

**Northern Mozambique Channel Initiative  
Partners Meeting**

*Meeting summary notes  
By Harifidy Ralison (WWF) and David Obura (CORDIO East Africa)*

**This is a draft, not yet approved by participants – 16 Nov. 2014**

**Date:** 15<sup>th</sup> of November, 2014 (World Parks Congress (WPC), 12-19 November 2014)

**Location:** Sydney, WPC venue, Hall 2 Pod North

**Organizers:** BirdLife International, Conservation International, CORDIO, WWF

**Contents:**

Objectives of the meeting: .....	1
Introduction .....	1
Relation of the NMCI with other initiatives .....	2
Marine Spatial Planning .....	2
Oil and Gas .....	4
Closing ideas .....	6
Appendix 1 – Meeting agenda .....	7
Appendix 2 – List of participants .....	9

**Objectives of the meeting**

Following up from the NMCI partners meetings at IMPAC3 in October 2013 and in Dar es Salaam in June 2014, this meeting aimed at advancing two strategic areas for development and collaboration on the NMCI, focused on:

- Aligning understanding on the need and opportunities of developing MSP framework(s) in the NMC area;
- Aligning understanding on Oil & Gas development in the Mozambique Channel; and
- Identifying concrete actions for joint collaboration on these two strategic areas

**Introduction**

The meeting was introduced by Harifidy Ralison and David Obura, providing a short overview of the initiative to date, though the introduction was kept short to maximize time for discussion on the objectives above. For background and up to date documents on the NMCI, participants were directed to [www.cordioea.net/nmc](http://www.cordioea.net/nmc).

The presentation highlighted the conceptual development and focus of current work on the NMCI, in particular the objectives, key components, documents under preparation (strategic framework, background

analysis, GEF PIF proposal), and the rationale and timelines of the approach (phased approach, consultation with governments, consultation with NGOs). The presentation also introduced several independent studies being commissioned: ecosystem service valuation, CSO survey, oil & gas assessment. Following the general introduction, an initial question on the relation of the NMCi to other initiatives was discussed, then brief primers were made on each of the topics, by Tundi Agardy (Marine Spatial Planning) and Suzanne Schmidt (WWF) (Oil and Gas).

### Relation of the NMCi with other initiatives

A point of clarification was requested on the relationship between WIOCC and NMCi. In dealing with this we tried to address the issue of the NMCi in relation to other programmes and initiatives in general, whether broad/large-scale (e.g. the WIOCC, the regional GEF programmes e.g. WIOLAB, ASCLME, etc.) or specific/small-scale (site-based projects).

In essence, the NMCi is being designed as a place-based sub-regional initiative that provides an integrated context for activities and priorities from both larger and smaller scale programmes and initiatives. Within the boundaries of the NMC<sup>1</sup>, the capitals approach<sup>2</sup> will help synthesize actions that relate institutions/policy, economic sectors including local/small scale sectors, ecosystems and natural capital, social conditions and the human/knowledge capital needed for effective implementation and governance.

Specifically in relation to the WIOCC: WIOCC is a political platform/initiative with top-level leadership from heads of state, with a particular focus on climate change adaptation and mitigation, and sustainable financing. These topics are extremely relevant to NMCi, thus the NMCi so by being compatible with the WIOCC can gain from support from the WIOCC to achieve its outcomes on the ground. Conversely, the NMCi could be considered a partner or vehicle for implementing WIOCC goals within its geographic area of activity. The proposal development phase for the NMCi is undertaking a mapping with initiatives, including the WIOCC, SAPPHIRE, WIOSAP, etc, to ensure this complementarity is built in, and that the synergies across the larger programmes will result in greater (additional) benefits within the NMC region.

The NMC is a priority subregion within the broader Western Indian Ocean, for a host of biodiversity, ecological, social and economic reasons, thus the NMCi can provide a mechanism and framework for implementation of many different programmes within its geography. The NMCi is seeking alignment between multiple different initiatives to enhance mutual achievement of goals.

### Marine Spatial Planning

Tundi Agardy provided a set of types of objectives that can offer a route into MSP, which can help guide countries on how building an MSP process as a way to concretize the vision for the NMCi. A primary goal here is the necessity to build governance/country ownership in the MSP process, so identifying the main objectives and stakeholders is critical.

Objectives for MSP	Examples
1) MSP can be seen as a holistic way to capture ecological (and socio-economic) values and making them explicit, thereby providing an opportunity to develop a blueprint for achieving conservation goals.	Australian initiative on biological assessments planning that can influence the selection of future MPAs and also push specific sectors e.g. shipping industry to integrate ecological dimensions
2) Information on biologically important areas (e.g. EBSAs) can be used for promoting sustainable blue (green) growth, to address sea-use and engage industry to invest in protection/management of	

<sup>1</sup> The precise boundaries will be defined by the relevant countries during early stages of the MSP process.

<sup>2</sup> The Capitals Approach arose from the Sustainable Livelihoods approach to focus development actions on broad and inter-dependent areas. The five capitals adapted to the NMCi are: Institutional – partnership, governance and decision-making; Economic – livelihoods and economic security and growth; Natural – the ocean, ecosystems and resources; Knowledge/Human – knowledge and innovation; and Social – an empowered society with secured welfare

	critical places/assets.	
3)	There is increasing interest in using resilience information in MSP, to maximize/enhance socio-ecological resilience.	Maldives example, where mapping of reef resilience is being used in management/protection for reef sites.
4)	To enhance food security, MSP can address fisheries production and sustainability, and for example its integration with aquaculture to make livelihoods more secure and limit vulnerability to shocks that lead to unsustainable practices.	In Ghana, MSP for fisheries production/management has a goal for preventing further reliance on bushmeat and pressure in forests.
5)	To improve MPA management through addressing inefficient/inappropriate boundaries that may result from existing PAs needing to meet new/expanded objectives	Pelagos Sanctuary, a reserve initially designed for whale protection and now revised as multiple use and revising borders to enhance protection

**Scale of MSP** – a question was raised about whether MSP is being considered at the larger/broad scale, or as multiple smaller scale MSP efforts around particular locations/issues, etc. Initially, the whole region is the focus for MSP, to provide a frame on which to ‘hang’ the governance context and needs for the region. That is, within the boundaries of the NMC that are identified by the countries and parties, the entire EEZs should be considered.

Within this region, the initiative aspires to harmonize and align national policies related to the ocean – in environment, fisheries, maritime trade, oil and gas, etc., particularly fostering development and alignment of national integrated ocean policies. The goal being to facilitate the implementation of priorities already identified in SAPs and prior intergovernmental projects, but with the specificity of the region in mind. An initially broad overview of the region, to establish the goals for MSP (see table above) implementing the vision of the region, would then provide a canvas on which smaller scale and more detailed spatial planning could occur, whether within the context of MSP or Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM), protected area network planning, fishery zones, etc.

As for decisions on the scope and focus for MSP, it will be useful to consider other multi-country planning initiatives and models, e.g. in the Benguela Current<sup>3</sup>. At present, the focus for the NMCi is on the development and alignment of ocean policies across the countries, pending elaboration on this by the countries in the GEF PIF consultation process (currently undertaken by the NMCi core team (David and Fidy) in collaboration with the Nairobi Convention Secretariat).

The regional MSP framework may also build on national level MSP processes that the countries may set up, with clear differences between those having only parts of their EEZs in the NMC area (Madagascar, Mozambique, Tanzania, France) vs. those having theirs entirely within (Comoros).

The monitoring framework offered by MSP can play a key role in national reporting, and provide early warnings of potential shocks and distortions to the system (e.g. illegal fishing, etc.). The initiative can help provide information and systems for analysis and reporting and for communications and advocacy materials to inform the public and governments. However it is likely that decision-making on these is likely to remain within national institutions.

**Inputs to MSP** – MSP can be used to guide the development of spatial data layers/information that will be used within it, particularly useful for early stages of the initiative. This brings out the importance of Strategic Assessments that need to be undertaken. Some of these are already encouraged by the Nairobi Convention, i.e. Strategic Environment Assessments (SEA), and the requirements for MSP can be used to guide these as well as their inter-linkages with assessments of economic sectors.

Highlighting connectivity and raising awareness amongst governments of the role of connectivity (e.g. in distributing both benefits/resources, and impacts) is a key benefit/goal that can arise from MSP. Supporting the initial broad-scale focus of MSP, rather than a heavy technical exercise this can be a process used to build

<sup>3</sup> The Benguela Current Commission is a multi-sectoral inter-governmental initiative of Angola, Namibia and South Africa. It promotes the sustainable management and protection of the Benguela Current Large Marine Ecosystem, or BCLME (<http://www.benguelacc.org>)

understanding and raise awareness amongst the various stakeholders including from governments, local communities and the private sector. Inputs to this can come from many sources, for example physical oceanographic studies of currents, or biological studies of larval dispersal, etc.

**Scenarios and vulnerability:** For a large/long term initiative, we need to consider potential future shocks, such as those coming from large/new investments that may come in the future, in specific markets/goods that are not clearly foreseen at present. In this context, MSP should be used to consider vulnerability and resilience (of the system), and how activities that may be very beneficial in one sector (e.g. agriculture/employment) may be very harmful to others, and the extent to which the governance/institutional system may be able to deal with these. Several points were raised in relation to this:

- Economic development and benefits to local communities and coastal economies must be at the center of scenario development, with sustainability as a cornerstone, to ensure the initiative will be attractive to broad sectors in the countries involved.
- Activities should be framed in the broader context and NMCi should try to be as inclusive as possible with the different sectors and threats, but at the same time the initiative should provide for place-based implementation with activities on the ground starting now.
- Scenarios need to be adjusted on the basis of feedback/monitoring - the monitoring and assessment framework offered by MSP can play a key role in this.

**Fisheries** – to date there has been little discussion on the fishery component of the initiative. While small scale fisheries are a clear priority, distant water fishing should also be treated as a priority issue. This is envisioned through building the relevant task force/working group from partners already engaged in this topic, as for example, of WWF within the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) and South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (SWIOFC).

## Oil and Gas

Participants were very aware of the fact that O&G exploration and exploitation is already happening, and we may be many steps behind on engaging with this industry. The subdivision of the maritime space into concessions and related trading are well advanced, though only a small number (e.g. Anadarko and ENI in northern Mozambique) are actually moving forward on concrete investment and implementation phases. To get ahead of the game and avoid playing catch up will require:

- Building on current efforts by individual NGOs to team up and share approaches, information and goals;
- Learning from other regional efforts and expertise;
- Spatial analysis and reporting on existing and planned oil and gas development and increased transparency; and
- Building capacity within the NMCi partnership on oil and gas industry engagement and adopting a concerted and strategic approach

The initiative needs to demonstrate to governments that there is a value and need to align O&G regulatory arrangements across the region, consider the impacts of the sector on other sectors, e.g. tourism, properly assess the risks of oil spills, push the O&G industry towards better safeguards and practices to reduce risks and impacts, and impose regulatory frameworks for infrastructure and transport development which ensure minimal risks and discharge. Concurrently the initiative needs to engage with the O&G industry to assess and monitor environmental risks, improve transparency and standards, ensure compensations/offsets for the environment and civil society and identify critical and sensitive areas.

NGOs already engaged in the oil and gas sector are listed here:

- IUCN – Fair Coasts project, at provincial (Cabo Delgado) and national (Mozambique) levels with Anadarko in the form of a collaboration to establish and monitor biodiversity action plans (BAPs), community development plans (CBDs) and sound working practices to ensure the sustainability and fairness of gas exploration and production within Cabo Delgado province of northern Mozambique

- FFI – with ENI and the government of Mozambique, in the area of data and information used in assessing environmental risks.
- WWF – finalizing its global marine action plan on extractives which will focus on NMC as one priority area. WWF also aims at commissioning a study/mapping analysis on O&G development in the NMC region (calling for partners' collaboration) and in particular assessing the value of the Africa Land Use Planning and Early Warning System (ALES, see below) as an early warning system of developments in the sector (see below).
- WCS – in other regions (e.g. Gulf of Guinea).

**Environmental assessments** – Environmental Impact Assessments are required by law in all countries now, and are done at the company level by experts contracted by the companies. This is often at a finer and more locally-focused level than can be used in a regional initiative, but also are often too narrow for assessing broader scale impacts from a development. A strategic approach should be promoted through overarching SEAs so that the relevant scales are considered in individual EIAs, and that they also provide information into the regional data framework. Aspects to be covered in these include connectivity, identification of critical habitat, onshore/offshore gradients, etc. This also provides a framework for companies to participate in data collection.

The **Africa Land Use Planning and Early Warning System (ALES)**, presented by Susanne Schmidt of WWF, is of high relevance to the NMC. It is a project that seeks to integrate environmental and development data into a common mapping platform in order to produce an overview of major development activities, their investments and their related impacts in WWF priority ecoregions and other environmental sensitive areas in Africa. The development sectors include extractives (oil & gas and mining), forestry, agro-industry and infrastructure. It is intended as a first entry to identify potential conflicts, not a tool for detailed planning but rather for building awareness and engagement with governments.

Several additional comments on/around ALES:

- Ensuring the NMC is well covered in the database is a high priority, as well as it being a pilot site for testing the database and how it might contribute to ongoing work in the sector. Its value as a first set of layers in supporting the MSP platform was also acknowledged.
- ALES represents the broadest scale of data, and currently does not include any ecological layers, though is planned for the future. This scale is useful for the first level of MSP and decision-making in the NMC
- An intermediate level of spatial datasets is likely needed (e.g. of habitat extents, species, etc.), and at the finest level of resolution, site-based information used in EIAs and detailed studies. There is a WWF-FFI joint project in Namibia that is a similar exercise but also includes social and cultural values, ecosystem service values, water use, etc. How can we reach a similar level here? Which datasets could be accessed/used to include in this system? FAO information on fisheries, spawning grounds (etc.) could be added as layers to identify overlaps. Identify sources of additional data, e.g. agriculture, forest.

From experience in the Coral Triangle and South West Pacific regions, information resources such as ALES and associated maps are very important for informing our advocacy and strengthening our influence on governmental decisions. Decisions are made well before EIAs are conducted (hence also the need for SEAs and that these be integrated in an MSP approach across the countries) – and passed the point of EIAs our influence is very minimal. We need to be able to engage at a much earlier stage when decisions about concessions are made. Layers we should look at are oil development, oil-spill response, and also importantly, LNG. The warden of the Quirimbas National Park commented how information is very difficult to access from field sites and at the national level. He gave examples of Statoil in Mozambique, where activities come and go, but the reasons for these movements are not understood, resulting in uncertainty on the ground. Intelligence such as from ALES is needed in order to question governments on these issues and increase transparency and liability.

With the power and scope of the energy companies/sector, we urgently need to enhance collaboration amongst NGOs, avoid duplication of effort and jointly advocate for more transparency and liability from companies.

## Closing ideas

A number of participants mentioned in closing their interest in/support for the initiative, but it is necessary to now have active engagement as a group, as well as full buy-in from the countries. The breadth and depth of the issues we are trying to tackle, and the alternative economic model – based on sustainable management and use of marine resources, benefiting local communities - we want to promote requires a truly concerted partnership approach. Actionable items for the near-term include:

- Identifying partner (NGO) activities that contribute to the NMCi vision, and developing a matrix of partners contributions;
- Building the foundations of the vision, strategic framework and outcome mapping;
- Building collaboration at the technical level, on issues such as MSP, but also at the policy/political advocacy level;
- Scale up and coordinate our lobbying activities at the national and regional level; and
- Complete the process of GEF PIF development with concerted inputs and consultations in the countries, and with NGO partners.

## Appendix 1 – Meeting agenda

#	Time	Topic	Led by /Speakers	Session objectives	Expected outcomes
1	17:30-17:45	<b>Welcome &amp; Introduction</b> Setting the scene, description of agenda and objectives of the meeting	David Obura	Setting the scene Understanding of agenda and objectives of meeting.  History and aspirations from a WIO-C perspective  A strategic vision and framework. Why we need to focus on MSP and O&G, why it matters for conservation and for people, why only a partnership approach can deliver.	Common understanding and expectations for the meeting.
2	17:45-17:55	<b>From IMPAC3 to where we are now (progress update)</b>	Fidy Ralison	Progress update and recent development of NMCi	Participants clearly understand the NMCi approach (conceptual framework, vision and strategy)
3	17:55-18:15	<b>Quick overview of Marine Spatial Planning and why it is relevant to NMC</b>  <b>Stakes of O&amp;G in the Mozambique Channel</b>	Tundi Agardy  Fidy, Susanne Schmitt	Understanding the needs and opportunities for developing an MSP approach in the NMC.  Understanding the needs and opportunities for developing an O&G approach in the NMC.	Go into the specifics of MSP and O&G for NMC, present NMCi as an “implementation mechanism” for achieving objectives of broader government commitments and sustainable ocean development through addressing these 2 strategic areas.  Plan for a regional workshop on MSP

4	18:15-18:50	<b>Discussion on concrete actions for joint collaboration in 2015</b>	All participants (led by David)	<p>Developing propositions of concrete actions for joint collaboration</p> <p>Identifying ideas and mechanisms to operationalize joint actions</p>	Experts and participants propose ideas on how we can move forward together next year while engaging the countries into tangible actions that increase their ownership into NMCi
5	18:50-19:00	<b>Wrap-up, next steps and closing</b>	David Obura	Quick recap and way forward for NMCi and partners	Roles and responsibilities clarified and agreed for the steps forwards

Draft - unapproved



## Appendix 2 – List of participants

Name	Organization/Office	Contact/e-mail
Alasdair Harris	Blue Ventures	al@blueventures.org
Alessandro Fusari	IGF Foundation Mozambique	alessandrofusari@yahoo.it
Ali Kaka	Expert	ali.kaka@adeptconservation.net
Ambroise Brenier	WCS	abrenier@wcs.org
Baldeu Araquechande	Quirimbas National Park	baldeu55@gmail.com
Brian Jones	Blue Ventures	brian@blueventures.org
Caleb McClennen	WCS Global Marine Programme	cmclennen@wcs.org
Charlotte Gobin	GEF	cgobin@thegef.org
Christine Mentzel	IUCN East Africa	Christine.MENTZEL@iucn.org
Constance Corbier-Barthaux	AFD	corbier@afd.fr
David Curnick	ZSL	david.curnick@zsl.org
David Obura	CORDIO	davidobura@gmail.com
Duan Biggs	ARC/ Center for Environmental Decisions UQ	d.biggs@uq.edu.au
Eric Coppenger	Rare Conservation	ecoppenger@rare.org
Fiona Llewellyn	ZSL	fiona.llewellyn@zsl.org
Gerard Rambeloarisoa	WWF-Madagascar	grambeloarisoa@wwf.mg
Gildas Andriamalala	Blue Ventures	gildas@blueventures.org
Glyn Davies	WWF-UK	gdavies@wwf.org.uk
Guillaume Chiron	AFD	chirong@afd.fr
Harifidy Ralison	WWF-Madagascar	horalison@wwf.mg
Hedley Grantham	CI	hgrantham@conservation.org
Jackie Thomas	WWF CTI	jthomas@wwfpacific.org
Janina Korting	GIZ, Blue Solutions	janina.korting@giz.de
John Tanzer	WWF-Int GMP	jtanzer@wwfint.org
Josh Cinner	James Cook U., ARC Centre of Excellence for Coral Reef Studies	joshua.cinner@jcu.edu.au
Kate Mannle	Rare Conservation	kmannle@rare.org
Keith Lawrence	CI	klawrence@conservation.org
Malhette Betre	CI	mbetre@conservation.org
Marina Antonopoulou	WWF-UAE	mantonopoulou@ewswwf.ae
Michael Mc Greevey	CI	mmcgreevey@conservation.org
Michelle Andrianarisata	CI Madagascar	mandrianarisata@conservation.org
Nick Hill	Zoological Society of London	nickaohill@gmail.com
Ole Vestergaard	UNEP	Ole.Vestergaard@unep.org
Paul Gamblin	WWF-Australia	pgamblin@wwf.org.au
Pippa Howard	Fauna and Flora Intl	Pippa.Howard@fauna-flora.org
Sue Wells	Independent	suewells1212@gmail.com
Susanne Schmitt	WWF-UK	sschmitt@wwf.org.uk
Tundi Agardy	Sound Seas	tundiagardy@earthlink.net
Valerie Burgener	WWF-Int GMP	vburgener@wwfint.org