



---

20 August 2017  
Ms Sally Barnes  
Director of National Parks  
Canberra ACT 2601

Dear Ms Barnes

The Ocean Science Council of Australia (OSCA) would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Australian Marine Parks Network Draft Management Plans released on 21 July 2017. OSCA is an internationally recognised group of university-based and independent marine researchers with direct expertise in relation to the development of the Australian Marine Parks Network (AMPN). A main purpose of OSCA is to encourage that public policy related to the national marine estate is based on evidence from sound science.

### **Summary**

The 2012 AMPN expansion represented progress towards a scientifically defensible network of marine parks and reaffirmed Australia as a leader in marine conservation. In its 2016 submissions<sup>1,2</sup>, OSCA expressed its support for the July 2012 expansion of the AMPN into four marine regions and the Coral Sea following decades of research and extensive community consultation. However, in consideration of the reports from the Bioregional Advisory Panel (Buxton and Cochrane 2015) and the Expert Scientific Panel (Beeton *et al.* 2015) hereafter referred to collectively as the 'Review', we found that the Review's recommendations were a significant step backwards relative to the 2012 management plans that were suspended in 2013. Moreover, OSCA found the Review inconsistent with the Australian Government's commitment to evidence-based marine management.

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://oceansciencecouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/OSCA-CMR-Review-2016\\_02\\_04-FINAL-1.pdf](http://oceansciencecouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/OSCA-CMR-Review-2016_02_04-FINAL-1.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> ; [http://oceansciencecouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/OSCA-Submission-CMRMP\\_2016\\_10\\_31.pdf](http://oceansciencecouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/OSCA-Submission-CMRMP_2016_10_31.pdf)

It is thus of significant concern that the draft management plans released on 21 July 2017 reflect an even further and greater step backwards, entirely inconsistent with available scientific evidence. Here we (1) summarise the key reductions in ocean protection proposed in the draft plans, (2) recap the key principles that underpin scientifically defensible marine protection and provide recommendations relevant at a systemic level, and (3) identify changes that are both systemic and park-specific that are needed if the Government wishes to achieve conservation outcomes cost-effectively and that are evidence based.

While recognising these weaknesses, there exists a significant opportunity for the Turnbull government to complete the network in a manner that meets conservation goals while supporting Australia's Blue Economy. OSCA had hoped that the 2017 draft management plans would address these concern by expanding the levels of IUCN II+ zoning in the plans referred to as Marine National Park Zoning (MNPZ protection), thereby upholding the goals and principles of the NRSMPA. Our submission provides key recommendations for consideration by Government.

### 1. Proposed undermining of protection

Despite the many proven environmental, social and economic benefits of IUCN II+ zoning and its critical role in buffering the impacts of climate change, implementation of the draft management plans would remove 400,000 km<sup>2</sup> of IUCN II+ protection across the AMPN, or 46% of the network. This means that in:

- 2007, 10% of Australia's EEZ was in marine parks, with 4% of the EEZ protected in IUCN II or higher.
- 2012, 36% of Australia's EEZ was in marine parks, with 14% of the EEZ in IUCN II or higher.
- 2017, 36% of Australia's EEZ remains as "protected" but **only 9%** of the EEZ in IUCN II or higher. This is below the most minimum of benchmarks (O'Leary et al. 2016).

***Lack of representation in high level (IUCN II+) zoning:*** Further, the draft management plans mean that: 259 primary conservation features remain unrepresented; 16 of the marine parks have no IUCN II or greater protection; 20 biological regions have no IUCN or greater protection; and IUCN II protection targets are now met for only 8 of 53 of Australia's bioregions, halving the number of bioregions that previously attained the target of 10%.

On a regional basis, the draft management plans mean that:

- The North region draft plan protects ~1% of the region in IUCN II or greater, a 57% reduction;
- The Temperate East draft plan protects ~ 4% of the region in IUCN II or greater, a 2% reduction;
- The North-west draft plan protects ~5% of the region in IUCN II or greater, a 49% reduction;
- The South-west draft plan protects ~7% of the region in IUCN II or greater, a 40% reduction; and
- The Coral Sea draft management plan protects ~24% of the region in IUCN II or greater, a 53% reduction and loss of some 264,000 km<sup>2</sup>.

Six marine parks would have their IUCN II+ zoning reduced by between 42 and 73%, and two marine parks would have their IUCN II+ zoning removed completely. If implemented, the draft management plans would leave 16 of the 44 marine parks established in 2012 without any IUCN II+ zoning. Added to

the nine without IUCN II+ zoning in the existing South-east network of 14 marine parks established in 2007 that would make 25 of the 60 Australian marine parks in Commonwealth waters without IUCN III+ protection.

**Out of sight - out of mind:** Where the draft plans increase protection in spatial coverage (e.g. Bremer Canyon and Perth Canyon), these marginal expansions have been at the cost of protection on the shelf and largely moved protection away from areas of known significant conservation value.

**Ignoring risk:** The Australian Government undertook a number of fishing gear risk assessments (FGRA) in 2010 and the Beeton *et al.* (2016) review re-assessed them. This review found that the original risk assessments were largely appropriate and that significant uncertainty remained as to the compatibility of a range of fishing gears with conservation outcomes. Nevertheless, the draft management plans now allow destructive fishing practices assessed by its own review as incompatible with conservation in 38 of the 44 marine parks under consideration.

**Down-grading of existing high level (IUCN Ia and II to II and IV) protection:** The draft plans also down-grade existing protection which compromises long term science time-series and undermines our ability to further our understanding of the impact of human activities on the ocean:

- Coringa Herald – was IUCN Ia, now integrated into the Coral Sea Marine Park as IUCN II; note – it operated as IUCN II but the opportunity to meet that standard was lost in 2012 declaration but could be addressed in new management plans;
- Lihou Reef – was IUCN Ia, now integrated into the Coral Sea Marine Park as IUCN II; note – it operated as IUCN II but was recommended for IUCN Ia in Review but was then again demoted;
- Middleton Reef – was IUCN Ia, now integrated into Lord Howe Marine Park; draft management plan both zones it as IUCN II and reduces the size of the zone;
- Mermaid Reef – was IUCN Ia, now integrated into the Argo Rowley Terrace Marine Park; draft management plan zones it IUCN II; and
- Ningaloo Mark Park – was IUCN II but operating as IUCN IV; draft plan confirms it as IUCN IV.

## 2. The principles

**Protection works:** There is broad consensus across the international marine research community (see submitted Science Statement signed by more than 1300 researchers) on the importance of IUCN II+ zoning in delivering conservation and economic outcomes. Research shows that the number of fish species and the size of fish increase inside IUCN II+ zoning, and larvae and adult spill across their boundaries. IUCN II+ zones also increase the resilience of marine life to climate change, and their protected marine life recovers more quickly than fished areas after damage from floods, storms and coral bleaching and resist climate “invaders”. IUCN II+ zones also accelerate the recovery of adjacent fisheries after natural or human-induced declines in fish populations, an important economic benefit that has been shown to fully compensate for the loss of fishing access in protected zones in the long run. Of note are the clear benefits generated for the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park following its expanded IUCN II+ protection by the Howard Government to 33% under the 2004 Representative Areas Program.

Political processes have suggested a near-term target of 10% of marine bioregions to be protected. For instance, the Aichi near-term target is for 10% of the global oceans to be in “effective and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas” by 2020. Significant international caucuses have suggested that minimum areas for protection exceed 30%. The World Parks Congress (Sydney, 2015) declared a target of ‘protection of both biodiversity and ecosystem services [that includes] at least 30% of each marine habitat ... [with] no extractive industries’. This target was later adopted by the IUCN Members Assembly at the World Conservation Congress (Hawaii, 2016), which passed the motion that ‘State and Government Agency Members designate and implement at least 30% of each marine habitat in a network of highly protected MPAs’ with the ‘ultimate aim of creating a fully sustainable ocean at least 30% of which has no extractive industries’. Such targets are also in line with the Howard Government’s declaration of 33% no-take in the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park and the WA Government’s declaration of 34% no-take in Ningaloo Marine Park in 2004. And indeed, targets of this order to achieve conservation goals are supported by empirical data (Edgar et al. 2014, O’Leary et al. 2016).

The other challenge in the draft plans is the highly residual nature of Australia’s AMPN. IUCN II+ zones have in large part been relegated to areas that minimise interference with extractive activities (Barr and Possingham 2013; Devillers et al. 2015). Indeed, across the AMPN, the 2017 draft plans fail to accept CSIRO and Expert Science Panel advice that all marine parks should contain at least one IUCN II+ zone.

The continental shelf constitutes about 22% of Australian waters (Geoscience Australia 2005) but continues to have the least amount of IUCN II+ coverage. This is despite its marine life being the most diverse and human impacts the most intense in Australia’s oceans. Under the 2012 management plans, only 3% of the continental shelf was protected within IUCN II+ zoning (Barr and Possingham 2013) and the 2017 draft management plans fail to address this notable deficiency. Each region continues to have only small amounts of its continental shelf within IUCN II+ zoning, e.g. the shelf and slope of the Temperate East remain virtually unprotected with only 0.01% (shelf) and 0% (slope) protected within MNPZs. The trend to locate IUCN II+ zoning in residual areas means that important conservation outcomes are missed and that it is difficult or impossible to quantify human impacts in the major habitat areas in which they occur.

Larger proportional protection is required in bioregions or ecosystems with more heterogeneous physical and biological characteristics and more exposure to threats (Pressey et al 2003; Desmet and Cowling 2004). This approach should therefore increase the extent of IUCN II+ zoning toward the continental shelf, which is the most heterogeneous and heavily used region of Australian waters (Williams et al. 2009).

*Recommendation 1:* Expand the 9% IUCN II+ protection within the existing boundaries to +30% across the network in a representative matter that reduces the residual nature, comparable to iconic protected areas such as the Great Barrier Reef and Ningaloo Marine Park, with a particular focus on the continental shelf.

*Recommendation 2:* Ensure that all bioregions incorporated within the boundaries of the marine parks

established in 2012 have comprehensive, adequate and representative (CAR) protection at IUCN II or greater level (see Recommendation 1). The Government should meet the CSIRO recommendations (as stated in their submissions to the development of the AMPN) for each marine park to include at least one MNPZ, with a particular focus on ensuring that the shelf, continental slope and seamounts are better represented within MNPZs.

***Partial protection (IUCN IV Habitat Protection Zones) does not deliver comparable biodiversity benefits to IUCN II+***

The draft management plans propose large increases in the area of IUCN IV Habitat Protection Zones (HPZs) to the AMPN. OSCA only supports such proposals where this protection represents an increase in the level of protection, e.g. IUCN VI to IUCN IV and protecting important conservation areas from extractive uses such as mining.

Minister Frydenberg's media statement of 21 July 2017, when announcing the release of the draft management plans, fails to acknowledge the downgrade of many of IUCN II+ zones to IUCN IV zones. Instead it obfuscates this downgrading when summarising the protection outcomes by emphasising that the draft plans: "Increase from 60 per cent to 63 per cent the area under high-level green [sic IUCN II] and yellow zone [sic IUCN IV] protection covering sites of ecological significance".

This implies that conservation outcomes from IUCN IV (HPZs) are comparable to those from IUCN II+ zones. This is not the case as attested to by a wealth of scientific literature and as confirmed by the Government's own Expert Science Panel. By allowing extractions, IUCN IV zones do not afford the same level of protection as IUCN II+ zones, and their reduced levels of protection result in reduced conservation outcomes (Ban et al 2014; Denny and Babcock 2004; Shears et al. 2006; Lester and Halpern 2008; Di Franco et al. 2009; Sciberras et al. 2015). In particular, Sciberras et al. (2015) concluded that "while PPAs [partially protected areas] significantly enhance density and biomass of fish relative to open areas, NTRs [no-take reserves] yielded significantly higher biomass of fish within their boundaries relative to PPAs." Edgar et al. (2014), in their seminal paper in *Nature*, concluded that "no-take" is a critical feature of successful marine parks in generating biodiversity outcomes. Australia's peak marine science body, the Australian Marine Sciences Association (AMSA), also made clear in its submission to the CMR Review that "Any rezoning to include more habitat protection, even if 'better' than general use, is still not no-take and therefore cannot be considered to satisfy CAR principles". Finally, it should be emphasised that IUCN IV zones open to fishing within marine parks are of little use to assess the effects of fishing and efficacy of fishery management outside the protected areas.

The suggestion that IUCN IV is equivalent to IUCN II+ zoning also ignores fundamental ecological evidence on the importance of intact ecosystems. Research from Atwood et al (2015), Burkholder et al (2013), Heithaus et al (2012), Barley et al. (2017a, 2017b) all document the importance of top down control on marine ecosystems. In short, the suggestion that habitat protection is sufficient to generate ecosystem services at a level commensurate with IUCN II+ is unsupported (Ban et al. 2014).

Finally, there is a considerable and growing body of scientific evidence that suggests that partial protection, as would occur if IUCN II+ zoning was replaced with IUCN IV in the AMPN, would accrue

increased management costs while adding much less in the way of meaningful, measurable conservation outcomes than MNPZ (Ban et al. 2011, Sciberras et al. 2015).

*Recommendation 3:* The Government should retain all previously identified IUCN II+ zoning and not downgrade them to partial protection such as HPZs. New HPZs in the 2017 draft management plans should only be retained where they increase the level of protection prosed in the 2013 plans, unless the area should be zoned as an MNPZ to meet CAR principles. For example, a HPZ has been recommended for Adele Island in the North- west Region, which is one of the most important seabird nesting sites in the Kimberley and home to globally unique coral reefs. This area requires protection from all extractive activities, including fishing, and hence an MNPZ is required.

**Reference areas:** The ability of the science community to demonstrate the effect of marine protection and assess impacts outside protected areas relies on the establishment of IUCN II+ zones as reference areas, noting the substantial review by McCook *et al.* (2010) of the zoning benefits on the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park as a highly relevant example of demonstrating management effectiveness. In the absence of high level protection, scientists are unable to provide this advice. The draft management plans jeopardise the opportunity to compare areas inside and outside MNPZs to assess the impact of human activity and the efficacy of management arrangements and indeed our ability to build ocean resilience.

Australia has very few IUCN Ia zones that provide researchers with a critical opportunity to test the impact of even non-extractive human activities. These zones, known as the “pink” zones in the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park have provided important information on human activity (i.e. pink zones have higher densities of sharks than even green zones; McCook et al. 2010). As such, downgrading IUCN Ia parks like Mermaid Reef to IUCN II eliminates a rare long-term log of response to the highest level of protection. Similarly, to downgrade the existing Ningaloo Marine Park which is zoned IUCN II to IUCN IV also means that rather than enforcing effective protection identified for this area, as per its original designation, it would be officially open for exploitation.

*Recommendation 4:* In the final AMPN management plans, the Government should increase representation of major habitats in IUCN II+ zones in a fully replicated design i.e. multiple examples of each habitat with full protection.

**Ignoring risk:** The draft management plans allow for trawling, gillnetting and longlining to occur in 38 of the 44 new marine parks, mining in 33 and the construction and operation of oil and gas pipelines in 42. By allowing extractive activities to continue throughout most of the AMPN, Australia is overlooking the primary roles of marine parks: biodiversity conservation and all this entails in terms of resilience and knowledge building, and as scientific reference areas. Of concern is that the Government’s own risk assessments have concluded that a number of these activities are incompatible with conservation outcomes, an outcome largely supported by the Review in its assessment of a subset of these activities. As such, their presence in “habitat protection zones” is not consistent with the goals of these zones.

*Recommendation 5:* Destructive fishing gears, as identified in the 2010 suite of Fishery Gear Risk Assessment Reports (<http://conservationgeography.org/content/fishing-gear-risk-assessments>) should be excluded from marine parks, regardless of zoning.

**Economics:** The Government’s justification for its significant reductions in IUCN II+ protection is to reduce its impact on commercial fishers, but the impact of the IUCN II+ zones as proclaimed in 2012 would have been very small. In the case of Middleton Reef Seamount, a part of which would have its protection removed, ABARES estimates such a change would annually return \$335 to each of the 92 holders of statutory fishing rights in the area’s main fishery, the Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery (Larcombe & Marton 2016). A similar outcome would occur where protection of the high continental shelf and upper slope habitats in Peaceful Bay off Walpole in the South-West Corner Marine Park would be reduced. The economic return from the reduced protection for all fisheries would be \$68,000 per year, and for the main fishery, the West Coast Demersal Fishery, it would amount to \$600 per year or \$86 for each licence holder (Larcombe & Marton 2016; Fletcher & Santoro 2014).

Australia’s marine tourism industry is worth \$28b per annum (*AIMS Index of Marine Industry 2016*) whereas the value of the returned catch from cuts to IUCN II+ protection across the AMPN is only \$4m per annum (*ABARES Potential displacement of commercial fisheries by a Commonwealth marine reserve zoning scheme. Revision 1 July 2017*), representing just 0.3% of the total revenue from Australia’s wild catch fisheries. Thus, the tiny economic benefits to fishers generated by the proposed reductions in protection would be greatly outweighed by economic costs to the tourism industry.

*Recommendation 6:* Move to a Blue Economy that values alternative options for our ocean economy and stops prioritising extractive activities at the expense of other industries.

### **3. Some specifics (but these should not be seen as the easy fixes – the above recommendations apply generally)**

In addition to addressing the recommendations identified above, there are some egregious examples of failed proposals. These are not a full list but are representative of the challenges faced by the daft draft management plans. They include:

**The Coral Sea:** This example indicates the Government’s lack of willingness to appropriately protect large iconic areas that are amongst the world’s last remaining intact systems. The Department has received significant input on why high protection of this area – “the jewel-in-the-crown” - matters as a link between the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park and France’s Coral Sea territory and as a rare tropical refuge for ocean wildlife. The reduction of protection by 53% is unsupported by science and is incumbent on the Government to justify. This is particularly important given the allowance of high-risk fishing activities in this region.

OSCA regards the proposed 53% reduction in IUCN II+ coverage within the Coral Sea as a significant retrograde step. The Government’s Expert Science Panel noted the uniqueness of the region’s coral reefs and emphasised the importance of increasing their protection. Recent research in the Coral Sea

shows that reefs not in IUCN II+ protection see their shark populations depleted by 90% of their original biomass, with populations of large predators halved and fish populations depleted by 70%. The importance of protecting the Coral Sea's reef sharks was highlighted by the Expert Science Panel which identified that: "Coral Sea reefs comprise a globally significant hotspot for reef sharks".

The draft management plan for the Coral Sea Marine Park would decimate the large IUCN II+ zone covering the eastern side of the marine park, cut by half the IUCN II+ zones at Osprey and Marion reefs, and convert Vema Reef's IUCN II zone to IUCN IV. These draft changes would only leave IUCN II zones at Coringa-Herald Islets and Bougainville, Lihou, Mellish and Kenn reefs, while Shark, Flinders, Holmes, Moore and Suamarez reefs, and Diane Bank and Willis Islets, would be zone IUCN IV – allowing ongoing exploitation.

These significant losses and the fragmentation of the IUCN II zoning in the 2012 management plans have no scientific basis. The intact IUCN II zone covering the Coral Sea was to be Australia's major contribution to the global protection of intact pelagic marine life at a large scale, consistent with the scale of newly established highly protected marine parks being established globally, for example in Chile, New Zealand, Palau, the UK and the USA. Moreover, France is in the process of creating a large marine reserve over its Coral Sea Territory, adjacent to Australia's Exclusive Economic Zone, and the combined protection would be globally significant. The 53% reduction in the IUCN II zoning would represent a major strategic failure with no basis in science.

The protection of the Coral Sea reefs is also critical to the dive tourism industry, which has direct sales of \$6M each year that could expand to \$15M if the reefs are highly protected (KPMG 2010). These figures contrast significantly with the \$4.1M the Government claims will be gained by the commercial fishing industry across the entire AMPN should the 2017 draft management plans be implemented. As we have already said, the economic returns to commercial fishing from reduced MNPZ protection are at best marginal and to only a small number of licence holders.

*Recommendation 7:* Expand 2012 protection to include previously excluded high conservation value reefs.

**Mermaid Reef:** This example indicates the Government's lack of willingness to maintain long-standing protection. The draft management plan downgrades IUCN Ia protection to IUCN II.

*Recommendation 8:* Reinstate IUCN Ia protection to allow continuation of this important and rare log of human impacts on our oceans.

**Perth Canyon:** This example exemplifies the Government's rejection of the science indicating the need to protect hotspots of biodiversity and instead yet again push protection further offshore.

*Recommendation 9:* Re-establish and expand the IUCN II zoning within the Perth Canyon Marine Park.



**Geographe Bay:** This example indicates the Government's rejection of the science regarding the need for representative protection and importantly a lack of understanding that you can't protect the seabed without protecting the fish.

*Recommendation 10:* Re-establish and expand the IUCN II zoning within the Geographe Marine Park. Exclude destructive fishing activities.

**Bremer:** This example indicates the Government's rejection of the science regarding destructive fishing. Pushing protection offshore to accommodate inshore scallop trawling is not defensible within a marine park.

*Recommendation 11:* Re-establish and expand the IUCN II zoning within the Geographe Marine Park. Exclude destructive fishing activities.

#### **4. Conclusions**

The draft management plans represent a retrograde step by Australia's Government and is a matter of both national and international significance. Australia has been a world leader in marine conservation for decades, beginning with the establishment of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park in 1975 and its expanded protection in 2004. At a time when oceans are under increasing pressure from overexploitation, climate change, industrialisation, and plastics and other forms of pollution, building resilience through a strong backbone of IUCN II zoning is well supported by decades of science.

The establishment of a strong backbone of IUCN II zoning is consistent with the move by many countries, including Chile, France, Kiribati, New Zealand, Palau, Russia, the UK and US that are establishing very large no-take marine reserves. In stark contrast, the implementation of the Government's draft management plans would see Australia become the first nation to retreat on oceans protection. Edgar et al. (2014) found that the effectiveness of marine protected areas in achieving meaningful conservation outcomes required five key features, including that they should be continuous, isolated and large. Large intact IUCN II zones are also necessary to protect relatively mobile species such as tunas and oceanic sharks (Koldewey et al. 2010; Wilhelm et al. 2014) and turtles (Scott et al. 2012).

The establishment of large IUCN II zones is increasing occurring as more nations acknowledge their significance and importance as a conservation measure. Their establishment is supported by the recognised failure of regional fisheries arrangements to stem the decline of oceanic species (Juan Jorda et al 2011; Stevens et al. 2000), and the recognised value of retaining examples of relatively intact marine ecosystems in which pelagic species are maintained or supported in recovery.

International policy momentum, including among several of our key regional and trading partners, is progressing the establishment of large IUCN II zones, not eroding them. Australia has held a role as a global leader in management of its oceans, and the fragmentation of this significant network will tarnish Australia's reputation and our ability to influence regional efforts towards sustainable marine resource management, as well as reducing conservation outcomes for minimal economic benefit.

OSCA recognises that stakeholders have concerns when management arrangements and existing access change. However, the history of marine park planning and establishment is one in which initial resistance from some extractive users is generally followed by a demonstration that IUCN II zones did not have significant negative outcomes for these stakeholders, particularly compared to the scale of impacts predicted by these sectors before establishment. Moreover, stakeholders often go on to embrace IUCN II zoning as they observe their benefits, both in terms of commercial fisheries (Goñi et al. 2010), recreational fisheries (Pascoe et al. 2014, Arias and Sutton 2013), tourism (Vianna et al. 2012) and education (Angulo- Valdes et al. 2010).

Stakeholders and taxpayers more generally want to know that changes to oceans management will generate benefits and be cost-effective. Changes to the AMPN that reduce protection levels, reduce coverage of key ecological features, or increase the residual nature of IUCN zones may also mean that much of the extractive uses that would have occurred in the absence of an AMPN continue effectively as if no AMPN was established at all. This “business as usual” approach is damaging to meaningful marine conservation as it creates an AMPN that is unlikely to provide the desired conservation outcomes; it represents the deliberate design of a system for poor conservation performance. It may also hinder the need for more protection in the future, since an area may be deemed to have sufficient protection, even if it is not representative of the biodiversity or reflective of the threats facing a region. This would leave the AMPN open to the charge that it is comprised of “paper parks” with associated costs but few conservation outcomes. Such an outcome will ultimately undermine public support for oceans management and protection.

Decision-makers and the community value evidence-based policy. At a time of rapid environmental change, there is a great need for responsive management underpinned by strong science. In addition to the recommendations above, in order to be fit for purpose, the AMPN should embrace the need for representative and replicated IUCN II zones of adequate size, provide clear direction recommending scientific monitoring of zoning effectiveness, and allocate essential resources for science and enforcement. An appropriately designed and scientifically based AMPN can co-exist alongside important marine industries and other human activity for mutual benefit.

The finalisation of the AMPN remains a remarkable opportunity for the Australian Government to strengthen the levels of IUCN II protection and to do so on the back of strong evidence. In contrast, implementation of the Government’s retrograde draft management plans undermines oceans resilience and would allow damaging activities to proceed in the absence of proof of impact, ignoring the fact that a lack of evidence does not mean a lack of impact. The 2017 draft plans deny the science-based evidence.

We encourage the Australian government to respond to our recommendations, increasing the number and area of IUCN II zones and reflecting the science. This means achieving a target of at least 30% of each marine habitat in IUCN II zones, supported by Australian and international marine scientists and affirmed by the World Parks Congress in Sydney in 2015 and the IUCN Members Assembly at the World Conservation Congress in Hawaii in 2016.


Yours sincerely,



David Booth  
Professor of Marine Ecology and  
Director of Centre for  
Environmental Sustainability,  
University of Technology Sydney.



Chris Daniels  
Professor of Biology,  
Division of Health  
Sciences, University of  
South Australia



Ove Hoegh-Guldberg FAA  
Director of the Global Change Institute and  
Professor of Marine Science at the University  
of Queensland.



Craig Johnson  
Head of Ecology and Biodiversity  
Centre, and Associate Director,  
Institute of Marine and Antarctic  
Studies, University of Tasmania



Jessica Meeuwig  
Professor of Marine Science  
and Director, Marine Futures  
Lab, University of Western  
Australia



David Pannell  
Professor of Environmental Economics,  
University of Western Australia

**The Ocean Science Council of Australia (OSCA):** *OSCA is an independent group of internationally recognised researchers with specialist knowledge about the oceans. We are based around Australia with expertise in a variety of disciplines - marine ecology, environmental law, economics, and sociology. Our mission is to ensure that policy is knowledge based – informed by the latest science – and to provide independent advice on the major opportunities and challenges for Australia’s oceans.*

## A selection of relevant papers

- Agardy T, Claudet J, Day, J (2016) 'Dangerous Targets' revisited: Old dangers in new contexts plague marine protected areas, *Aquatic Conserv: Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.* **26 (Suppl. 2)**: 7–23 (2016)
- Agardy T, di Sciara GN, Christie P (2011) Mind the gap: addressing the shortcomings of marine protected areas through large scale marine spatial planning, *Mar. Policy*, **35**:226–232.
- Allgeier JE, Valdivia A, Cox, C, Layman CA (2016) Fishing down nutrients on coral reefs, *Nature Communications*, **7**.
- Almany GR (2015) Marine ecology: Reserve networks are necessary, but not sufficient, *Current Biology*, **25(8)**:R328–R330.
- Almany GR, Hamilton, RJ, Bode M, Matawai M, Potuku T, Saenz-Agudelo P, Planes S, Berumen ML, Rhodes KL, *et al.* (2013) Dispersal of grouper larvae drives local resource sharing in a coral reef fishery, *Current Biology*, **23 (7)**:626–630.
- Althaus F, Williams A, Alderslade P, Schlacher TA (2016) Conservation of marine biodiversity on a very large deep continental margin: how representative is a very large offshore reserve network for deep-water octocorals?, *Diversity and Distributions*.
- Angulo-Valdes JA, Hatcher BG (2010) A new typology of benefits derived from marine protected areas, *Mar. Policy* **34 (3)**:635–644.
- Arias A, Sutton SG (2013) Understanding recreational fishers' compliance with no-take zones in the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, *Ecology and Society* **18**:1–9.
- Asaad I, Lundquist CJ, Erdmann MV, Costello MJ (2016) Ecological criteria to identify areas for biodiversity conservation, *Biological Conservation*.
- Atwood TB, Connolly RM, Ritchie EG, Lovelock CE, Heithaus MR, Hays GC, Fourqurean JW, Macreadie, PI (2015) Predators help protect carbon stocks in blue carbon ecosystems, *Nature Climate Change*, DOI: 10.1038/NCLIMATE2763.
- Aylesworth L, Phoonsawat R, Suvanachai P, Vincent AC (2016) Generating spatial data for marine conservation and management, *Biodiversity and Conservation*, pp. 1–17.
- Ballantine B (2014) Fifty years on: Lessons from marine reserves in New Zealand and principles for a worldwide network, *Biological Conservation*, **176**:297–307.
- Balmford A, Beresford J, Green J, Naidoo, R, Walpole M, Manica A (2009) A global perspective on trends in nature-based tourism, *PLoS Biol*, **7(6)**.
- Balmford A, Bruner A, Cooper P, Costanza R, Farber S, Green RE, Jenkins M, Jefferiss, P, Jessamy V, *et al.* (2002) Economic reasons for conserving wild nature, *Science*, **297(5583)**:950–953.
- Balmford A, Gravestock P, Hockley N, McClean CJ, Roberts CM (2004) The worldwide costs of marine protected areas, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **101**:9694–9697.
- Ban NC, Adams V, Pressey RL and Hicks J (2011) Promise and problems for estimating management costs of marine protected areas, *Conservation Letters*, **4**:241–252.
- Ban NC, McDougall C, Beck M, Salomon AK, Dripps, K (2014) Applying empirical estimates of marine protected area effectiveness. *Biological Conservation* **180**: 134-148.
- Barley SC, Meekan MG, Meeuwig, JJ. 2017a. Diet and condition of mesopredators on coral reefs in relation to shark abundance. *PLoS ONE*, **12(4)**: e0165113.
- Barley SC, Meekan MG, Meeuwig, JJ. 2017b. Species diversity, abundance, biomass, size and trophic structure of fish on coral reefs in relation to shark abundance. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, **565**: 163-179.
- Barnosky AD, Matzke N, Tomiya S, Wogan GO, Swartz B, Quental TB, Marshall C, McGuire JL, Lindsey EL, *et al.* (2011) Has the Earth's sixth mass extinction already arrived?, *Nature*, **471(7336)**:51-57.

- Barr LM and Possingham HP (2013) Are outcomes matching policy commitments in Australian marine conservation planning? *Mar. Policy* **42**:39–48.
- Baskett ML, Barnett LAK (2015) The ecological and evolutionary consequences of marine reserves, *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, **46(1)**:49-73.
- Bastari A, Micheli F, Ferretti F, Pusceddu A, Cerrano C (2016) Large marine protected areas (LMPAs) in the Mediterranean Sea: The opportunity of the Adriatic Sea, *Mar. Policy*, **68**:165–177.
- Bates AE, Barrett NS, Stuart-Smith RD, Holbrook NJ (2014) Resilience and signatures of tropicalization in protected reef fish communities, *Nature Climate Change* **4**:62-67.
- Bates AE, Stuart-Smith RD, Barrett NS et al. (2017) Biological interactions both facilitate and resist climate-related functional change in temperate reef communities. Proceedings of the Royal Society – B Biological Sciences. Article Number: 20170484
- Beeton RJS, Buxton CD, Cochrane P, Dittmann S, Pepperell JG (2016). Commonwealth Marine Reserves Review: report of the Expert Scientific Panel. Department of the Environment, Canberra. <http://www.parksaustralia.gov.au/marine/review/reports.html>
- Beaver D, Turner J (2016) Commercial fishing in Australia’s marine reserves: response to the Commonwealth Marine Reserves Review and recommendations for the development of management plans for Australia’s marine reserves. Centre for Conservation Geography. <http://saveourmarinelife.org.au/commercial-fishing-report/>
- Bennett NJ, Dearden P. (2014) Why local people do not support conservation: community perceptions of marine protected area livelihood impacts, governance and management in Thailand, *Mar. Policy* **44**:107–116.
- Bennett NJ, Govan H, Satterfield T (2015) Ocean grabbing, *Mar. Policy*, **57**:61–68.
- Bode M, Williamson DH, Weeks R, Jones GP, Almany GR, Harrison HB, Hopf JK, Pressey RL (2016) Planning marine reserve networks for both feature representation and demographic persistence using connectivity patterns, *PLoS One*, **11(5)**:e0154272. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27168206>.
- Bohnsack JA (2011) Impacts of Florida Coastal Protected Areas on Recreational World Records for Spotted Seatrout, Red Drum, Black Drum, and Common Snook, *Bulletin of Marine Science* **87(4)**:939–970.
- Boonzaier L, Pauly D (2016) Marine protection targets: An updated assessment of global progress, *Oryx*, **50(1)**:27–35.
- Bouchet PJ, Meeuwi, JJ, Kent S, Chandra P, Letessier TB, Jenner CK (2015) Topographic determinants of mobile vertebrate predator hotspots: Current knowledge and future directions, *Biological Reviews*, **90(3)**:699–728.
- Brashares JS, Abrahms B, Fiorella KJ, Golden CD, Hojnowski CE, Marsh RA, McCauley DJ, Nuñez TA, Seto K, et al. (2014) Wildlife decline and social conflict, *Science*, **345(6195)**:376–378.
- Briscoe DK, Maxwell SM, Kudela R, Crowder LB, Croll D (2016) Are we missing important areas in pelagic marine conservation? Redefining conservation hotspots in the ocean, *Endangered Species Research*, **29(3)**:229-237.
- Brown CJ, Abdullah S, Mumby PJ (2015) Minimizing the short-term impacts of marine reserves on fisheries while meeting long-term goals for recovery, *Conservation Letters*, **8(3)**:180–189.
- Bruno JF, Valdivia A (2016) Coral reef degradation is not correlated with local human population density, *Scientific Reports*, **6**.
- Bunce L, Townsley P, Pomeroy R, Pollnac R. (2000) *Socioeconomic manual for coral reef management*. Australian Institute of Marine Science, Townsville, Australia.

- Burkholder DA, Heithaus MR, Fourqurean JW et al. (2013) Patterns of top-down control in a seagrass ecosystem: could a roving apex predator induce a behaviour-mediated trophic cascade? *Journal of Animal Ecology* 82: 1192-1202
- Butchart SH, Walpole M, Collen B, Van Strien A, Scharlemann JP, Almond RE, Baillie JE, Bomhard B, Brown C, et al. (2010) Global biodiversity: indicators of recent declines, *Science*, **328(5982)**:1164–1168.
- Butchart SHM, Clarke M, Smith RJ, Sykes RE, Scharlemann JPW, Harfoot M, Buchanan GM, Angulo A, Balmford A, et al. (2015), Shortfalls and Solutions for Meeting National and Global Conservation Area Targets, *Conservation Letters*, **8(5)**:329–337.
- Butchart SHM, Di Marco M, Watson JEM (2016) Formulating Smart Commitments on Biodiversity: Lessons from the Aichi Targets, *Conservation Letters*.
- Butcher PA, Boulton AJ, Macbeth WG, Malcolm HA (2014) Long-term effects of marine park zoning on giant mud crab *Scylla serrata* populations in three Australian estuaries, *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **508**:163–176.
- Buxton CD, Cochrane P (2015). Commonwealth Marine Reserves Review: Report of the Bioregional Advisory Panel. Department of the Environment, Canberra.  
<http://www.parksaustralia.gov.au/marine/review/reports.html>
- Cabral RB, Gaines SD, Johnson B, Bell TW, White C (2016) Drivers of redistribution of fishing and non-fishing effort after the implementation of a marine protected area network, *Ecological Applications*.
- Cabral RB, Mamauag SS, Aliño PM (2015) Designing a marine protected areas network in a data-limited situation, *Mar. Policy*, **59**:64–76.
- Campbell LM, Gray NJ, Hazen EL, Shackeroff JM (2009) Beyond baselines: rethinking priorities for ocean conservation, *Ecol. Soc.*, **14**:14. [online]  
URL: <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol14/iss11/art14/>.
- Cardinale BJ, Duffy JE, Gonzalez A, Hooper DU, Perrings C, Venail P, Narwani A, Mace GM, Tilman D, et al. (2012) Biodiversity loss and its impact on humanity, *Nature*, **486(7401)**:59–67. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22678280>.
- Carvalho PG (2016) *The Effectiveness of Periodically-Harvested Closures in Meeting Ecological and Socioeconomic Objectives*.
- Caselle JE, Rassweiler A, Hamilton SL, Warner RR (2015) Recovery trajectories of kelp forest animals are rapid yet spatially variable across a network of temperate marine protected areas, *Scientific Reports*, **5**:14102. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26373803>.
- Ceballos G, Ehrlich PR, Barnosky AD, García A, Pringle RM, Palmer TM (2015) Accelerated modern human-induced species losses: Entering the sixth mass extinction, *Science Advances*, **1(5)**:e1400253.
- Chae DR, Wattage P, Pascoe S (2012) Recreational benefits from a marine protected area: A travel cost analysis of Lundy, *Tourism Management* **33(4)**:971–977.
- Charles A, Wilson L (2009) Human dimensions of marine protected areas, *ICES J. Mar. Sci.*, **66**:6–15.
- Chhatre A, Saberwal V (2005) Political incentives for biodiversity conservation, *Conserv. Biol.*, **19**:310–317.
- Chollett I, Box SJ, Mumby PJ (2016) Quantifying the squeezing or stretching of fisheries as they adapt to displacement by marine reserves, *Conservation Biology*, **30(10)**:166–75. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26096358>.

- Christie P (2004) Marine protected areas as biological successes and social failures in southeast Asia, pp.155–164 in J.B. Shipley, editor. *Aquatic protected areas as fisheries management tools. Designs, use, evaluation of these fully protected areas*, American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, MD.
- Christie P, McCay B, Miller M, *et al.* (2003) Toward developing a complete understanding: a social science research agenda for marine protected areas, *Fisheries*, **28**:22–26.
- Clark MR, Althaus F, Schlacher TA, Williams A, Bowden DA, Rowden AA (2016) The impacts of deep-sea fisheries on benthic communities: a review, *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, **73(suppl 1)**:i51–i69.
- Convention on Biological Diversity (2010) *Strategic plan for biodiversity 2011–2020*.
- Costello C, Ovando D, Clavelle T, Strauss CK, Hilborn R, Melnychuk MC, Branch TA, Gaines SD, Szuwalski CS, *et al.* (2016) Global fishery prospects under contrasting management regimes, *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, **113(18)**:5125–9. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27035953>.
- Costello MJ (2014) Long live Marine Reserves: A review of experiences and benefits, *Biological Conservation* **176**:289–296.
- Costello MJ, Ballantine B (2015) Biodiversity conservation should focus on no-take Marine Reserves: 94% of Marine Protected Areas allow fishing, *Trends in Ecology, Evolution*, **30(9)**:507–509.
- Cronon W (1996) The trouble with wilderness: or, getting back to the wrong nature, *Environ. Hist.*, **1**:7–28.
- D'Agata S, Mouillot D, Wantiez L, Friedlander AM, Kulbicki M, Vigliola L (2016) Marine reserves lag behind wilderness in the conservation of key functional roles, *Nature Communications*, **7**:12000. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27354026>.
- Darimont CT, Fox CH, Bryan HM, Reimchen TE (2015) The unique ecology of human predators, *Science*, **349(6250)**:858–860.
- Davidson AD, Boyer AG, Kim H, Pompa-Mansilla S, Hamilton MJ, Costa DP, Ceballos G, Brown JH (2012) Drivers and hotspots of extinction risk in marine mammals, *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, **109(9)**:3395–3400.
- Davis K, Kragt M, Gelcich S, Schilizzi S, Pannell D (2015) Accounting for enforcement costs in the spatial allocation of marine zones, *Conservation Biology*, **29(1)**:226–237.
- Day JC (2002) Zoning: lessons from the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, *Ocean Coast. Manag.*, **45**:139–156.
- Day JC, Dobbs K (2013) Effective governance of a large and complex cross-jurisdictional marine protected area: Australia's Great Barrier Reef, *Mar. Policy* **41**:14–24.
- De Leo GA, Micheli F (2015) The good, the bad and the ugly of marine reserves for fishery yields, *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*, **370(1681)**. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26460129>.
- De Santo EM (2013) Missing marine protected area (MPA) targets: How the push for quantity over quality undermines sustainability and social justice, *J. Environ. Manage.*, **124**:137–146.
- De Santo EM, Jones PJS, Miller AMM (2011) Fortress conservation at sea: a commentary on the Chagos marine protected area, *Mar. Policy*, **35**:258–260.
- De Vos JM, Joppa LN, Gittleman JL, Stephens PR, Pimm SL (2015) Estimating the normal background rate of species extinction, *Conservation Biology*, **29(2)**:452–462.
- Dell C, Montoya JP, Hay ME (2015) Effect of marine protected areas (MPAs) on consumer diet: MPA fish feed higher in the food chain, *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, **540**:227–234.
- Deloitte Access Economics (2013) *Economic contribution of the Great Barrier Reef* Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, Townsville, Queensland, Australia.
- Denderen PD, Rijnsdorp AD, Kooten T (2016) Using marine reserves to manage impact of bottom trawl fisheries requires consideration of benthic food-web interactions, *Ecological Applications*.



- Denny CM, Babcock RC (2004) Do Partial Marine Reserves Protect Reef Fish Assemblages?, *Biological Conservation* **116**:119–29. doi:10.1016/S0006-3207(03)00183-6.
- Desmet P, Cowling R 2004. Using the species-area relationship to set baseline targets for conservation. *Ecology and Society* 9:11.
- Devillers R, Pressey RL, Grech A, Kittinger JN, Edgar GJ, Ward, T, Watson R (2015) Reinventing residual reserves in the sea: are we favouring ease of establishment over need for protection?, *Aquatic Conserv: Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.*, **25**:480–504.
- Devitt KR, Adams VM, Kyne PM (2015) Australia's protected area network fails to adequately protect the world's most threatened marine fishes, *Glob. Ecol. Conserv.*, **3**:401–411
- Di Franco A, Bussotti S, and Navone A (2009) Evaluating Effects of Total and Partial Restrictions to Fishing on Mediterranean Rocky-Reef Fish Assemblages, *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, **387**:275–85. doi:10.3354/meps08051.
- Di Lorenzo M, Claudet J, Guidetti P (2016) Spillover from marine protected areas to adjacent fisheries has an ecological and a fishery component, *Journal for Nature Conservation*, **32**:62–66.
- Dirzo R, Young HS, Galetti M, Ceballos G, Isaac NJ, Collen B (2014) Defaunation in the Anthropocene, *Science*, **345(6195)**:401–406.
- Duffy JE, Lefcheck JS, Stuart-Smith RD et al. (2016) Biodiversity enhances reef fish biomass and resistance to climate change. *Proc. Nat Academy* 113 (22): 6230-6235
- Duffy R (2006) Non-governmental organisations and governance states: The impact of transnational environmental management networks in Madagascar, *Env. Polit.*, **15**:731–749.
- Dulvy NK (2013) Super-sized MPAs and the marginalization of species conservation. *Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.*, **23**:357–362.
- Dunstan PK, Bax NJ, Dambacher JM, Hayes KR, Hedge PT, Smith DC, Smith AD (2016) Using ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs) to implement marine spatial planning, *Ocean & Coastal Management*, **121**:116–127.
- Edgar GJ, Stuart-Smith R, Willis TJ, Kininmonth S, Baker SC, Banks S, Barrett NS, Becerro MA, Bernard ATF, Berkhout J, Buxton C, Campbell SJ, Cooper AT, Davey M, Edgar SC, Forsterra G, Galvan D, Irigoyan AJ, Kushner DJ, Moura R, Parnell P, Shears NT, Soler G, Strain EMA, Thomson RJ, (2014) Global conservation outcomes depend on marine protected areas with five key features, *Nature*, **506**:216–223.
- Edgar GJ, Stuart-Smith, RD, Thomson RJ et al. (2017) Consistent multi-level trophic effects of marine reserve protection across northern New Zealand. *PLOS ONE* 12(5): Article Number: e0177216
- Engelhard SL, Huijbers CM, Stewart-Koster B, Olds AD, Schlacher TA, Connolly RM (2016) Prioritizing seascape connectivity in conservation using network analysis, *Journal of Applied Ecology*.
- Evans JL, Peckett F, Howell KL (2015) Combined application of biophysical habitat mapping and systematic conservation planning to assess efficiency and representativeness of the existing High Seas MPA network in the Northeast Atlantic, *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, **72(5)**:1483–1497.
- Evans LS, Ban NC, Schoon M, Nenadovic M. (2014) Keeping the great in the Great Barrier Reef: large-scale governance of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, *Int. J. Commons*, **8**:396–427.
- Fenner D (2016) Criticism of Marine Protected Areas by fisheries scientists, *Mar. Poll. Bull.*, **108(1–2)**12–4. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27210561>.
- Ferguson AM, Harvey ES, Knott NA (2016) Herbivore abundance, site fidelity and grazing rates on temperate reefs inside and outside marine reserves, *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, **478**:96–105.



- Fernandes L, Day J, Lewis A, *et al.* (2005) Establishing representative no-take areas in the great barrier reef: large-scale implementation of theory on marine protected areas, *Conserv. Biol.*, **19**:1733–1744.
- Fiske SJ (1992) Sociocultural aspects of establishing marine protected areas, *Ocean Coast. Manag.*, **17**:25–46.
- Fitzpatrick B, Harvey E, Langlois T, Babcock R, Twigg E (2015) Effects of fishing on fish assemblages at the reefscape scale, *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, **524**:241–253.
- Fletcher, W.J. and Santoro, K. (eds). (2014). Status Reports of the Fisheries and Aquatic Resources of Western Australia 2013/14: The State of the Fisheries. Department of Fisheries, Western Australia.
- Fletcher WJ, Kearney RE, Wise BS, Nash WJ (2015). Large-scale expansion of no-take closures within the Great Barrier Reef has not enhanced fishery production, *Ecol. Appl.*, **25**:1187–1196.
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (2016) *The State of the World Fisheries and Aquaculture* Rome, Italy.
- Fox HE, Mascia MB, Basurto X, *et al.* (2012) Reexamining the science of marine protected areas: linking knowledge to action, *Conserv. Lett.*, **5**:1–10.
- Friedlander A, Wagner D, Gaymer C, Wilhelm A, Lewis N, Brooke S, Kikiloi K, Varmer O (2016) Co-operation between large-scale MPAs: successful experiences from the Pacific Ocean, *Aquatic Conserv: Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.*, **26 (Suppl. 2)**:126–141 (2016).
- Gaines SD, Lester SE, Grouard-Colvert K, Costello C, Pollnac R (2010) Evolving science of marine reserves: new developments and emerging research frontiers, *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **107**:18251–18255.
- Gaines SD, White C, Carr MH, Palumbi SR.(2010) Designing marine reserve networks for both conservation and fisheries management, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **107**:8286–18293.
- Gallacher J, Simmonds N, Fellowes H, Brown N, Gill N, Clark W, Biggs C, Rodwell L (2016) Evaluating the success of a marine protected area: a systematic review approach, *Journal of Environmental Management*, **183**:280–293.
- Game ET, Grantham HS, Hobday, AJ, Pressey RL, Lombard AT, Beckley LE, Gjerde K, Bustamante R, Possingham HP, Richardson AJ (2009) Pelagic protected areas: The missing dimension in ocean conservation, *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, **24**:360–369.
- Gamfeldt L, Lefcheck JS, Byrnes JEK, Cardinale BJ, Duffy JE, Griffin JN (2015) Marine biodiversity and ecosystem functioning: what's known and what's next?, *Oikos*, **124(3)**:252–265.
- Gaymer CF, Stadel AV, Ban, NC, Cárcamo PF, Ierna J, Lieberknecht LM (2014) Merging top-down and bottom-up approaches in marine protected areas planning: experiences from around the globe, *Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.*, **24**:128–144.
- Gell FR, Roberts CM (2003) Benefits beyond boundaries: the fishery effects of marine reserves, *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **18**:448–455.
- Geosciences Australia, 2005. Primary bathymetric units of Australia's EEZ. Canberra: Australian Government.
- Giakoumi S, Scianna C, Plass-Johnson J, Micheli F *et al.* (2017) Ecological effects of full and partial protection in the crowded Mediterranean Sea: a regional meta-analysis, [www.nature.com/scientificreports](http://www.nature.com/scientificreports), August 2017.
- Gilby BL, Stevens T (2016) Meta-analysis indicates habitat-specific alterations to primary producer and herbivore communities in marine protected areas, *Global Ecology and Conservation*, **2**:289–299.
- Goetze J, Langlois T, Claudet J, Januchowski-Hartley F, Jupiter SD (2016) Periodically harvested closures require full protection of vulnerable species and longer closure periods, *Biological Conservation*, **203**:67–74.

- Golden C, Allison EH, Cheung WW, Dey MM, Halpern BS, McCauley DJ, Smith M, Vaitla B, Zeller, D, *et al.* (2016) Fall in fish catch threatens human health, *Nature*, **534**:317–320.
- Goñi R, Hilborn R, Diaz D (2010) Net contribution of spillover from a marine reserve to fishery catches, *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, **400**:233–243.
- Grafton RQ, Kompas T, Van Ha P (2006) The Economic Payoffs from Marine Reserves: Resource Rents in a Stochastic Environment, *The Economic Record*, **82(259)**:469–480.
- Graham F, Rynne P, Estevanez M, Luo J, Ault JS, Hammerschlag N, Schoeman D (2016) Use of marine protected areas and exclusive economic zones in the subtropical western North Atlantic Ocean by large highly mobile sharks, *Diversity and Distributions*, **22(5)**:534–546.
- Graham NAJ, McClanahan TR (2013) The last call for marine wilderness?, *BioScience*, **63**:397–402.
- Gray NJ (2010) Sea change: exploring the international effort to promote marine protected areas, *Conserv. Soc.*, **8**:331–338.
- Green AL, Maypa AP, Almany GR, Rhodes KL, Weeks R, Abesamis RA, Gleason MG, Mumby PJ, White AT (2015) Larval dispersal and movement patterns of coral reef fishes, and implications for marine reserve network design, *Biol Rev Camb Philos Soc*, **90(4)**:1215–47. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25423947>.
- Gruby RL, Basurto X (2013) Multi-level governance for large marine commons: politics and polycentricity in Palau's protected area network, *Environ. Sci. Policy*, **33**:260–272.
- Gruby RL, Campbell LM (2013) Scalar politics and the region: strategies for transcending Pacific Island smallness on a global environmental governance stage, *Environ. Plan. A.*, **45**:2046–2063.
- Grüss A, Kaplan DM, Guénette S, Roberts CM, Botsford LW (2011) Consequences of adult and juvenile movement for marine protected areas, *Biological Conservation*, **144(2)**:692–702.
- Guenther C, López-Carr D, Lenihan HS (2015) Differences in lobster fishing effort before and after MPA establishment, *Applied Geography*, **59**:78–87.
- Halpern BS (2003) The impact of marine reserves: do reserves work and does reserve size matter?, *Ecological Applications*, **13**:117–137.
- Halpern BS, Frazier M, Potapenko J, Casey KS, Koenig K, Longo C, Lowndes JS, Rockwood RC, Selig ER, *et al.* (2015) Spatial and temporal changes in cumulative human impacts on the world's ocean, *Nature Communications*, **6**.
- Halpern BS, Lester SE, Kellner JB (2009) Spillover from marine reserves and the replenishment of fished stocks, *Environmental Conservation*, **36**:268–276.
- Halpern BS, Lester SE, Kellner JB (2010) Spillover from marine reserves and the replenishment of fished stocks, *Environmental Conservation*, **36(4)**:268.
- Halpern BS, Walbridge S, Selkoe KA, Kappel CV, Micheli F, D'Agrosa C, Bruno JF, Casey KS, Ebert C, *et al.* (2008) A global map of human impact on marine ecosystems, *Science*, **319(5865)**:948–952.
- Harrison HB, Williamson DH, Evans RD, Almany GR, Thorrold SR, Russ GR, Feldheim KA, Van Herwerden L, Planes S, Srinivasan M (2012) Larval export from marine reserves and the recruitment benefit for fish and fisheries, *Current Biology*, **22**:1023–1028.
- Heithaus MR, Vaudo JJ, Kreicker S *et al.* (2012) Apparent resource partitioning and trophic structure of large-bodied marine predators in a relatively pristine seagrass ecosystem. *Marine Ecology Prog. Series* 481: 225-237
- Herrera GE, Moeller HV, Neubert MG (2016) High-seas fish wars generate marine reserves, *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, **113(14)**:3767–72. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26976560>.

- Hiddink JG, Moranta J, Balestrini S, Sciberras M, Cendrier M, Bowyer R, Kaiser MJ, Sköld M, Jonsson P, *et al.* (2016) Bottom trawling affects fish condition through changes in the ratio of prey availability to density of competitors, *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **53(5)**:1500–1510.
- Hilborn R (2016) Marine biodiversity needs more than protection, *Nature*, **535(7611)**:224–226.
- Hill LS, Johnson JA, Adamowski J (2016) Meeting Aichi Target 11: Equity considerations in Marine Protected Areas design, *Ocean & Coastal Management*, **134**:112–119.
- Hixon MA, Johnson DW, Sogard SM (2014) BOFFFFs: on the importance of conserving old-growth age structure in fishery populations, *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, **71(8)**:2171–2185.
- Hoisington C (2013) The Marine Protection Dividend: NSW marine parks deliver more over time, Centre for Policy Development Occasional Paper 24.
- Hoisington C, Eadie L (2012) Preserving our marine wealth: an economic evaluation of the proposed commonwealth marine reserves network, Centre for Policy Development Occasional Paper 19.
- Hooper DU, Adair EC, Cardinale BJ, Byrnes JE, Hungate BA, Matulich KL, Gonzalez A, Duffy JE, Gamfeldt L, *et al.* (2012) A global synthesis reveals biodiversity loss as a major driver of ecosystem change, *Nature*, **486(7401)**:105–8. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22678289>.
- Hopf JK, Jones GP, Williamson DH, Connolly SR (2016) Synergistic effects of marine reserves and harvest controls on the abundance and catch dynamics of a coral reef fishery, *Current Biology*, **26(12)**:1543–8. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27185553>.
- Horodysky AZ, Cooke SJ, Graves JE, Brill RW (2016) Fisheries conservation on the high seas: linking conservation physiology and fisheries ecology for the management of large pelagic fishes, *Conservation Physiology*, **4(1)**:cov059. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27382467>.
- Hughes T, Cameron D, Chin A, Connolly S, Day J, Jones G, McCook L, McGinnity P, Mumby P, *et al.* (2016) A critique of claims for negative impacts of Marine Protected Areas on fisheries, *Ecological Applications*, **26(2)**:637–641.
- Huijbers CM, Connolly RM, Pitt KA, Schoeman DS, Schlacher TA, Burfeind DD, Steele C, Olds AD, Maxwell PS, *et al.* (2015) Conservation benefits of marine reserves are undiminished near coastal rivers and cities, *Conservation Letters*, **8(5)**:312–319.
- Hunt C (2013) Benefits and opportunity costs of Australia’s Coral Sea marine protected area: A precautionary tale, *Mar. Policy*, **39**:352–360.
- Islam GMN, Tai SY, Kusairi MN, Ahmad S, Aswani FMN, Senan MKAM, Ahmad A (2017) Community perspectives of governance for effective management of marine protected areas in Malaysia, *Ocean & Coastal Management*, **135**:34–42.
- Jenkins CN, Van Houtan KS (2016) Global and regional priorities for marine biodiversity protection, *Biological Conservation*.
- Jentoft S, Chuenpagdee R, Pascual-Fernandez, JJ (2011) What are MPAs for: on goal formation and displacement, *Ocean Coast. Manag.*, **54**:75–83.
- Jentoft S, van Son TC, Bjørkan M (2007) Marine protected areas: a governance system analysis, *Hum. Ecol.*, **35**:611–622.
- Jones PJ, Lieberknecht L, Qiu W (2016) Marine spatial planning in reality: Introduction to case studies and discussion of findings, *Mar. Policy*.
- Jones PJS (2006) Collective action problems posed by no-take zone, *Mar. Policy*, **30**:143–156.
- Jones PJS (2014) *Governing marine protected areas: resilience through diversity*, Routledge, New York.
- Jones PJS, De Santo EM (2016) Viewpoint: Is the race for remote, very large marine protected areas (VLMPAs) taking us down the wrong track?, *Mar. Policy*, **73**:231–234.

- Jones PJS, Qiu W, DeSanto EM (2013) Governing marine protected areas: social-ecological resilience through institutional diversity, *Mar. Policy*, **41**:5–13.
- Joppa L, O'Connor B, Visconti P, Smith C, Geldmann J, Hoffmann M, Watson J, Butchart S, Virah-Sawmy M, *et al.* (2016) Filling in biodiversity threat gaps, *Science*, **352(6284)**:416–418.
- Juan-Jordá MJ, Mosqueira I, Cooper AB, Dulvy NK (2011) Global population trajectories of tunas and their relatives, *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, **51**:20650–20655.
- Katsanevakis S, Stelzenmüller V, South A, Sørensen TK, Jones PJ, Kerr S, Badalamenti F, Anagnostou C, Breen P, *et al.* (2011) Ecosystem-based marine spatial management: review of concepts, policies, tools, and critical issues, *Ocean & Coastal Management*, **54(11)**:807–820.
- Kawaka JA, Samoilys MA, Murunga M, Church J, Abunge C, Maina GW (2017) Developing locally managed marine areas: Lessons learnt from Kenya, *Ocean & Coastal Management*, **135**:1–10.
- Kerwath SE, Winker H, Götz A, Attwood CG (2013) Marine protected area improves yield without disadvantaging fishers, *Nature Communications*, **4**.
- Kittinger JN, Teneva LT, Koike H, Stamoulis KA, Kittinger DS, Oleson KL, Conklin E, Gomes M, Wilcox B, *et al.* (2015) From reef to table: Social and ecological factors affecting coral reef fisheries, artisanal seafood supply chains, and seafood security, *PLoS One*, **10(8)**: e0123856.
- Klein CJ, Brown CJ, Halpern BS, Segan DB, McGowan J, Beger M, Watson JE (2015) Shortfalls in the global protected area network at representing marine biodiversity, *Scientific Reports*, **5**.
- Koldewey HJ, Curnick D, Harding S, Harrison LR, Gollock M (2010) Potential benefits to fisheries and biodiversity of the Chagos Archipelago/British Indian Ocean Territory as a no-take marine reserve, *Mar. Poll. Bull.*, **60**:1906–1915.
- Larcombe J, Marton N, 2016. Potential displacement of commercial fisheries by a Commonwealth marine reserve zoning scheme: Report on Panel-recommended network. ABARES technical report to client prepared for the Department of the Environment, Canberra.
- Lee KA, Huveneers C, Macdonald T, Harcourt RG (2015) Size isn't everything: movements, home range, and habitat preferences of eastern blue groper (*Achoerodus viridis*) demonstrate the efficacy of a small marine reserve, *Aquatic Conserv: Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.*, **25(2)**:174–186.
- Leenhardt P, Cazalet B, Salvat B, Claudet J, Feral F (2013) The rise of large-scale marine protected areas: conservation or geopolitics?, *Ocean Coast. Manag.*, **85**:112–118.
- Lester S, Halpern B (2008) Biological responses in marine no-take reserves versus partially protected areas, *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, **367**:49–56.
- Lester SE, Halpern BS, Grorud-Colvert K, Lubchenco J, Ruttenberg BI, Gaines SD, Airamé S, Warner RR (2009) Biological effects within no-take marine reserves: a global synthesis, *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, **384**:33–46.
- Levine A (2007) Staying afloat: state agencies, local communities, and international involvement in marine protected area management in Zanzibar, Tanzania, *Conserv. Soc.*, **5**:562–585.
- Lotze HK, Lenihan HS, Bourque BJ, Bradbury RH, Cooke RG, Kay MC, Kidwell SM, Kirby MX, Peterson CH, *et al.* (2006) Depletion, degradation, and recovery potential of estuaries and coastal seas, *Science*, **312(5781)**:1806–1809.
- Lynch TP, Harcourt R, Edgar G, Barrett N (2013) Conservation of the Critically Endangered Eastern Australian Population of the Grey Nurse Shark (*Carcharias taurus*) Through Cross-Jurisdictional Management of a Network of Marine-Protected Areas, *Environmental Management*, **52**:1341–1354.
- Lyons C, Blount B, Carothers C, Marchioni M, Davis R, Loring P (2016) Considering communities in fisheries management, *Mar. Policy*.

- Mascia MB (2003) The human dimension of coral reef marine protected areas: recent social science research and its policy implications, *Conserv. Biol.*, **17**:630–632.
- Mascia MB, Claus CA, Naidoo R (2010) Impacts of marine protected areas on fishing communities, *Conserv. Biol.*, **24**:1424–1429.
- Mazor T, Possingham HP, Edelist D, Brokovich E, Kark S (2014) The crowded sea: incorporating multiple marine activities in conservation plans can significantly alter spatial priorities, *PLoS One*, **9**(8):e104489. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25102177>.
- McCauley DJ, Pinsky ML, Palumbi SR, Estes JA, Joyce FH, Warner RR (2015) Marine defaunation: animal loss in the global ocean, *Science*, **347**(6219):1255641. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25593191>.
- McCook LJ, Ayling T, Cappo M, Choat JH, Evans RD, De Freitas DM, Heupel M, Hughes TP, Jones GP, Mapstone B (2010) Adaptive management of the Great Barrier Reef: A globally significant demonstration of the benefits of networks of marine reserves, *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, **107**:18278–18285.
- McCrea-Strub A, Zeller D, Rashid Sumaila U, *et al.* (2011). Understanding the cost of establishing marine protected areas, *Mar. Policy*, **35**:1–9.
- Mellin C, MacNeil MA, Cheal AJ, Emslie MJ, Caley MJ (2016) Marine protected areas increase resilience among coral reef communities, *Ecology Letters*: DOI: 10.1111/ele.12598.
- Morison AK, McLoughlin K (2010) Assessment of risks that commercial fishing methods may pose to conservation values identified in the Areas for Further Assessment of the East Marine Region, Report to Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts, Canberra.
- Moussaoui ALI, Bensenane M, Auger P, Bah A (2015) On the optimal size and number of reserves in a multi-site fishery model, *Journal of Biological Systems*, **23**(01):31–47.
- National Geographic (2015) About Pristine Seas [WWW Document].
- O'Leary BC, Winther-Janson M, Bainbridge JM, Aitken J, Hawkins JP, Roberts CM (2016) Effective coverage targets for ocean protection, *Conservation Letters*, DOI: 10.1111/conl.12247
- Olds AD, Pitt KA, Maxwell PS, Babcock RC, Rissik D, Connolly RM (2014) Marine reserves help coastal ecosystems cope with extreme weather, *Global Change Biology*, **20**:3050–3058.
- Oliver TH, Heard MS, Isaac NJ, Roy DB, Procter D, Eigenbrod F, Freckleton R, Hector A, Orme CDL, *et al.* (2015) Biodiversity and resilience of ecosystem functions, *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **30**(11):673–684.
- Orzechowski EA, Lockwood R, Byrnes JE, Anderson SC, Finnegan S, Finkel ZV, Harnik PG, Lindberg DR, Liow LH, *et al.* (2015) Marine extinction risk shaped by trait–environment interactions over 500 million years, *Global Change Biology*, **21**(10):3595–3607.
- Ostrom, E. (2005) *Understanding institutional diversity*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Pajaro MG, Mulrennan ME, Vincent ACJ (2010) Toward an integrated marine protected areas policy: connecting the global to the local, *Environ. Dev. Sustain.*, **12**:945–965.
- Pala C (2013) Giant marine reserves post vast challenges, *Science*, **339**:640–641.
- Palumbi SR (2004) Marine reserves and ocean neighborhoods: the spatial scale of marine populations and their management, *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.*, **29**:31–68.
- Papageorgiou M (2016) Coastal and marine tourism: A challenging factor in Marine Spatial Planning, *Ocean & Coastal Management*, **129**:44–48.
- Pascoe S, Doshi A, Dell Q, Tonks M, Kenyon R (2014) Economic value of recreational fishing in Moreton Bay and the potential impact of the marine park rezoning, *Tourism Management*, **41**:53–63.
- Pauly D, Zeller D (2016) Catch reconstructions reveal that global marine fisheries catches are higher than reported and declining, *Nature*, doi:10.1038/ncomms10244.

- Payne JL, Bush AM, Heim NA, Knope ML, McCauley DJ (2016) Ecological selectivity of the emerging mass extinction in the oceans, *Science*.
- Pendoley KL, Schofield G, Whittock PA, Ierodiaconou D, Hays GC (2014) Protected species use of a coastal marine migratory corridor connecting marine protected areas, *Marine Biology*, **161(6)**:1455–1466.
- Pereira TJ, Manique J, Quintella BR, Castro N, de Almeida PR, Costa JL (2017) Changes in fish assemblage structure after implementation of Marine Protected Areas in the south western coast of Portugal, *Ocean & Coastal Management*, **135**:103–112.
- Pérez-Jorge S, Pereira T, Corne C, Wijtten Z, Omar M, Katello J, Kinyua M, Oro D, Louzao M (2015) Can static habitat protection encompass critical areas for highly mobile marine top predators? Insights from coastal East Africa, *PLoS One*, **10(7)**:e0133265.
- Pew Charitable Trusts. (n.d.). Global Ocean Legacy: Marine Conservation For a New Century.
- Phillips A (2004) The history of the international system of protected area management categories, *Protected Area Categories*, **14(3)**:4. Available from: [https://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/14\\_3lowres.pdf](https://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/14_3lowres.pdf).
- Pillans S, Ortiz J-C, Pillans RD, Possingham HP (2007) The impact of marine reserves on nekton diversity and community composition in subtropical eastern Australia, *Biol. Conserv.*, **136**:455–469.
- Pilyugin SS, Medlock J, De Leenheer P (2016) The effectiveness of marine protected areas for predator and prey with varying mobility, *Theoretical Population Biology*, **110**:63–77. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27151107>.
- Pita P, Fernández-Vidal D, García-Galdo J, Muíño R (2016) The use of the traditional ecological knowledge of fishermen, cost-effective tools and participatory models in artisanal fisheries: Towards the co-management of common octopus in Galicia (NW Spain), *Fisheries Research*, **178**:4–12.
- Pollnac R, Christie P, Cinner JE, *et al.* (2010) Marine reserves as linked social-ecological systems, *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, **107**:18262–18265.
- Pomeroy RS, Parks JE, Watson LM (2004) *How is your MPA doing? A guidebook of natural and social indicators for evaluating marine protected area management effectiveness*, IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.
- Potts T, Burdon D, Jackson E, *et al.* (2014) Do marine protected areas deliver flows of ecosystem services to support human welfare?, *Mar. Policy*, **44**:139–148.
- Pressey RL, Cowling RM, Rouget M, 2003. Formulating conservation targets for biodiversity pattern and process in the Cape Floristic Region, South Africa. *Biological Conservation* 112:99.
- Puig P, Canals M, Company JB, Martín J, Amblas D, Lastras G, Palanques A, Calafat AM (2012), Ploughing the deep sea floor, *Nature*, **489(7415)**:286-289.
- Rees SE, Mangi SC, Hattam C, Gall SC, Rodwell LD, Peckett FJ, Attrill MJ (2015) The socio-economic effects of a Marine Protected Area on the ecosystem service of leisure and recreation, *Mar. Policy*, **62**:144–152.
- Richmond L, Kotowicz D (2015) Equity and access in marine protected areas: the history and future of “traditional indigenous fishing” in the Marianas Trench Marine National Monument, *Appl. Geogr.*, **59**:117–124.
- Roberts CM, Bohnsack JA, Gell F, Hawkins JP, Goodridge R (2001) Effects of marine reserves on adjacent fisheries, *Science*, **294**:1920–1923.
- Rotjan R, Jamieson R, Carr B, *et al.* (2014) Establishment, Management, and Maintenance of the Phoenix Islands Protected Area. In *Advances in Marine Biology*, edited by Magnus L. Johnson and Jane Sandell, 1st ed. London: Elsevier Ltd. **69**:289–324.



- Sale PF, Agardy T, Ainsworth CH, Feist BE, Bell JD, Christie P, Hoegh-Guldberg O, Mumby PJ, Feary DA, *et al.* (2014) Transforming management of tropical coastal seas to cope with challenges of the 21st century, *Mar. Poll. Bull.*, **85(1)**:8–23.
- Sand PH (2012) Fortress conservation trumps human rights? The “marine protected area” in the Chagos Archipelago, *J. Environ. Dev.*, **21**:36–39.
- Sandbrook C, Adams WM, Büscher B, Vira B (2013). Social research and biodiversity conservation, *Conserv. Biol.*, **27**:1487–1490.
- Savage J, Hobsbawn P (2015), *Australian fisheries and aquaculture statistics 2014* AGoAaW Resources Canberra, Australia.
- Schmiing M, Fontes J, Afonso P (2016) Predictive mapping of reproductive fish habitats to aid marine conservation planning, *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, no. ja.
- Sciberras M, Jenkins SR, Mant R, Kaiser MJ, Hawkins SJ, Pullin AS (2015) Evaluating the Relative Conservation Value of Fully and Partially Protected Marine Areas, *Environmental Evidence* 58–77. doi:10.1111/faf.12044.
- Scott R, Hodgson DJ, Witt MJ, Coyne MS, Adnyana W, Blumenthal JM, Broderick AC, Canbolat AF, Catry P, Ciccione S, Delcroix E, Hitipeuw C, Luschi P, Pet-Soede L, Pendoley K, Richardson PB, Rees AF, Godley, BJ (2012) Global analysis of satellite tracking data shows that adult green turtles are significantly aggregated in Marine Protected Areas, *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **21**:1053–1061.
- Segi S (2014) Protecting or pilfering? Neoliberal conservationist marine protected areas in the experience of coastal Granada, the Philippines, *Hum. Ecol.*, **42**:565–575.
- Selig ER, Turner WR, Troeng S, Wallace BP, Halpern BS, Kaschner K, Lascelles BG, Carpenter KE, Mittermeier RA (2014) Global priorities for marine biodiversity conservation, *PLoS One*, **9(1)**:e82898. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24416151>.
- Shackeroff JM, Hazen EH, Crowder LB (2009) Oceans as peopled seascales, pp. 33–54 in K. McLeod, H. Leslie, editors. *Ecosystem-based management for the ocean*, Island Press, Washington, D.C.
- Shears N, Grace R, Usmar M, Kerr V, Babcock R (2006) Long-term trends in lobster populations in a partially protected vs. no-take marine park, *Biological Conservation*, **132**:222–31. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2006.04.001.
- Shears NT, Babcock RC (2003) Continuing trophic cascade effects after 25 years of no-take marine reserve protection, *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, **246**:1–16.
- Shelton AO, Hutchings JA, Waples RS, Keith DM, Akçakaya HR, Dulvy NK (2015) Maternal age effects on Atlantic cod recruitment and implications for future population trajectories, *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, p. fsv058.
- Silver JJ, Gray NJ, Campbell LM, Fairbanks LW, Gruby RL (2015) Blue Economy and Competing Discourses in International Oceans Governance, *J. Environ. Dev.*, **24**:135–160.
- Singleton RL, Roberts CM (2014) The contribution of very large marine protected areas to marine conservation: Giant leaps or smoke and mirrors?, *Mar. Pollut. Bull.*, **87**:7–10.
- Skytruth (2012) <http://skytruth.org/>
- Skytruth Oceana, Google (2014) Global Fishing Watch <http://globalfishingwatch.org/>.
- Smith MD, Lynham J, Sanchirico JN, Wilson JA (2010) Political economy of marine reserves: understanding the role of opportunity costs, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **107**:18300–18305.
- Spalding MD, Meliane I, Milam A, Fitzgerald C, Hale LZ (2013) Protecting marine spaces: global targets and changing approaches, pp. 213–248 in A. Chircop, S. Coffen-Smout, M. McConnell, editors. *Ocean Yearbook 27*, Martinus Nijhoff.

- Spalding M, Wood L, Fitzgerald C, Gjerde K (2010) The 10% target: where do we stand? Pages 25-40 in Toropova C, Meliane I, Laffoley D, Matthews E, Spalding M eds. *Global ocean protection: present status and future possibilities*, IUCN, The Nature Conservancy, UNEP-WCMC, UNEP, UNU-IAS, Agence des aires marines protégées, Gland.
- Speed CW, Meekan MG, Field IC, McMahon CR, Harcourt RG, Stevens JD, Babcock RC, Pillans RD, Bradshaw CJA (2016) Reef shark movements relative to a coastal marine protected area, *Regional Studies in Marine Science*, **3**:58–66.
- Steinberg PE (2008) It's so easy being green: overuse, underexposure, and the marine environmentalist consensus, *Geography Compass*, **2**:2080–2096.
- Stephenson RL, Paul S, Pastoors MA, Kraan M, Holm P, Wiber M, Mackinson S, Dankel DJ, Brooks K, et al. (2016) Integrating fishers' knowledge research in science and management, *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, p. fsw025.
- Stevens JD, Bonfil R, Dulvy NK, Walker PA (2000) The effects of fishing on sharks, rays, and chimaeras (chondrichthyans), and the implications for marine ecosystems, *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, **57**:476–494.
- Stewart JD, Beale CS, Fernando D, Sianipar AB, Burton RS, Semmens BX, Aburto-Oropeza O (2016) Spatial ecology and conservation of Manta birostris in the Indo-Pacific, *Biological Conservation*, **200**:178–183.
- Stigner MG, Beyer HL, Klein CJ, Fuller RA, Carvalho S (2016) Reconciling recreational use and conservation values in a coastal protected area, *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **53**(4):1206–1214.
- Stocker L, Collard L, Rooney A (2015) Aboriginal world views and colonisation: implications for coastal sustainability, *Local Environment*, **21**(7):844–865.
- Stonich SC (2003) The political ecology of marine protected areas: The case of the bay islands, pp. 121–147 in S. Gössling, editor. *Tourism and development in tropical islands: political ecology perspectives*, Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd., Cheltenham.
- Sumaila UR, Lam VW, Miller DD, Teh L, Watson RA, Zeller D, Cheung WW, Cote IM, Rogers AD, et al. (2015) Winners and losers in a world where the high seas is closed to fishing, *Scientific Reports*, **5**:8481. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25674681>.
- Swartz W, Sumaila R, Watson R (2013) Global ex-vessel fish price database revisited: a new approach for estimating 'missing' prices, *Environmental and Resource Economics*, **56**(4):467–480.
- The Pew Charitable Trusts (2015) Fact Sheet. The virtual watch room: pioneering technology to monitor and protect marine reserves [WWW Document].
- Thorpe A, Bavinck M, Coulthard S (2011) Tracking the debate around marine protected areas: key issues and the BEG framework, *Environ. Manage.*, **47**:546–63.
- Toonen RJ, Wilhelm T., Maxwell SM, et al. (2013) One size does not fit all: the emerging frontier in large-scale marine conservation, *Mar. Pollut. Bull.*, **77**:7–10.
- Tremain DM, Harnden CW, Adams DH (2004) Multidirectional movements of sportfish species between an estuarine no-take zone and surrounding waters of the Indian River Lagoon, Florida, *Fishery Bulletin*, **102**(3):533–544.
- Usseglio P, Friedlander AM, Koike H, Zimmerhackel J, Schuhbauer A, Eddy T, Salinas-de-León P (2016) So Long and Thanks for All the Fish: Overexploitation of the Regionally Endemic Galapagos Grouper *Mycteroperca olfax* (Jenyns, 1840), *PLoS one*, **11**(10):e0165167.
- Vianna GMS, Meekan MG, Pannell D, Marsh S, Meeuwig JJ (2012) Socio-economic value and community benefits from sharkdiving tourism in Palau: A sustainable use of reef shark populations, *Biological Conservation*, **145**:267–277.



- Villegas-Ríos D, Moland E, Olsen EM (2016) Potential of contemporary evolution to erode fishery benefits from marine reserves, *Fish and Fisheries*.
- Vincent, AC, Harris, JM (2014) Boundless no more, *Science*, **346(6208)**:420–421.
- Wagner D, Wilhelm A, Friedlander A, et al. (2013) *A shared research agenda for large-scale marine protected areas*.
- Walmsley SF, White AT (2003) Influence of social, management and enforcement factors on the long-term ecological effects of marine sanctuaries, *Environ. Conserv.*, **30**:388–07.
- Watson JE, Darling ES, Venter O, Maron M, Walston J, Possingham HP, Dudley N, Hockings M, Barnes M, et al. (2016) Bolder science needed now for protected areas, *Conservation Biology*.
- Watson JEM, Dudley N, Segan DB, Hockings M (2014) The performance and potential of protected areas, *Nature*, **515**:67–73.
- Webb TJ, Mindel BL (2015) Global patterns of extinction risk in marine and non-marine systems, *Current Biology*, **25(4)**:506-11. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25639240>.
- Wells S, Ray G, Gjerde K, White A, Muthiga N, Creel J, Causey B, McCormick-Ray J, Salm R, Gubbay S, Kelleher G, Reti J (2016) Building the future of MPAs – lessons from history, *Ecosyst.* **26 (Suppl. 2)**:101–125.
- White JW, Botsford LW, Hastings A, Baskett ML, Kaplan DM, Barnett LA (2013) Transient responses of fished populations to marine reserve establishment, *Conservation Letters*, **6(3)**:180–191.
- White, C, Costello, C (2014) Close the high seas to fishing?, *PLoS Biol*, **12(3)**:e1001826.
- Wilhelm TA, Sheppard CRC, Sheppard ALS, Gaymer CF, Parks J, Wagner D, Lewis NA (2014) Large marine protected areas – advantages and challenges of going big, *Aquatic Conserv: Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.*, **24**:24–30.
- Wilhelm TA, Sheppard CRC, Sheppard ALS, Gaymer CF, Parks J, Wagner D, Lewis Na, 2014. Large marine protected areas – advantages and challenges of going big. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems* 24:24-30.
- Williams A, Bax NJ, Kloser RJ, Althaus F, Barker B, Keith G (2009) Australia’s deep-water reserve network: implications of false homogeneity for classifying abiotic surrogates of biodiversity, *ICES Journal of Marine Scienc*, **66**: 214–224.
- Williamson DH, Harrison HB, Almany GR, Berumen ML, Bode M, Bonin MC, Choukroun S, Doherty PJ, Frisch AJ, et al. (2016) Large-scale, multi-directional larval connectivity among coral reef fish populations in the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, *Molecular Ecology*.
- Williamson DH, Russ GR and Ayling AM (2004) No-take marine reserves increase abundance and biomass of reef fish on inshore fringing reefs of the Great Barrier Reef, *Environmental Conservation*, pp. 149–159.
- Wilson B (2016), Might marine protected areas for mobile megafauna suit their proponents more than the animals?, *Aquatic Conserv: Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.*, **26(1)**:3–8.
- Wood LJ, Fish L, Laughren J, et al. (2008) Assessing progress towards global marine protection targets: shortfalls in information and action, *Oryx*, **42**:340–351.
- World Parks Congress (2014), *A strategy of innovative approaches and recommendations to enhance implementation of marine conservation in the next decade*.
- Worm B, Barbier EB, Beaumont N, Duffy JE, Folke C, Halpern BS, Jackson JB, Lotze HK, Micheli F, et al. (2006) Impacts of biodiversity loss on ocean ecosystem services', *Science*, **314(5800)**:787–790.
- Young E (2001) State intervention and abuse of the commons: fisheries development in Baja California Sur, Mexico, *Ann. Assoc. Am. Geogr.*, **91**:283–306.
- Young MA, Foale S, Bellwood DR (2016) Why do fishers fish? A cross-cultural examination of the motivations for fishing, *Mar. Policy*, **66**:114–123.

- Young O (2006) Vertical interplay among scale-dependent environmental and resource regimes, *Ecol. Soc.*, **11**: 27 [online] URL: <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol11/iss21/art27>.
- Zeiger JB, Caneday L, Barker P (1992) Symbiosis between tourism and our national parks, *Parks & Recreation*, **27(9)**:74–79.
- Zgliczynski BJ, Sandin SA (2017) Size-structural shifts reveal intensity of exploitation in coral reef fisheries, *Ecological Indicators*, **73**:411–421.