

---

**MSP Steering Committee – Extraordinary Meeting**

Meeting #19

MSP Policy Peer Review

Date: Friday 14 August 2020

Time: 09:00 AM - Noon

Location: STC Conference Room, Latanier Road, Victoria, Mahe

---

**Minutes**

**Meeting Objectives:**

1. Review the comments and feedback received by the reviewers,
2. Discuss and agree on which comments to incorporate in the final policy document
3. Discuss the process and way forward to endorsement of the policy at Cabinet level.

**Attendance:**

Mr. Alain de Comarmond – Co-Chair MSP SC and PS for Environment, MEECC  
 Mr. Daig Romain- PCU GoS-UNDP-GEF Protected Areas Finance Project  
 Ms. Elke Talma- PCU GoS-UNDP-GEF Programme Coordinator  
 Ms. Francesca Adrienne- Blue Economy Department  
 Dr. Frauke Fleischer-Dogley – CEO, Seychelles Islands Foundation  
 Ms. Angelique Pouponneau- CEO, SEYCCAT  
 Mrs. Joanna Prosper – GoS-UNDP-GEF Ridge to Reef Project  
 Dr Murugaiyan – MEECC  
 Ms. Amina Antat – rep. Aubrey Lesperance SFA  
 Ms. Emma Mederic - SeyCCAT  
 Ms. Rabia Somers- rep. Dr David Rowat, MCSS  
 Ms. Kelly Hoareau- UniSey  
 Mr. Selby Remy- CEO, Seychelles National Parks Authority

**MSP Core Team:**

Ms. Helena Sims, MSP Project Manager, TNC Africa

**Absent with apologies:**

Miss. Cynthia Adrienne – MHILT  
 Mrs. Marie- May Muzungaile- MEECC  
 Mr. Patrick Samson – PetroSeychelles  
 Dr. Jan Robinson – SWIOFish3  
 Ms. Vania Robert – SeyCCAT  
 Mr. Justin Prosper – MEECC  
 Mr. Peter Brinn - GCCA Project  
 Mr. John Nevill - Consultant  
 Ms. Ashley Dias - MEECC

**Minutes;**

Agenda Item #	Agenda Item	Comment/Advice	Action_Response (with initials)
1	Welcome	The Principle Secretary for Environment welcomed all the members to the meeting.	

Agenda Item #	Agenda Item	Comment/Advice	Action_Response (with initials)
	Agenda Review	The agenda and objectives of the meeting was reviewed and adopted without any changes.	Annex I
2	Overview of the MSP policy	There was a presentation which summarised the MSP policy drafting process and the overall content of the MSP Policy.	
3	MSP peer review process	A summary of the Peer Review process and the guiding questions to the reviewers was provided.	
		There was a query on the date of the document and whether it would be labelled as 2020.	It was confirmed that the dates would be updated once the policy is finalised. AD
4	Comments from Reviewer 1	A summary of the comments received from the 1 <sup>st</sup> reviewer was provided. Each comment was addressed by the SC and feedback summarised below:	See annex II for comments received.
	General comments 1 to 3	No significant comments from the MSP SC.	
	General comment 4	It was confirmed that the main timelines that need to be updated in the policy are in line 291, objective 3 and that the activity 3, 4 and 6 will be completed by 2021.	
		It was proposed to have specific month to be able to track the target.	Due to many uncertainties at this point, it was decided to keep only to a yearly target.
		The MSP SC was reminded by one member that the MSP had kept on target because of the written milestones in the debt swap loan agreement. It was recommended to have similar dates (milestone) to keep track of implementation.	Timelines will also be in the marine plan document and in the implementation plan. HS.
	General comment 5, 6, 7	The MSP SC was reminded that there has been progress on the development of the management frameworks for the protection areas; Z2 – SWIOFISH3 funded work has started and Z1- work will be funded through donor to SeyCCAT	
		No changes were made to the policy document	
	General Comment 8	An SC member proposed that the policy document should mention how the 30% goal was determined including how the target percentages of Z1 and Z2 were decided.	MSP SC co-chair elaborated that the commitment is mentioned in the policy document that was made at Rio+ 20. AD.
		No changes were made to the policy document as indicators will be developed for the marine spatial plan and implementation plan and there is mention of KPIs in the action plan.	
Lines 66-79	The MSP SC agreed to adopt this recommendation.		

Agenda Item #	Agenda Item	Comment/Advice	Action_Response (with initials)
	Line 69	MSP SC confirmed that there is no need to list all commitments as these are often updated and new commitments may be made making the policy outdated.	
		MSP SC agreed to reference the Aichi target and SDG to be kept.	
		MSP SC agreed to be general and mention 'international commitments'.	
	Line 95-102	MSP SC noted that lines 95 to 102 lists some commitments and that the wording does not include CITES or World Heritage convention	MEECC to prioritise this list. AD.
		There was a proposal to have a list of international conventions and commitments in an Annex.	There was no agreement amongst MSP SC members to include a list in an Annex to the policy.
		It was advised that the language should reflect that any other international commitment should be met. E.g., reaffirming Seycheles' International Obligations and commitments including;	
	Line 126-129	There were no objections though MEECC confirmed to explore further with other policy documents which words would be put in bold.	AD.
	Lines 141-143	There was unanimous agreement to make this change	
	Line 141	Benefit of it's seas changed to 'marine environment'	
		MSP SC noted that within the paragraph, there is no reference to other aspects of the ocean – mineral exploration, fisheries, cultural. Only reference to megafauna.	
Line 141	There was agreement to have a full stop after colonisation. Then start a new sentence with 'considerable...'		
5	Coffee Break		
6	Reviewer 2	A summary of the comments received from the 2 <sup>nd</sup> reviewer was provided. Each comment was addressed by the SC and feedback summarised below:	See Annex III for comments from the 2 <sup>nd</sup> reviewer.
	General comments 1, 2 and 3	There was no agreement to make changes to the MSP Policy based on these comments.	
	General comment 4	There was agreement to make the change to operating principles.	
		There was a discussion on whether the operational principles are for the policy or for the action plan.	
	There was agreement to move the operating principles from the annex to the policy to guide further decisions in future (move line 245-278) to policy.		

Agenda Item #	Agenda Item	Comment/Advice	Action_Response (with initials)
	General Comments 5, 6,7,8	There was no agreement by the MSP SC to make changes based on these comments.	
	Line 55	It as agreed that the 'Seychelles Marine Spatial Plan' was to be used for consistency throughout the document	
	Line 58	There was agreement to change 'management conditions' to 'management considerations'.	
	Line 69	There was agreement to change 'country's' to 'Seychelles'.	
	Line 93	There was agreement to use 'a Blue economy'.	
	Line 93	There was a proposal and agreement to include 'the blue economy roadmap' after 'the merchant shipping act'.	
	Line 95-104	As per previous discussions, it was agreed to include the World Heritage Convention.	
	Line 117	There was agreement to change 'shortfall' to 'gaps'.	
	Line 118	There was agreement for the line to read 'and to ensure optimal management'.	
	Line 144	There was a proposal to add a map of the EEZ as an annex in the policy document. The map to include the archipelagoes and plateaus (existing boundaries only).	
	Line 144	There was agreement to change 'Seychelles plateau' to 'Mahe plateau'.	
	Line 140	It was proposed and agreed that the Annex 1 line 140 be edited to read 'when seabed area covered by extended continental shelf is factored in'.	
	Line 116	MSP SC agreed to Capitalise Seychelles Marine Spatial Plan.	
	Line 154, 161, 166, 173	Agreement to change 'GoS' to 'Government of Seychelles' for consistency.	
	Line 164	It was proposed that the MSP Core Team check the numbers for the debt swap to clarify the amount provided by TNC for the impact capital loan (USD16.6 or USD15.6 million).	
	Line 158, 160	It was agreed that for consistency the policy should read 'The Nature Conservancy'.	
	Line 182	It was agreed to keep the term 'Mission' as this is what is used in other Seychelles' policy documents.	
	Line 186	There was no agreement to change this line.	
	Line 191-195	It was agreed to change 'mission' to 'aim' and for the line to read 'consolidated into 3 <b>overall</b> objectives'	
	Line 203	It was agreed that the acronyms would not be used (write out).	
	Line 215	It was agreed to keep 'optimise'.	
	Line 225	There was no agreement by the MSP SC to add initial.	
	Line 226	There was a recommendation and agreement to put the dates in brackets.	

Agenda Item #	Agenda Item	Comment/Advice	Action_Response (with initials)
	Line 237	There was a recommendation and agreement to change SMSP to MSP for consistency.	
	Line 242	There was agreement to add a comma after Monitoring, data collection and analysis are optimised...	The same edits to be made in the table in the Annex, objective 4.
	Line 245	There has been agreement to change 'operating guidelines' to 'operating principles'.	
	Line 246	There was agreement to change 'action plan' to 'MSP'.	
	Lines 236-244	It was recommended and agreed to add a full stop at end of all the bullets.	
	Line 249	It was agreed to use 'enable' rather than 'create'.	
	Line 262	There was no agreement to make this change.	
	Line 271	There was no agreement to make this change.	
	Line 276	It was proposed and agreed to add 'Marine' to spatial plan in the line. There was no agreement to make other changes.	
	Line 274	It was proposed and agreed to add Seychelles Climate Policy & Strategy and the Blue Economy roadmap to this line.	
	Line 84 onwards	It was agreed to bold key phrases from line 84	
7	AOB	The MSP SC discussed on the use of 'marine protection areas' vs 'marine protected areas' in the policy document.	There was agreement to use marine protected areas.
		It was pointed out that in Objective 1, the reference to area 1 in table 1 should be changed to the port fee boundary area. Similarly, in objective 2, situation analysis there is reference to area 6 and this should be changed.	There was agreement to make language more general and to remove reference to area numbers. HS.
	Next Steps	The MSP SC members are given one week to send in written comments. All comments should be received by Friday 21 <sup>st</sup> August. Once finalised the Policy will then be reviewed by the MSP Executive Committee and then to the Cabinet for endorsement.	
<i>Meeting adjourned at 1230hrs</i>			

Minutes submitted by: Helena Sims on 17 August 2020.

**Annex I: Meeting Agenda**

**SEYCHELLES MARINE SPATIAL PLAN (MSP) INITIATIVE**

**MSP Steering Committee – Extraordinary Meeting**

Meeting #19- MSP Policy Peer Review

Date: Friday 14 August 2020

Time: 09:00 AM - Noon

Location: STC Conference Room, Latanier Road, Victoria, Mahe

**Agenda**

**Meeting Objectives:**

1. Review the comments and feedback received by the reviewers,
2. Discuss and agree on which comments to incorporate in the final policy document
3. Discuss the process and way forward to endorsement of the policy at Cabinet level.

#	Time	Topic
	09:00	Arrival and Registration
1	09:05	Meeting Opening – Steering Committee co-Chair MEECC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome and Agenda review</li> </ul>
2	09:10	Recap of MSP Policy drafting process
3	09:20	Summary of the peer review process – reviewers & guiding questions
4	09:30	Review of comments & specific edits – for decisions vs info reviewer 1
5	10:15	Coffee break
6	10:30	Review of comments & specific edits – for decisions vs info reviewer 2
7	11:30	Any Other Business (AOB) and next steps
	12:00	Adjourn.

## **Annex II: Comments from Reviewer #1**

### General comments:

1. The Seychelles MSP policy is highly innovative, appropriately complex, and will likely be a pioneering effort that can serve as a model for other high biodiversity marine States. The policy summary is clearly written and easy to follow, and I commend everyone involved with its formulation.
2. I really like the section on Operational Guidance, but think in a way it mixes apples and oranges, mixing features and steps. All points should be made, but I would advocate having all the bolded phrases be action-oriented (e.g. 'maintaining the public trust', 'planning at appropriate scales').
3. I'm not sure I understand the situation analyses under objective 1 and 2. It seems the situation analysis should spell out the problem that various features of the marine plan address. In other words, certain areas are subject to overfishing or destructive fishing, therefore strictly protected (no take) zones are identified as a response to this problem. I see the solutions spelled out, but not the problems - at least not at the level of detail that the plan encompasses, nor in a spatial manner.
4. Does the timeline with its benchmarks need to be revised, or have all the 2018 targets been met? I noticed some highlighted- perhaps these are things that were not fulfilled by the stated date?
5. Under Objective 4, data monitoring (point 4): are the data to be peer-reviewed, or the data analyses? I think it would be difficult to get peer reviewers of raw data, and as long as the types of data that are collected are pre-approved/vetted, it is really the analysis that needs review. This includes methods of data management / aggregation, statistical analyses, and interpretation of results, at a minimum.
6. If this statement is true: "...structured scientific data regarding ecosystem function, health and productivity are still chronically lacking." then I wonder if it makes sense to focus on representativeness? Or is the representativeness just at the coarse level of habitat diversity, not biodiversity?
7. The latter point brings up a major issue, which you have undoubtedly considered (and if so, it would be great to include the justification in the supplemental materials). The issue is how the targets were decided. The 30% is a common figure (though not based on any science that I know of)- but 15% strictly protected and 15% less strictly protected - where did these numbers come from? Is there any evidence that designating 15% of the EEZ as no-take will increase fisheries production or maintain overall marine biodiversity? Doesn't it matter where the 15% is - and could it just as well be 5%, or 50%? If there is justification for these quantified targets, then it should be included in the policy background. Otherwise people could argue that the zonation is arbitrary.
8. Perhaps the most important issue is what kind of performance metrics will be put in place to be able to ascertain whether the plan is reaching its objectives, or how it should be modified. These KPIs should be related to the outcomes, not to the management activities (i.e. measuring increases in coral cover, in spawning populations, in nursery habitat - not measuring the amount of area closed or the number of infractions of regulations). This will be key to a robust, adaptive marine plan.

### Specific edits by Line:

---

Lines 66-79 The word “to” is redundant, so begin each bullet with the verb.

Line 69- name these commitments - are they different from CBD and Aichi, or SDG?

Lines 126-129 this should be bolded, as it is the crux of the policy statement.

Lines 141-143. I would separate the statement on the riches of the sea from the description of degradation - especially as it is unlikely that the entire EEZ is equally degraded, whereas the entire EEZ provides a wealth of resources and ecosystem services.

### **Annex III: Comments from Reviewer #2**

#### **General comments:**

1. My overall impression is that this document tries to do too much. In my view it has too much detail for a “Policy” document. I can’t think of any other MSP that has tried to put as much detail into a policy document. It’s an important document; the only one that some decision-makers are likely to read; and hopefully that will stimulate more to look forward to the actual plan (toward the end I had the impression that I was actually reading the details of the plan—or at least a work plan);
2. The “Policy” document ends at p. 7, but I think the narrative of Annex 1, and possibly Annex 3 could be incorporated into the Policy, rather than annexes—a shorter Annex 2, too;
3. The “Policy” and the “Action Plan” would then be two separate documents. The Policy section would cover general direction, including Annexes 1-3; the Action Plan (Annex 4) gets to specific management actions for implementation;
4. The exception of Annex 4 would be to move the section at line 245 now titled “Operational Guidance” (I suggested re-titling it to “Operating Principles”) into the Policy section;
5. Isn’t most of the Action Plan already an outline of the “Implementation Plan” for the SMSP?
6. Shouldn’t this document mention the March 2020 announcement of the 13 new MPAs covering a third of the Seychelles’ EEZ—a major deliverable under the debt refinancing—and the achievement of Objective 1?
7. No matter what you decide about the above comments, I think a flow diagram of how the pieces fit together needs a flow diagram would be useful; and
8. Obviously, many of the dates specified need to be updated.

#### **Specific Comments on Policy Document:**

Line 55: Add “National” after Seychelles; the document uses both the “Seychelles’ Marine Spatial Plan” and “Seychelles’ National Marine Spatial Plan”; chose one and be consistent;

Line 58: What are “management conditions”?

Line 69: Change “the Country’s” to “the Seychelles”

Line 93: I don’t think a definition exists for **the** “Blue Economy”; “**a** Blue Economy” would be better. This occurs in several other places, e.g., lines 104 & 216;

Line 95-104: The **World Heritage Convention** should be added somewhere in this listing of international conventions. The **Aldabra Atoll** was inscribed on World Heritage List in 1982 (as noted later in the Supplemental Material);

Line 117: Wouldn’t “gaps” be better than “shortfall”?

Line 118: Personally, I don’t know what “optimal management” means. “**best management**” is probably a better term;

Line 144: Is the **Seychelles Plateau** shown on a map somewhere in the policy document?;

Line 163: Spell out “the Government of the Seychelles”;



---

Line 182: Shouldn't "Mission" be "Goal"? But then the goal would be different than the one identified in Part 1 of the Supplemental Material; shouldn't that goal be used in the Policy document?

Line 186: Add "has" after 2014;

Line 191-195: Three (not very SMART) "objectives" are identified; the first is at least measurable; the latter two not. Was any effort made to make these statements SMARTer? How would these objectives be evaluated without more specificity? Later references (e.g., lines 235-244) to "objectives" identifies **five** objectives—this is confusing at first reading;

Line 203: What is the **SWIOFish3** project? Third South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Governance and Shared Growth Project, funded by the World Bank?

Line 215: I would use "realize" economic opportunities, instead of "optimize"

Line 225: Add "initial" before development (to indicate this is not a "one-off" Plan;

Line 237: Change "goal" to "objective";

Line 242: Monitoring data collection and analysis activities **are completed and...**;

Line 245: Should this be "**Operating Principles**"? [see above general comments]

Line 247: Change "operational guidance" to operating principles;

Line 249: Change "create" to identify?;

Line 262: Add at end, "for example, who benefits and who pays.";

Line 271: After "adapts", add "to new conditions and information" over time;

Line 276: "The best available data and information have been" used....;