

The Rufford Foundation

Final Report

Congratulations on the completion of your project that was supported by The Rufford Foundation.

We ask all grant recipients to complete a Final Report Form that helps us to gauge the success of our grant giving. The Final Report must be sent in **word format** and not PDF format or any other format. We understand that projects often do not follow the predicted course but knowledge of your experiences is valuable to us and others who may be undertaking similar work. Please be as honest as you can in answering the questions – remember that negative experiences are just as valuable as positive ones if they help others to learn from them.

Please complete the form in English and be as clear and concise as you can. Please note that the information may be edited for clarity. We will ask for further information if required. If you have any other materials produced by the project, particularly a few relevant photographs, please send these to us separately.

Please submit your final report to jane@rufford.org.

Thank you for your help.

Josh Cole, Grants Director

Grant Recipient Details	
Your name	Vera Horigue
Project title	Marine protected area network governance and collaborative partnerships
RSG reference	11261-1
Reporting period	19th March 2012 to April 2013
Amount of grant	£3000
Your email address	vera.horigue@my.jcu.edu.au
Date of this report	26th June 2013

1. Please indicate the level of achievement of the project's original objectives and include any relevant comments on factors affecting this.

Objective	Not achieved	Partially achieved	Fully achieved	Comments
Develop a management performance assessment tool (questionnaire) for marine protected area (MPA) networks			√	The tool we developed was a good start to outlining the benchmarks and activities of MPA networks. We used management performance as a surrogate for management effectiveness. We assumed that greater effort (performance), results to greater (outcomes). Moreover, it is easier to measure management outputs compared to outcomes. We are planning to improve this tool further based on the experiences we had during the implementation of the tool. We are currently finalising the paper to be submitted for publication.
Evaluate management performance of MPA networks			√	We recently submitted the paper the paper for publication in Ocean and Coastal Management. We realised that rigorous assessment of management performance of MPA networks require a lot more information that the tool we developed cannot answer. Hence, it was good that we also conducted key informant interviews to complement the tool. The interviews were really important to get information from the MPA network members.
Determine the factors that affect management performance of MPA networks			√	We are currently finalising the paper to be submitted for publication. We're also in the process of writing another publication, detailing how these factors affect management performance. The factors we identified are: 1) history and objectives of the network; 2) governance structure; 3) varying interests and priorities; and 4) social, geographical and economic attributes of the study areas.
Assess the strength of relationships of the members of the MPA networks by understanding		√		We're indicating partially achieved, since we haven't finished data analysis for all the case studies we have. However, we have begun to see patterns as to what affects the strength of relationships in MPA networks. Leadership and

the effects of governance structure				accountability measures are important in MPA networks. We observed that self-organised networks are more likely to have weaker relationships, because of the lack of strong leadership, accountability measures and political obligation.
-------------------------------------	--	--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2. Please explain any unforeseen difficulties that arose during the project and how these were tackled (if relevant).

We encountered a few delays in the project, because of logistical problems and unfavourable weather conditions. To address this, we have extended our stay in some study areas. Some of the key informants that we wanted to interview were not available. Some of them have introduced us to other people that were knowledgeable, however some of them did not. Some informants also refused to be interviewed entirely. We could not address this difficulty but have noted these people in our project.

I (Vera) had health problems during field work and that affected my productivity. Even though I struggled, I managed to finish field work and still got treatment. I would have wanted to finish the field work sooner, but I could not at my condition at that time. I have extended my PhD, because I could not finish all the data analysis and writing.

3. Briefly describe the three most important outcomes of your project.

The first outcome of our research included creating a method to assess management performance of MPA networks. This method included creating a tool (questionnaire) to evaluate management performance, combined with community perception surveys, key informant interviews and strength-weaknesses-opportunities analysis. This method, particularly the tool developed, can be used as a guide for collaborative partnerships to sustain MPA network initiatives. Local government institutions can use it as a guide for them to use, and to track their progress using the tool on their own.

Secondly, we were able to determine the benefits of establishing collaborative partnerships to form MPA networks. We learned that being part of collaborative partnerships expedite MPA establishment, since members of partnerships become more accountable and feel the need to keep up with other the other local government institutions. Moreover, we found that being part of collaborative partnerships enables members to improve their management more due to the lessons learned shared by other MPA managers and local governments. Regular meetings enabled MPA managers and/or local government officials talk about their experiences more openly and seek others opinions and experiences about common issues.

Lastly, we found out that governance structures, objectives of collaborative partnerships and relative dependence on fisheries have a more profound effect on management performance. Involvement of higher level governance institutions (e.g. provincial governments) make collaborative partnerships perform better, since there is another institution who makes the members accountable compared to partnerships who are self-organised wherein members are just composed of local governments in the same level. The objectives also have an impact on performance, because it is what drives the

partnerships. If the objective of the partnerships is to share information, then they usually limit their activities to sharing information. However, if the objective of the partnerships is to coordinate their efforts and have a more organised planning and management strategy, then they increase possibilities for improving and enhancing their MPA networks. The relative dependence on fisheries also has an effect. If community members are not dependent too much on fisheries that mean that there is more livelihood options for them to consider. It is also the same for local government institutions, it is easier for them to implement MPA network initiatives since buy-in is easier to obtain because there will be less displacement of fishermen.

4. Briefly describe the involvement of local communities and how they have benefitted from the project (if relevant).

We have spent a lot of time in coastal areas and interacted with local government officials and community members (e.g. fishermen). We conducted interviews, focus group discussions and perception surveys. We also observed the living conditions in the areas. We learned a lot from working with the communities. The communities benefitted from the project because we were also able to share information and experiences with regards to MPAs, coastal and fisheries management. We always asked the participants if they have any questions relevant to the project. They usually asked what they could to improve their initiatives. We tried our best to answer their questions and introduced them to other experts who could help them when we couldn't.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

We intend to pursue this project by continuing the development of the management performance assessment tool and the methods for evaluating MPA and MPA network effectiveness. We plan to create a management performance tool that is extensively applicable to include different types of networks. The tool that we created was a good start. However, we found gaps during implementation. We plan to pursue further development of the tool and address the comments from other colleagues who used the tool in their project sites. We also plan to pursue research on management effectiveness and to look at the impact of management performance on biophysical outcomes (e.g. improved coral cover and fish biomass) and socioeconomic benefits (e.g. sustained catch and income from fisheries or tourism from MPAs) at the network level and compare the outcomes between MPA networks and single MPAs. We are also planning to develop guidelines for the development of networks and benchmarks to be assessed.

6. How do you plan to share the results of your work with others?

We will be publishing the work in peer-reviewed journals. We are also planning to present the results of this study in universities, our collaborators in the Philippines and in conferences. We are also looking for additional funding to conduct a feedback trip to report the lessons learned from project in the case study areas. Lastly, we plan to create knowledge products (e.g. pamphlets, guidebooks) about MPA network development, evaluation and governance.

7. Timescale: Over what period was The Rufford Foundation grant used? How does this compare to the anticipated or actual length of the project?

The RSGF grant was used from March 2012 until January 2013. We used the grant for field work purposes, but the entire length of the project is actually longer. I (Vera) was not able to take in into

account the time spent on data transcription and analysis and writing. Because I'm doing a PhD, I also had other projects (thesis chapters) that needed to be finished before I could work on the project with funds from RSGF. Although, this did not interfere with the fieldwork schedule, I had problems finishing and writing up the RSGF project report as requested, because I haven't started analysing my data when I was supposed to submit this final report.

8. Budget: Please provide a breakdown of budgeted versus actual expenditure and the reasons for any differences. All figures should be in £ sterling, indicating the local exchange rate used.

From RSGF funds only and does not include International Airfares (Return Australia and Philippines, administrative costs, supplies and honorarium for research assistants and field enumerators); Exchange rate in 2012: 1 GBP = 61 PHP

Item	Budgeted Amount	Actual Amount	Difference	Comments
Local Airfare (Office-base to various sites in the Philippines) – 5 return flights Manila and field sites	500	452.80	47.20	I was able to get cheaper flights and some of my flights were paid by my collaborators in the Philippines.
Local Transport (Around the Philippines – taxi, jeep, ferry)	1300	798.40	501.6	Local transport was a lot cheaper than expected, because I chose the cheapest options whenever possible when travelling. There were a few times that I needed to hire vehicles and pay for petrol, but those amounts were minimal.
Accommodations (in the Philippines)	600	973.11	-373.11	Accommodation was cheaper in the study areas. I usually try to stay at cheaper accommodation (but comfortable areas), but sometimes those options were not available when I am in Manila. I also paid for the accommodation of my research assistants when we're at the study areas. This amount is actually lower than as well, because we stayed for free at colleagues' houses and a collaborator's office.
Food (in the Philippines)	600	780.36	-180.36	Food was cheap in my field sites, but I also paid for my field enumerators and research assistants.
Total	3000	3004.67	-4.67	The difference was minimal, so I was able to use my other grant. Also, I realigned my budget, because my expenses were cheaper in some items.

9. Looking ahead, what do you feel are the important next steps?

At the moment, I (Vera) am prioritising finishing my PhD. However, my second priority is to get my work published and share the lessons learned from it. I also plan to visit my case study areas to present the results of the project when I return to the Philippines. Hopefully my research can help the MPA network members and MPA managers improve their management. I have also been looking for research positions and drafting research proposals for a potential post-doctoral research project, to enable me to pursue the work that I have started during my PhD and develop some ideas further.

10. Did you use The Rufford Foundation logo in any materials produced in relation to this project? Did the RSGF receive any publicity during the course of your work?

I have used the RSGF logo and acknowledged RSGF during presentations of the initial results of my project in various workshops and forums in the Philippines. I plan to use the RSGF logo and acknowledge RSGF in the reports and publications I'm writing and in the conferences, I plan to go to. I also acknowledged and used the RSGF logo during my pre-completion seminar.

I have also recommended RSGF to my colleagues, particularly post-graduate research students at James Cook University and the University of the Philippines.