Taller de Evaluación y Seguimiento de Zonas de Refugio Pesquero en México

La Paz, 10 y 11 de Octubre

Pedro Sierra, Director adjunto INAPESCA:

* Zonas de Refugio Pesquero (ZRPs) are viewed as management tolos, not conservation tools. They are focused to manage fisheries or aquaculture.
* Five basic controls exist in INAPESCA, and all of them target “fishing sustainability”
  + Minimum catch sizes, tat protect young, immature organisms
  + Specify fishing methods that allow small organisms to escape
  + Closures, partial access by time
  + Quotas, which specify how much can be extracted. It is achieved by limiting access to the fishery.
  + ZRPs, that seek to protect heavily fished populations
* **He calls for methods that allow to evaluate the effectiveness of this management tool (ZRPs)**
* An important thing is the fact that users have welcomed and braced the use of ZRPs as a fishery management tool. The temporality and flexibility of the tool makes it attractive to fishers.
* Idea of making adjustments to the NOM-049 in order to allow INAPESCA – CONAPESCA to propose ZRPs, not only give advice on ZRPs proposed by fishers.
* Subsidies for swimming crab, shark, and shrimp imply that a closure is a wrong management tool. This hinders the way in which INAPESCA - CONAPESCA can enforce the fishery.
* Enforcement (vigilancia) of ZRPs is key to achieve their success, along with controlling people and their awareness of the reserves. Users are key enablers of effectiveness of ZRPs.

Edaysi Bucios, CONAPESCA:

* Workshop serves as a platform to strengthen relationships between NGOs and Government Agencies, as well as pushing for the implementation of ZRPs.
* Construct a platform that enables enforcement, participation, in addition to the traditional implementation – evaluation series of events.

Armando Vega, INAPESCA:

* Presents objectives of the workshop:
  + Determine and identify processes that must be followed for the establishment and later monitoring and evaluation of effectiveness of ZRPs
  + ZRPs Punta Coyote- San Cosme and Sian Ka’an are next in line to void, and indicators to evaluate them must be defined.
  + Identify INAPESCA’s role in the evaluation as the technical party

Miguel Ángel Huerta, CONAPESCA, National panorama of existing ZRPs

* Presents FAO statisctics on overexploited (~30%), exploited (~60%) and subexploited ( ~ 10%)
* Land protected areas > Marine protected areas (in size and number)
* Mexico is one of the countries with the longest coastline, seafood is an important industry and source of food
* No take zones (NTZ) have economical, social, and environmental benefits. Therefore, it is important to promote its implementation, evaluate its effects, and analyze its re-establishment, modification or elimination
* Similar instruments before:
  + NOM 002 for shrimp fishery: No trawling allowed in depths > 10 meters
  + NOM 060 for objective species: Limits acces to continental water masses, like coastal lagoons
  + NOM 029 for sharks: 5Km buffer to all reefs with restricted access, plus a closure season
* ZRPs closed areas in national waters seeking to protect FISHING RESOURCES and collaterally, protect the environment
* ZRPs are described in NOM 049, in which they are described as four categories:
  + Total permanent (no fishing, never)
  + Total temporal (catch-release sportfishing is allowed, no fishing, gor a period of time)
  + Partial permanent (Some species are protected, forever, sportfishing and self-consumption allowed)
  + Partial temporal (Some species protected, for a period of time, sportfishing and self-consumption allowed)
* NOM 049 describes the outline of Estudios Técnicos Justificativos (ETJ)
  + Basic infoirmation of the zone
  + Objectives and justification
  + Objective species
  + Fishery and demographic-specific information
  + Relation to other government-owned protected areas
* They suggest that INAPESCA should ask for:
  + Diversity indeces
  + Size structure
  + Presence of migratory species
  + Description of chain of value associated to the zone
* Procedure that allows the implementation of ZRPs
  + Interested parties can be “Subdelegaciones”, productive sector (fishers), and NGOs
  + Dirección General de Ordenamiento Pesquero y Acuícola (DGOPA) analices the application made by the interested party. If they believe that the application is strong enough, they ask INAPESCA for their technical opinion and at the same time DGOPA creates the “agreement” (document), which is validated by the “juridic opinion”.
  + Once all this is put together, it is sent to SAGARPA (lawyer), where the agreement is written
  + It is sent to the Diario Oficial de la Federación, where the information will be published
  + (To come) A program of evaluation and monitoring and after the agreement is void, revision of the status of ZRP
* High degree of bureocracy:
  + SAGARPA
    - CONAPESCA
    - INAPESCA
  + NGOs
  + Fishing sector
  + CONANP
  + CONABIO
  + SEMARNAT
* National status:
  + 7 ZRPs have been established (35 polygons, 2.01 E6 hectares)
    - 2 in Baja
      * Corredor Punta Coyote (first to be void)
      * Golfo de Ulloa (Until June 24th 2018)
    - 1 in Tecapan to protect “ostión”
    - 4 in Caribbean
      * Bahía Espíritu Santo
      * Banco Chinchorro
      * Akumal
      * Bahía Asención
      * El uso de varias zonas pequeñas es más aceptado por los pescadores, pues les permite re-distribuir su esfuerzo de manera más sencilla
  + Upcoming ZRPs (the ones in “validación juridical” are expected to be enacted this year
    - El Rosario
    - Natividad
    - Puerto Libertad
    - San Pedro Nolasco
    - Bahía Jitzámuri
    - Isla de la Piedra
    - Acapatehua
* Institutional environment does not allow having monetary resources for enforcement. External funding should be identified
* Most of the ZRPs are in three states, he calls for implementation in other regions
* Time of response by CONAPESCA and INAPESCA should be faster, because bureaucracy hinders the implementation and can “desmotivar” de implementation of ZRPs
* Reduce the time between implementation and follow up of ZRPs
* Questions:
  + Why has INAPESCA not been involved in enforcement of ZRPs? 🡪 The NOM 049 stablished that INAPESCA should enforce, nevertheless when the norm was written, the expenses of enforcement were not included in the budget that the agency has. In other words, there is no money.

Alvin Suárez, COBI, Objetivos generals y específicos de las ZRPs existentes

* NOM 049 contains some objecives:
  + Species of comercial interest
  + Increase productivity
  + Avoid overexploitation
  + Preserve important hábitat
  + Maintain biological processes (recruitment, growth, reproduction, feeding)
* Corredor San Coste – Punta Coyote
  + Increase species of comercial interest
  + Increase productivity of nearby areas
  + Contirbute to the maintenance of biological processes
* Sian Ka’an
  + Increases pecies of commercial interests
  + Increase productivity of nearby areas
  + Contribute to the mainetance of biological processes
* Banco chinchorro
  + Increases pecies of commercial interests
  + Increase productivity of nearby areas
  + Contribute to the mainetance of biological processes
* Teacapán
  + Increase species of commercial interests
  + Increase productivity of nearby areas
  + Protect species from overexploitation
  + Recover overexploited species
* Golfo de Ulloa
  + Increase species of commercial interests
  + Increase productivity of nearby areas
  + Contribute to the mainetance of biological processes
  + Protect species under the Mexican red list
* Akumal
  + Increase species of commercial interests
  + Increase productivity of nearby areas
  + Contribute to the maintenance of biological processes
* Bahía Ascensión
  + Increase species of commercial interests
  + Increase productivity of nearby areas
  + Contribute to the maintenance of biological processes
* Questions
  + Hector Reyes: ZRPs focuses on the resource, not the fishers
  + Chava: Modifications that allow ZRPs to be used as conservation tools

Juan Carlos Villaseñor, Bren School, Indicators (Comments / questions made during the presentation):

* Pablo, For INAPESCA, even when no effectiveness is shown, we would understand that five years are not enough, and under the “cautious principle” we would recommend to continue with the ZRP in place.
* Maria José says that it is important to have publicly available information (i.e. results, analysis and decision making) to enhance transparency
* Luis Bourillon: Transparency is important, but be careful because it could backfire at the users

Juan Gabriel, CRIP La Paz, Monitoreo y evaluación de las zonas de refugio pesquero

* No notes, no brains after presentation

Alvin Suárez, COBI, Biophysical, socioeconomic and governance principles for the design of no-take marine reserves

* NTZ are areas where no extraction or destruction is allowed
* Questions:
  + Principles can be used to re-establish or modify present ZRPs

Ramón Chávez, INAPESCA, Diagrama de flujo interno de CONAPESCA

* No presentation

Miguel Ángel Huerta, CONAPESCA & Ramón Chávez, INAPESCA, Árbol de decisiones para evaluación de refugios

* If fishers have agreed to maintain the ZRPs or when available information does not justify a modification, reserves would be left untouched and given more time.
* If fishers have agreed to make changes to the ZRPs or technical information justifies the changes, modifications would be made to the agreement, in which time, area, type and complimentary management measures would be included
* If the agreement comes to an end, reserves are automatically not recognized any more. As a contingency measure, a “prorroga” would be published ASAP, extending a couple of months the duration on the reserves, while paperwork gets done.
* When there is no agreement by fishers, data show negative trends or negative impact, or the context has changed, the ZRPs would be deleted.