent 32.54% of the world gross tonnage (35% needed). With only less than 2.5% of tonnage needed, it is expected the Convention will enter into force soon.</p> <p>Capacity development tools and training courses have been developed to train the member countries. A good way to communicate is through publications, including TV shows, as well as through the website and new social media such as Twitter.</p> <p>A special partnership with the European Bank for reconstruction and Development (EBRD) has been established to bring more financing and to develop a guidance document on infrastructure, as well as a poster and a presentation. Dedicated training courses for the private sector have been delivered under this partnerships, in countries of the EBRD region (Russia, Turkey, Ukraine and Georgia), to train directly the Bank clients.</p> <p>The Project is now developing a new online learning platform, in fact there are about 30 people trained per workshop in average, but with an online tool it will be easier to reach more people. This e-learning platform could also become a part of the legacy of the GloBallast Project as it will end in 2016.</p>
<p>Engaging the seafood supply chain in fisheries improvement <i>Blake Lee-Harwood, Sustainable Fisheries</i></p>	<p>SFP has a lot of reach in the corporate world. It focuses on fixing the worst, and is interested in working with fisheries in poor conditions. It is a virtual NGO with no building or headquarters, network, which is somewhat unique but works well. There is an official trusted seafood</p>

adviser, and work on how to connect with fishers to improve fisheries, as well as on policy and conservation (e.g. precautionary management of small pelagics). Metrics can help people assess how sustainable their fisheries are and thus simplify some processes and the supplier roundtables are mainly populated by companies that buy fishmeal and fish oil.

Brief summary of the main issues of the discussion

- Must break down the acronyms, before you use one got to spell it out! Distracting from progressing communication. This is especially true when working with the private sector, as they don't really speak the same language, so need to improve the language used.
- GloBallast: if you want to bring funding to environmental issue projects, there are issues dealing with the maritime shipping industry, costly equipment, and difficulties to explain to the industry how to implement the BWM Convention. It cannot be implemented without the support of the industry, which is not easy but some of the industry wants a green image and shows that it wants to get involved in this research. Through its support to countries through IMO, GloBallast was there briefing all stakeholders and the private sector, and played an instrumental role in the implementation. Special funds were made available by the industry to develop specific activities and overcome barriers in the implementation of the Convention, e.g. to develop research on shore/port-based contingency measures. This specific partnership between GloBallast and the industry is called the Global Industry Alliance (GIA).
- Approach to the private sector involvement in a few steps: first, the project manager must understand how to approach the private sector (often academics or NGOs who don't have a lot of experience with this sector so must be trained), second, an assessment needs to be done for their particular project on how to work with the private sector, and prepare a private sector engagement plan.
- For the assessment, there are some questions to ask: What are Private Sector strengths? How will Private Sector benefit from the project? What are available mechanisms for private sector involvement? And most importantly, what are private sector needs? For the plan: engage private sector in preparing plan, utilize personnel well-versed in private sector (cannot just have academics but also need people from the private sector), prepare activities reflecting mutual benefits, with concrete, scheduled activities and next steps (not just overall plan), finally, must communicate, engage and share.
- It is recommended to work with the private sector through corporate social responsibility, gifting/granting, contracts, partnerships (data and equipment sharing), steering committee and action committee memberships. It can be a double edged sword as private sectors may be dominated by various industries, so need to understand their strength (fishing, tourism...) and have to consider them as real partners, not just someone that brings in the necessary cofinancing.
- Tourism typically does not have a lot of money to give away but usually benefits from those initiatives.
- Such projects were successful in the Caspian Sea, the Yellow Sea and the Mediterranean. There are good examples of private sector involvement. If protecting the environment makes people save money, it makes them more involved. This principally worked with small LMEs, as can talk directly to owner of companies and financiers but there are also some good examples with larger corporations.
- Private sector involvement is very important, we must think more about the strategies for the private sector, and about global projects which are very important, and which may spread to other projects as well.

3. LME Regional caucuses

Africa, Arctic (ICES LME WG), Asia, Latin America and Caribbean	
Chair of this session:	Rudolf Hermes, BOBLME and Hein Rune Skjoldal, IMR-Norway
Chairs of LME caucuses:	Africa: Hashali Hamukuaya and David Vousden

	Arctic / ICES LME WG: Hein Rune Skjoldal Asia: Rudolf Hermes Latin America / Caribbean: Patrick Debels
Expected outcomes	For the 2014 meeting, 4 topics have been identified of importance to the LME community, these are : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EBM tools to support LME/ICM/MPA with emphasis on Marine Spatial Planning - Economic valuation tools - Data and information management for marine and coastal projects - Incorporating climate change/OA models in marine and coastal management
Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Many ecosystems approaches were not available twenty years ago - The LME projects have successfully innovated (as have the sciences outside the project) - Not one size fits all

General description of the session

The session focused on introducing LMEs and recent advances in the context of LME governance and projects. Attendees were invited to participate in their Regional Caucus' discussion. Multiple discussions therefore resulted from this session (i.e. one for each Regional Caucus).

Through the regional caucus meetings, project practitioners discussed on:

- 1) The establishment of regional networks¹ in each region to strengthen governance and ecosystem based management, with participation of LME, MPA, ICM projects, questions (priority questions in bold) to address will include:
 - **Nature, scope and membership of the regional networks to be established under the LME COP project**
 - **How to create linkages with MPA, ICM, MSP communities within regions and synergies with regional ocean governance mechanisms (for e.g. Regional Seas)?**
 - How to engage with freshwater (rivers and groundwater) IW projects?
 - How to engage private sector and NGO community identify innovative approaches?
 - Define the coordination mechanism, activities and responsibilities for operationalising the regional networks
- 2) The capacity developments needs for each region with a focus on :
 - **A prioritized list of training needs building on the capacity development plan and survey² developed during the LME CoP preparation.**
 - **The identification of twinning opportunities within and across regions, including the topic of such twinning and institutions to be involved**
 - Defining measures to assess progress in institutional and human capacity development in regions
 - Identifying scientific research needs and support that could be pooled within or across regions
 - Identify means for stronger involvement of science and university communities in the regional networks

¹ The LME Governance Project foresees the establishment of 3 regional networks in Africa, South East Asia, and Latin America/Caribbean.

² The capacity development plan and survey are available on the IOC LME Meeting webpage: http://ioc-unesco.org/index.php?option=com_oe&task=viewEventRecord&eventID=1512

- 3) The communication needs for each region with a focus on:
- Building on CoP Prodoc outcome 4 (Communication, outreach, dissemination), identify communication/dissemination objectives and activities for each region.
 - Identification of audience (scientific community, public, decision makers, private sectors) and type of format to communicating LME results.

The outcomes of these regional LME caucus were discussed during the relevant plenary sessions of the LME and Coastal Partners meeting, namely session 3 on networks (Chairs will be invited to report), session 4 on training and twinning and session 5 on communication, dissemination and outreach. Session 3 also provided an opportunity for identifying linkages and synergies across regions.

Brief summary of each presentation considering the main messages and those references which can be applicable in the LME context

<p>Introductory presentation <i>Rudolf Hermes, BOBLME</i> <i>Hein Rune Skjoldal, Norwegian Institute Marine Research</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Purpose: Practitioners interact and exchange information on work progress and achievements at regional level (Africa, Arctic, Asia, Latin America/Caribbean) – existing activities and outputs, and future priority needs. - Information on the ICES Working Group on Large Marine Ecosystems Best Practices (WGLMEBP) and on the Regional Caucuses (history, capacity development, communication needs, advances, recommendations).
---	---

Regional networks

<p>Africa</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - African LME Caucus already exists and can form the basis of an LME/ICM Regional Governance Network - The African Centre for Capacity Development in Ocean Governance can provide resources and support for this process - Existing partnerships and alliance such as the Western Indian Ocean Sustainable Ecosystem Alliance along with other LME partnerships can provide a useful model for a broader pan-African partnership - AfriCOG will review the needs and requirements for ship's time versus the availability of suitable vessels and advise the African LMEs on options and costs - The African LME Caucus will consider provision of logistics and feasibility of an annual Partner/Donor Conference that could be facilitated and organised through AfriCOG - Existing individual LME linkages to industry through arrangement with the World Ocean Council and other private sector partners could be arranged at a more pan-African level, and within individual LMEs with strategies being developed to ensure full participation and engagement with the public and private sectors - The African LME Caucus could now become a more formally established group with terms of reference and a work-plan. Capacity development activities and support can be managed logistically through AfriCOG. This process would provide the required regional network support to the Global ICM/LME Governance project
<p>Arctic - ICES LME WG</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is an initiative to establish a community of practitioners for the Arctic, led by Phil Mundy from NOAA. - Last year was published the Arctic Ocean review which review international agreements applicable to the Arctic. - The role of ICES is to support the LME project in the Arctic and in the general LME projects. We believe that the technical support is probably where ICES has much to offer.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ICES LME WG will prepare a report from the ICES working group LME best practices; this would be provided to the other LME practitioners and partners.
Asia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There should be clear guidance from GEF that the implementing agencies should ensure that the projects will coordinate and network during the project development, or in the project document development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o We need clear guidance so that networking happens during project implementation, and also funds are provided to be able to coordinate with other projects. o Alternatively, give the responsibility to ensure networking to the UNDP Global Governance Project to make sure that they provide those inventories of projects; and because they have the budget, and they should make sure that networking is taking place. - Identify existing networks and mechanisms and work with them to access areas where they aren't available network (for example UNEP Regional Seas and IOC sub-commission/committees, RFBs, APEC LME WS). - Use networking to assist the development of new projects, for instance in the Arabian Sea LME and East Sea/Sea of Japan LME - Engagement of private sector: Explore collaboration with World Ocean Council members to invite them to engage with LME (co-finance)
Latin America and Caribbean	<p>Membership of the regional networks to be established under the LME COP project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Low representation of LME/associated LAC community at this meeting – so proposal for the interim “LAC network core membership” = the group present at this LME meeting (= initial contact list, - Review/revise core membership later once the activities are better known; - For practical purposes the (core) membership can be expanded, depending on the topic <p>How to create linkages with MPA, ICM, MSP communities within regions and synergies with regional ocean governance mechanisms (for e.g. Regional Seas)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concept of “umbrella” SAP can help foster establishment of partnerships/linkages - The “1% rule” for IW:LEARN/exchange initiatives under GEF IW projects can assist here, but how can non-IW/GEF projects be financially supported? <p>How to engage with freshwater (rivers and groundwater) IW projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On an LME-by-LME basis, more than through a Caucus - Use IW:Learn/LME COP as possible mechanisms

	<p>How to engage private sector and NGO community identify innovative approaches?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Exchanges of best practices / lessons learned - Need to engage with local 'micro' NGOs – not necessarily core members of the regional caucus, but can be engaged on a case-by-case basis. Work out mechanism to engage them... <p>Define the coordination mechanism, activities and responsibilities for operationalising the regional networks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rotating chairmanship across the LMEs from the Caucus - Question: How much funding can be allocated to such coordination activities? Even split between the three caucuses? And what about coordination among LMEs and associated projects belonging to different regions?
Capacity development	
Africa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All of the LME projects have undertaken Capacity Development Needs Assessments. What they now need is a process to Prioritise these, to identify Delivery Mechanisms and to secure Funding - The African LME Caucus is a founding partner in AfriCOG. AfriCOG is developing a regional/continental level programme for Capacity Development in collaboration with its various partners including the LMEs. This will prioritise and address the needs of the Caucus, the latter being the regional network for Africa - AfriCOG will also identify Delivery Mechanisms in relation to such aspects as training courses and general institutional capacity development - AfriCOG will also identify and secure the Funding on behalf of its partners, including the LME Caucus - Toolkits and other packages being provided by the Global LME/ICM governance project should be guided by the regional bodies and LMEs in a 'bottom-up' process - Twinning and sharing of lessons and best practised has been very valuable and should continue within and between Caucus regions - The Caucus regions should consider the use of MOOCs or Massive Open Online Course as a tool to deliver accredited courses that have open access via the web - In view of the fact that funding for the Global LME/ICM Governance project is limited, more funding should be secured to support the Caucus-level regional networks
Arctic - ICES LME WG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Arctic Council: political and research collaboration between eight countries (8 countries: 3 large countries and 5 smaller countries) - Commitment to implementing EBM policies to the Arctic and improve - Reporting scale for EBM: LME is the current scale, but we need pan-arctic scale and potentially a global level reporting. - A lot of EB approaches and activities take place outside of the Arctic Council (Norway's Barrents Sea, i.e.)
Asia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We endorse twinning, in particular for skills transfer, process, and project management. - Regarding assessing impact of capacity development and beyond,

	<p>there should be dedicated monitoring funds to the GEF implementing and executing agencies, including the new ones (NGOs), to make sure that the ex-post monitoring is taking place and followed up, as capacity development is often better measured after project life.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a need to make use of short term training, but also need for the option of a master course (one to two years, with interdisciplinary or EBM/EAF emphasis), guided by the objective of the project. - There should be three options possible: in country, within the region or in a developed country (or even a mix of two / three). - Tap universities strategically for interdisciplinary research and science needs - There is a need for developing knowledge and skills to apply EAF and EBM; and to communicate effectively (science-policy interface)
Latin America and Caribbean	<p>Capacity developments needs for each region</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Training has to be 1 component of a comprehensive process for capacity building, starting with a capacity needs assessment, developing a relevant curriculum based on these needs, and embedding into institutions and local processes. - Sustainability: training aimed at local partners with permanent role/mandate, versus training of Project Coordination Unit (unless it's for TDA-SAP processes or processes under the responsibility of the PCU) <p>Similar list of topics to the global list – but need for capacity building (events, materials) in Spanish - e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Valuation of ecosystem services - Indicators – look for common systems - Data & information management - Reporting requirements for international agreements - Marine spatial planning - Private sector engagements - Interactions with ABNJ projects? - Monitoring Control & Surveillance/IUU <p>Twinning needs/opportunities within and across regions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Exchanges to make progress on specific processes/projects e.g. marine atlas / state of marine environment, (e.g. CLME+ and ASCLME and? BOBLME?), marine spatial planning etc. - Twinning between LMEs/projects with similar problems and challenges (not necessarily in the same region) i.e. similar ecosystems and/or similar political dynamics (number of countries etc.); or TDA development - Visit programs that are more advanced on a particular topic e.g. sustainable financing for MPAs / for governance mechanisms, capacity building, marine spatial planning, governance - Exchanges with external partners with expertise on a particular topic e.g. ICES – Humboldt Current (fisheries management); CCAD twinning with other, already well-established regional environmental governance bodies (built into the project); Seascapes

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ocean Health Index – from regional to national analyses. Piloted by Colombia, other countries can learn from this - Sustainable financing of governance mechanisms/institutions - Gulf of Mexico, Caribbean & Europe (GOOS ocean observation system) - gap analysis for MPA
Communication	
Africa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It was generally agreed that the need to communicate the results of scientific data capture and analyse managers and policy-level decision makers through broad scenarios that also take into account other national and regional needs was a high priority. - The African IW:LEARN Workshops that have been show-cased in the region in collaboration with AfriCOG are a valuable opportunity for IW Projects to meet and discuss Best Lessons and Practices
Arctic - ICES LME WG	<p>Communicating ICES science and advice to different audiences - policy makers, stakeholders, and media - can be a challenge. The ICES course on communication aims to bring together experience from a practical scientific and advisory perspective with the experience from communication science and best practices. The objective is to equip participants (including LME practitioners) with a number of practical tools and techniques in order to be able to really communicate the results of scientific or advisory work.</p> <p>Course structure: Role of marine science and advice in society, Preparing key messages, Targetting specific audiences, Presentation techniques, Press releases, Handling media, How to give interviews.</p>
Asia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reporting format: e.g. Ecosystem Health report card; project notes / policy brief (2 to 4 pages); social and/or new media. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Ensure that project reports/reviews and workshop reports are disseminated and translated into press releases and use other ways to engage with the media. - Engaging effectively with the general public and private sector (through media or directly, paying attention to language requirements (translations)) - Develop and use measures to monitor / assess the uptake of information content - Develop capacity in “communicating science” (writing and presentation) to peers, to decision / policy makers and to the public. This is best done by formal training of counterpart staff, and in collaboration with local / national (marine) science associations
Latin America and Caribbean	<p>Communication needs for each region with a focus on: identification of audience (scientific community, public, decision makers, private sectors) and type of format to communicating LME results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Language issue/translations! - Each LME needs a clear, carefully developed strategy, objectives, audiences, involving/delegating responsibility to regional

	<p>organizations with a stake in LME/clear mandate related to LME/marine resources governance, with PCUs managing communications on over-arching aspects/issues (not just something to quickly decide/develop)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional Caucus (or global LME COP?) can provide guidance on how to create and implement such strategy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o i.e. capacity building / training on communications strategy development, (innovative) tools (not just individual products) - Role for Caucus/LME COP: communicate on over-arching/common issues, reach public that is difficult to reach by individual LME projects - Probably more limited needs for communications at level of regional caucus? Maybe more at global level (LME COP) - Regional Caucus can help disseminate to regional processes and institutions e.g. Interamerican Development Bank, regional conferences etc. – other communications will be at global scale or LME/local scale. - Regional Caucus can help to channel messages (including messages common to the LMEs) upwards to global fora (through the global COP, or directly)? - Caucus: potential economies of scale in development of applications/tools/materials? - Exchanges / lessons learned from intl NGOs with strong communication skills/experience - Scientific journal bilingual for scientific audience - Allocate higher proportion of budget to communications within LME projects? (may be project-dependent/Depend on the project strategy & objectives)
--	--

4. Conclusions

This meeting has shown that the role of everyone in protecting the ocean is important in terms of different specialties and scales, as well as the need to come together to share experiences and collaborate further in the future.

The LME community is increasing and has become the best environment to interact and gather lessons learned on integrated coastal area management, marine spatial planning and marine protected areas.

In addition to the overall ideas that have been discussed in the context of the LME Governance project, there are many other ideas that will help us to think of how we should organize our work and how the project should be implemented in order to share the maximum benefit amongst all the partners.

We need to improve the regional networks in order to share data, information and good practices, meanwhile twinning initiatives will facilitate the implementation of lessons learned and the development of tools to support an efficient LME governance.

We need to think of how science could effectively impact marine governance, and in this important task, regional and international organizations with the active support of their Member states represent the best challenge.

--