MSP Steering Committee

Meeting #5
Thursday 30 April 2015
1:30 PM - 4:00 PM
Location: ICCS Room 3

Minutes

Meeting Objectives:

- 1. To resolve outstanding issues related to zoning and terminology
- 2. To provide recommendations for revising zoning design map 1.1
- 3. To provide recommendations for presentation to Cabinet

Members Present:

Wills Agricole- PS Energy & Climate Change (Chair)
Alain De Comarmond- PS Environment
Cynthia Adrienne- MLUH
David Rowat- MCSS
Jan Robinson- SFA
Jeanne Mortimer- ICS
Justin Prosper- MSP Data Manager, MEECC
Keith Andre- FBOA
Olivier Bodère- MEECC's office
Patrick Samson- PetroSeychelles
Rodney Quatre- SNPA
Virginie Lagarde- FBOA (alternate)

MSP Core Team:

Joanna Smith (JLS)- MSP Science and Process Lead (TNC Canada) Helena Sims (HS) - MSP Project Manager (TNC)

Observers/Project Partners:

Andrew Grieser Johns- PCU Programme Coordinator/Chief Technical Adviser Joanna Prosper- UNDP GEF Outer Island Project Manager

Members invited, absent with apologies:

Amanda Padayachy- Ministry of Finance, Trade and Blue Economy Bernice Elizabeth- Dept. of Tourism Denis Matatiken- SNPA Frauke Dogley- SIF Glenny Savy / Mr. Ronny Renaud - IDC Jude Bijoux- MAF & SFA Paul Hodoul- Tourism



- 1) Welcome: Principle Secretary Will Agricole, the Chair of the SC, opened the meeting at 1345hrs.
- Review and adoption of Agenda

Agenda Item	Comment/advice	Action_Response (with initials
		for who provides response)
2: Review and	4.2; Dr Smith met with SFA staff to discuss the	
adoption of	Industrial fisheries. Was advised to put together a	
Minutes of SC4	packet for the fishery for the CEO of SFA to send	
	out ASAP.	
	5.10; recommended a meeting between the	
	Biodiversity group and the fisheries resources	
	group. This has been summarised in the minutes	
	under point 6.2 page 4.	
	Note: Mr John Nevill has stepped down from the	
	TWG; he will participate as a stakeholder in the	
	MSP. The current chair of the TWG is Dr David	
	Rowat and Mr Chris Mason-Parker is the Vice Chair.	
	7.5; No further updates as meetings with the Debt	
	swap team and the trust are ongoing	
	With no further comments, the minutes of SC 4 was	
5	adopted.	
Brief Update	Cabinet meeting is scheduled for the 6 May 2015.	
on Timelines,	Purpose of the meeting is to update the cabinet on	
Outputs and	the MSP process. A clear definition of no-take and	
Advice Log	sustainable use is required.	
Roundtable	Requests have been made from media	A communications plan and a
updates.	representatives for more information on the MSP	media pack are being
	process to increase the transparency of the process.	developed. A list of questions
		from the Today have also been
		answered and should be
	A 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	published soon (HS)
	A concern on how closed the meetings are has been	All stakeholders are welcome
	raised as media were told to leave in the last	to attend and the public can
	stakeholder workshop.	observe in the workshops,
		which are open to anyone wishing to attend. The media
		were welcome to record the
		opening address but not record the discussions during the
		workshop. The reason being
		that a maximum level of
		stakeholder participation was
		expected and some people will
		be reserved to comment if they
		are being recorded. It is
		important that stakeholders
		can make comments or raise



	T	61
		concerns with confidentiality
	The Maritime Poundary partialis (Mr. Chang town)	respected (JLS and HS)
	The Maritime Boundary portfolio (Mr. Chang-tave) has been moved from MLUH to the Blue Economy	
	section in the Ministry of Finance, Trade and the Blue Economy.	
	Ms. Elyn Albert recently attended a 3 day workshop on MSP (UNESCO).	
	SFA is to receive the draft Management plan for the Mahé plateau tomorrow the 1st May 2015. Concerned that information on the MSP initiative is not reaching some of the key individuals concerned e.g.; Blue economy section	A link with the PS of the Blue Economy section can be made. Individuals from the SC can send minutes to key peers who should be informed. (JLS)
	Questioned when the GeoPDF will be sent out following the last workshop for comments on	They GeoPDF will be sent out early next week as the MSP
	zones.	team were cross referencing
	Zones.	the non-disclosure agreement with the existing DSA. Dr Rowat to be sent the GeoPDF first for testing. (JLS)
	Dr Klaus sent layers for the final Marxan iteration	
	last week. Mr. Tingey requested for more details and data for clarification and these were received today. The final report and the Marxan Analysis are being sent and Ms Sims to post a dropbox link for sharing next week.	
	Has prepared a small report on the MSP for the UNEP. Requested clarification on a report that the debt-swap condition is for the protection of seagrass areas for carbon sequestration.	The condition of the debt swap is for the Government of the Seychelles to develop a marine spatial plan for conservation and climate change adaptation goals. Request for Mr. Bodere to send the article. (JLS)
Outstanding Issues & draft zoning design map 1.1 (combined)	No take coverage is currently approximately 8% and sustainable use is 19.37%. There is no current coverage of the trench in the zoning.	
Terminology of zones	Suggest to rename the economic area (Zone 3) as "sustainable use" areas as even no-take areas have an economic benefit.	
	the definition of no-take is very important. Will this area allow for eco-tourism?	Refer to the activities table for Biodiversity and fisheries. The SC/TWG needs to guide and define the no-take term and what uses will be allowed. J.S.
	No-take is not currently defined under the new PA Policy, but sustainable use is. The zoning carried out in the MSP needs to translate with and align to the	
	new PA Act and Policy. The outstanding issue	
	however is that there are no regulations drafted for	



	T	T
	the Act yet, which would define the uses allowed in each PA category.	
	Zoning areas at this point as no-take may limit	
	information and research if they limit the possibility	
	of seismic surveys being undertaken.	
	How long will these no-take zones be declared for?	
	How often will the plan be reviewed and are these	
	zones permanent?	
	Good to see fishery replenishment removed from	
	biodiversity protection.	
	Simplified 3 zones welcome but terminology needs	
	to be revised. Need to apply the ridge to reef	
	process and activities that are prohibited in a no-	
	take area should not only apply to fisheries related	
	activities but also tourism and development and	
	any use of ecosystem services as a 'take'. Therefore	
	there is a need to look at all human uses in these	
	areas.	
	It is important to define clearly what is sustainable	
	in the sustainable use areas in the new PA Act and	
	include reference points and numbers.	
	Does any member of the SC object to the new 3	
	zones?	
	Need to consider the management of zones and if	
	they are practical. On biodiversity side there is no	
	objection.	
	No other objections/comments were made from	
	the SC.	
	if biodiversity is mentioned in the first and second	
	zone, there should be mention of biodiversity in the	
	third zone in some way.	
	Proposes zone 1 is a high biodiversity zone, Zone 2	Need to advise government as
	is a medium biodiversity zone and zone 3 is a	to who is managing what and
	biodiversity and mixed use zone	hence economic use area could
		preferably be multi-use area
		based on this argument. (JLS)
Draft Zoning	Upon looking at the areas proposed and the zoning,	At the time of zoning these
Design Map 1.1	it seems that stakeholder comments and	areas, it was assumed that
Design Mah 1.1	preferences have not been taken into	catch and release were allowed
	consideration. Particularly with reference to area 2	in the no-take areas, as is the
	& 6 which are based largely on eco-tourism with fly	1
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	case with many other countries. These activities
	fishing. Hence if this area is a no-take zone, will	
	these activities be allowed to continue?	normally fund the Protected
		Area. It is now understood that
		this principle doesn't (or may
		not) apply in the Seychelles.
		(JLS)
	It seems that these areas are being designed at	Clarity for no-take is crucial
	multi-use Protected Areas with only the exclusion	here (JLS)
	of Industrial fisheries (as allowing research, tourism	
	etc).	



It is important to consider the Seychelles concepts as well as scientific purposes for the Seychelles MSP as if a no-take area allows fly-fishing but excludes other fishermen there will be a very poor buy-in and compliance from stakeholders. If model regulations could be drafted for the new PA Act that defines uses for each category (and notake) and address the fly-fishing uses in the outer islands, this would greatly assist the MSP process. It is important to note that the fly-fishing areas are seasonal and if only part of these areas are open for tourism (zoning) whilst strictly conserving the other areas, this may be more accepted. This MSP process needs to be more consultative and take more time for stakeholders to respond and accept the proposed zoning. The process is currently moving too fast with short deadlines and more stakeholder input is needed. Particularly the
as if a no-take area allows fly-fishing but excludes other fishermen there will be a very poor buy-in and compliance from stakeholders. If model regulations could be drafted for the new PA Act that defines uses for each category (and notake) and address the fly-fishing uses in the outer islands, this would greatly assist the MSP process. It is important to note that the fly-fishing areas are seasonal and if only part of these areas are open for tourism (zoning) whilst strictly conserving the other areas, this may be more accepted. This MSP process needs to be more consultative and take more time for stakeholders to respond and accept the proposed zoning. The process is currently moving too fast with short deadlines and
other fishermen there will be a very poor buy-in and compliance from stakeholders. If model regulations could be drafted for the new PA Act that defines uses for each category (and notake) and address the fly-fishing uses in the outer islands, this would greatly assist the MSP process. It is important to note that the fly-fishing areas are seasonal and if only part of these areas are open for tourism (zoning) whilst strictly conserving the other areas, this may be more accepted. This MSP process needs to be more consultative and take more time for stakeholders to respond and accept the proposed zoning. The process is currently moving too fast with short deadlines and do not overlap with important
and compliance from stakeholders. If model regulations could be drafted for the new PA Act that defines uses for each category (and notake) and address the fly-fishing uses in the outer islands, this would greatly assist the MSP process. It is important to note that the fly-fishing areas are seasonal and if only part of these areas are open for tourism (zoning) whilst strictly conserving the other areas, this may be more accepted. This MSP process needs to be more consultative and take more time for stakeholders to respond and accept the proposed zoning. The process is currently moving too fast with short deadlines and do not overlap with important
If model regulations could be drafted for the new PA Act that defines uses for each category (and notake) and address the fly-fishing uses in the outer islands, this would greatly assist the MSP process. It is important to note that the fly-fishing areas are seasonal and if only part of these areas are open for tourism (zoning) whilst strictly conserving the other areas, this may be more accepted. This MSP process needs to be more consultative and take more time for stakeholders to respond and accept the proposed zoning. The process is currently moving too fast with short deadlines and
PA Act that defines uses for each category (and notake) and address the fly-fishing uses in the outer islands, this would greatly assist the MSP process. It is important to note that the fly-fishing areas are seasonal and if only part of these areas are open for tourism (zoning) whilst strictly conserving the other areas, this may be more accepted. This MSP process needs to be more consultative and take more time for stakeholders to respond and accept the proposed zoning. The process is currently moving too fast with short deadlines and do not overlap with important
take) and address the fly-fishing uses in the outer islands, this would greatly assist the MSP process. It is important to note that the fly-fishing areas are seasonal and if only part of these areas are open for tourism (zoning) whilst strictly conserving the other areas, this may be more accepted. This MSP process needs to be more consultative and take more time for stakeholders to respond and accept the proposed zoning. The process is currently moving too fast with short deadlines and do not overlap with important
take) and address the fly-fishing uses in the outer islands, this would greatly assist the MSP process. It is important to note that the fly-fishing areas are seasonal and if only part of these areas are open for tourism (zoning) whilst strictly conserving the other areas, this may be more accepted. This MSP process needs to be more consultative and take more time for stakeholders to respond and accept the proposed zoning. The process is currently moving too fast with short deadlines and do not overlap with important
islands, this would greatly assist the MSP process. It is important to note that the fly-fishing areas are seasonal and if only part of these areas are open for tourism (zoning) whilst strictly conserving the other areas, this may be more accepted. This MSP process needs to be more consultative and take more time for stakeholders to respond and accept the proposed zoning. The process is currently moving too fast with short deadlines and do not overlap with important
It is important to note that the fly-fishing areas are seasonal and if only part of these areas are open for tourism (zoning) whilst strictly conserving the other areas, this may be more accepted. This MSP process needs to be more consultative and take more time for stakeholders to respond and accept the proposed zoning. The process is currently moving too fast with short deadlines and
seasonal and if only part of these areas are open for tourism (zoning) whilst strictly conserving the other areas, this may be more accepted. This MSP process needs to be more consultative and take more time for stakeholders to respond and accept the proposed zoning. The process is currently moving too fast with short deadlines and do not overlap with important
tourism (zoning) whilst strictly conserving the other areas, this may be more accepted. This MSP process needs to be more consultative and take more time for stakeholders to respond and accept the proposed zoning. The process is currently moving too fast with short deadlines and do not overlap with important
areas, this may be more accepted. This MSP process needs to be more consultative and take more time for stakeholders to respond and accept the proposed zoning. The process is currently moving too fast with short deadlines and do not overlap with important
This MSP process needs to be more consultative and take more time for stakeholders to respond and accept the proposed zoning. The process is currently moving too fast with short deadlines and do not overlap with important
and take more time for stakeholders to respond and accept the proposed zoning. The process is currently moving too fast with short deadlines and do not overlap with important
and accept the proposed zoning. The process is currently moving too fast with short deadlines and do not overlap with important
currently moving too fast with short deadlines and do not overlap with important
more stakeholder input is needed. I distinuity the I history dreas. For example
priority areas zoned for no-take should be discussed when looking at the VMS data
further. Many of these areas (2, 3, 8, and 9) are very for area 2, there is very low
important to the Seychelles fishermen. VMS data there. (JLS)
When will the SC be allowed to go back to the Once the GeoPdf are
fishermen for feedback on the proposed areas and distributed next week,
what is the time frame for this? What is the time frame for this? feedback from others can be
sought and received preferably
within the next few months.
(JLS)
When looking at areas 6 & 7, why have certain large areas been proposed as no-take and others not? It quantitative area sizes are
, 9
large no-take areas and would possibly be the commitments made. (JLS)
preferable to have a management plan style of zoning within these large areas for smaller no-take Is it not possible to keep this
possible to have zoning within wider, no-take which will have further zoning
priority areas, through the endorsement of in future through a
management plans specific to those areas. management plan? (AG-J)
Agree as these areas will need further planning to
be undertaken within them. They should be named
for e.g.; high biodiversity areas with further
discussion on zoning within.
The controversial issues in the proposed no-take The IDC already puts strict
zones can simply be summarised as sustenance controls on fly-fishing in the
fishing and fly-fishing. But areas can be zoned and outer islands through
managed for this. restrictions on the number of
rods allowed etc. (JR)
Comments on the proposed zoning design need to
be received by May 11th 2015
the FBOA to call a general meeting to discuss the If this is carried out next week
proposed zoning design before the 7 May so that TNC
can be present. (JLS)



		It would be best to have the FBOA meeting before the cabinet meeting. (WA)
Cabinet	the SC members to send an e-mail if there are	
Presentation 6	ation 6 suggestions on any other outstanding issues that	
May 2015 need to be addressed and presented to cabinet.		
	Correction should be made in the presentation and	
	cabinet memo to bi-lateral fisheries agreements.	
	proposed to question the ministers on their	
	perception of what a national no-take & sustainable	
	use area should be.	
	Requested a copy of the cabinet presentation.	
Other Business	Requested for the sharing of some literature on no-	
	take areas.	
	An honorarium has been approved for members of	
	the SC and TWG to provide stakeholder support	
	funding, and these will be distributed after each	
	meeting for members who attend.	

Meeting adjourned at 1525hrs Next SC to be confirmed.

Minutes submitted by: Helena Sims edited on 15th February 2016



Annex I Agenda:

Agenda

Meeting Objectives:

- 1. To resolve outstanding issues related to zoning and terminology
- 2. To provide recommendations for revising zoning design map 1.1
- 3. To provide recommendations for presentation to Cabinet

Item#	Time	Topic
1	1:30 PM	Opening
		Welcome and Agenda review
	1:40 PM	MSP Initiative
2		 Adoption of Minutes from Steering Committee #4 (March 2015)
		Brief Update on Timelines, Outputs and Advice Log
		 Roundtable – Updates from SC members
	2:00 PM	Outstanding Issues
3		 Terminology: Fisheries Replenishment Areas, "No Take" and
		"Sustainable Use"
	2:15 PM	Draft Zoning Design Map 1.1
4		Discuss stakeholder advice received on Wed 22 April
		Recommendations for design revisions
	3:00 PM	Tea and coffee break
	Cabinet presentation 6 May	
5	3:15 PM	Present Cabinet memo
		 Draft presentation - recommendations for key messages
6	3:45 PM	Wrap-up and Schedule for Next Meeting
	4: 00 PM	Adjourn

