



LME: LEARN Project Meeting

Summary Report

5 – 6 December 2016

Paris, France

Contents

1. Objectives of the Meeting	3
2. Agenda at a glance	4
3. Summary of sessions (A-F)	5
SESSION A: INTRODUCTION	5
Session B: INTRODUCTION TO WORKING GROUPS: REVIEW OF EXISTING TOOLS	6
SESSION C: WORKING GROUP ON GOVERNANCE	7
SESSION D: WORKING GROUP ON ECOSYSTEM BASED MANAGEMENT.....	10
SESSION E: WORKING GROUP ON DATA AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	14
SESSION F: WRAP UP SESSION	16
Annexes	17
ANNOTATED AGENDA	17
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS.....	20

1. Objectives of the Meeting

The primary objective of the LME:LEARN Project Meeting was to convene three working groups of the project (Governance, Ecosystem Based Management, and Data and Information Management) and to initiate work towards implementing respective project activities. The meeting took place in Paris on 5-6 December 2016 in the premises of UNESCO (1, rue Miollis, Paris).

A limited group of participants (working group members and selected project managers) attended this meeting. While working group membership has been by invitation, other participants were welcome to attend sessions as observers.

2. Agenda at a glance

AGENDA	Monday 5 December 2016		PROJECT MEETING A Intro Session		PROJECT MEETING B Intro to WGs Session		PROJECT MEETING C WG Governance Session		PROJECT MEETING D WG Ecosystem Based Management Session		PROJECT MEETING D WG Ecosystem Based Management Session	
	09 00						10 45		14 45		16 00	
Tuesday 6 December 2016		09 00	PROJECT MEETING E WG Data and Information Management Session				11 15	PROJECT MEETING E WG DIM Session	PROJECT MEETING F Wrap Up Session			

3. Summary of sessions (A-F)

SESSION A: INTRODUCTION

The institutional representatives of the LME:Learn opened the meeting: Mr. Julian Barbière, Head of the Marine Policy and Regional Coordination Section of IOC-UNESCO, which is also the Executing Agency of the project, Mr. Christian Severin, Environmental specialist in charge of the International Waters focal area of the GEF Secretariat, and Mr. Vladimir Mamaev, UNDP/GEF Regional Team Leader and Regional Technical Advisor, UNDP Istanbul. After welcoming the participants, all institutional representatives thanked the LME Annual Meeting's Planning Committee and the IW/LME:Learn PCU for the organisation of this meeting. The objective of the meeting is to kick-start the "large-scale" implementation of the project.

Mr. Ivica Trumbic, Chief Technical Advisor of LME:Learn, gave an introductory presentation on the progress of implementation of LME:Learn activities. After briefing the audience on the main components of the project, he summarised the hitherto progress as follow:

- Good collaboration with the project executing partners was established;
- The LME project meeting was organized in collaboration of all partners who see it as an opportunity to expand partnerships;
- Working groups were established as main vehicles for project's implementation;
- Foundations for functioning Regional Networks were laid;
- Web site as the main communication tool is being developed and will soon be launched;
- Work on management toolkits has started.

Mr. Trumbic also informed the participants of the main tasks of the working groups at this meeting, namely:

- WG on Governance should have as final output the toolkit or the handbook on governance. During this meeting it has to decide what is it that is still needed for the LME community in terms of improving the LMEs' governance and how to proceed towards achieving that objective;
- WG on Ecosystem Based Management has to coordinate development of 6 toolkits, which is not an easy task because the project document does not say very much what each toolkit should offer;
- WG on Data and Information Management should follow the development of the database of projects, and at this meeting it should discuss what would be its contents.

SESSION B: INTRODUCTION TO WORKING GROUPS: REVIEW OF EXISTING TOOLS

Chairs: Lauren Wenzel, NOAA and Keith Lawrence, CI	
Speakers	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of a dataset of existing tools for oceans EBM and governance. Identify whether or not the proposed toolkits under LME:Learn meet currently unmet needs; are any changes needed to the list of toolkits? 	Keith Lawrence, CI
Discussion on the set of toolkits proposed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are linkages needed between the tools? Are there mechanisms to deliver them in a consistent way? 	Lauren Wenzel, NOAA

The session's objectives were to (1) present what tools already exist, and (2) to use this to assess critically the list of toolkits proposed under LME:Learn. One of the aspects to be discussed during the session was to distinguish between the notions of "creating a new tool", "helping users to implement existing tools" and a "navigation guide" to help users pick between existing tools.

Main points given by the speakers

Major issue related to a large number of toolkits to be developed within the LME:Learn project is that they all will have to be useful to the users. To do so, a feedback from potential users needs to be obtained. The question also is how to achieve links between toolkits having in mind that in certain aspects some of the toolkits may be overlapping. Finally, there is a need to make a thorough analysis of existing tools in order to define the exact contents of new tools to be developed. An analysis undertaken by CI has found more than 400 tools related to integrated management. Moreover, it has prioritized 118 tools. Tools could be grouped into guides and frameworks, with management strategy tools as an important sub-category; geographic tools, with spatial focus and mainly addressed to non-technical users; and modelling/simulation tools that require technical expertise.

Summary of the discussion

The session discussed the connections among the seven proposed toolkits and the benefits of taking an integrated approach focused on the end users. Participants noted that there are many existing materials and tools that the toolkits could build upon, and that the LME: Learn project should help users identify and navigate among existing tools and fill gaps where needed. There is potential to collaborate with EBM Tools Network and OpenChannels to tap into existing tools and to use their networks to raise awareness of work in LMEs. It was stressed that the LME project managers and partners need capacity building to learn how to use existing tools. A means for users to provide feedback/ratings on the real usefulness of various tools should be included.

Main recommendations and follow-up actions

LME:LEARN should look across the seven proposed toolkits to see how they can be combined (where appropriate), reference each other, and be delivered seamlessly. The seven toolkits, discussed in two working groups, could be viewed as a single product with multiple components.

SESSION C: WORKING GROUP ON GOVERNANCE

Chairs: Wojciech Wawrzynski, ICES and Lauren Wenzel, NOAA	
Rapporteur: Ivica Trumbic, IOC/UNESCO	
Speakers	
Objectives and expected outcomes of the session	Wojciech Wawrzynski, ICES / Lauren Wenzel, NOAA
Proposal for the Governance Toolkit Outline	Ellen Johannesen, ICES
Review of governance frameworks and best practices	Emma Kelley, NOAA
Discussion on the contents, format, timeline, workplan and target audience of the Governance Toolkit	Wojciech Wawrzynski, ICES
Summary of the discussion and next steps	Lauren Wenzel, NOAA

The WG Governance session sought to: (1) define contents, format and timeline for the Governance toolkit for GEF LME/ICM/MPA/Climate Adaptation projects; (2) review governance frameworks that are relevant for the Toolkit; and (3) discuss and agree on the target audience as well as on the most appropriate product(s) of the group's endeavours.

Main points given by the speakers

As an introduction to the session, an extensive overview of the governance approaches and frameworks was given, including an analytical review of best practices in the application of governance. The objective was to provide information that will help build the governance toolkit but also to identify what information is still needed while developing the LME governance toolkit. A draft outline of the toolkit was presented to the participants, and it served as the basis for subsequent discussion.

Summary of the discussion

The aim of delivering the toolkit is to provide an inception guide linking to specific information sources on ocean governance, while the main target audience for the WG's final product will be LME practitioners and administrators. It was suggested that the format should be concise, engaging, visual, web-based, easily printable/downloadable (pdf) and have potential for multi-media/video, contain infographics, etc. Language in toolkit should be concise and include engaging formats such as infographics and case studies. The web-based version should include downloadable information for those with less reliable internet access.

There was a strong sense from the group that all LME toolkits should be well integrated to avoid duplication and allow for seamless use by LME managers and their partners. For consistency purposes, it was suggested that all the planned LME:Learn toolkits could constitute parts of one overall LME:Learn toolkit. The working group emphasized that the toolkit needs to address governance tools that can be applied at different spatial scales (e.g. transboundary, national, sub-national, community). The toolkit should also refer to the TDA/SAP processes, including the governance assessment required in the SAP.

The NOAA review of governance frameworks and best practices matrix, presented at the meeting, should be completed (with additional projects added) and included as a component of the toolkit. The toolkit could include information on legal and institutional frameworks in governance (for instance, which frameworks chose to embed commission or to include advancement status on conventions and commissions).

The participants proposed the following draft outline of the toolkit:

1. Introduction to governance in Large Marine Ecosystems
 - A definition of governance
 - Strong rationale including social and economic benefits and links to SDGs
 - Governance challenges specific to LMEs
 - Challenges of integrated versus sector based management
 - The need for integration/consideration of interactions with other conventions, such as climate change/biodiversity conventions
2. Governance Frameworks: A review of best practices
 - TDA/SAP links
 - Approaches to transboundary resources management
 - Nest in scale for different management needs (geographic scale)
 - Legal and institutional frameworks
 - Translating science into policy: tools and procedures
 - Ethics as a foundation of good governance
 - The role of soft law/code of conducts/social norms on influencing compliance behaviour
 - Interaction with regional economic development organizations and how to influence policy
 - Matrix of Governance Principles in Large Marine Ecosystem projects
 - Stakeholder engagement
3. Assessing and monitoring governance performance
 - Establishing good governance arrangements and processes
 - Monitoring effectiveness of governance arrangements
 - Mechanisms for marine resource governance at different geographic scales (land-12 miles, 12-200, 200+)
 - Governance tools at different geographic scales (regional, national, sub-national institutions and authorities)
 - Cross-sectoral tools - e.g. Marine Spatial planning, ICZM
 - Sector based - e.g. Ecosystem approach to fisheries management
 - Conservation based - e.g. MPAs
4. Additional Tools and Resources
 - List of related resources
 - Governance Tools

Main recommendations and follow-up actions

ICES will work on the content layout of the toolkit and send it to the WG members for comments, while individual volunteers will draft specific sections, e.g. NOAA Fisheries will work on the matrix of governance cases, University of Newcastle on cultural compliance, etc. Next WG meeting will be held online in February / March 2017. The LME:Learn PCU will work on the web domain and the graphic design of the toolkits.

The proposed workplan is as follows:

- Jan-March 2017
 - Working group examines best practices from GEF IW project portfolio for inclusion

- Working group examines existing platforms, manuals and guidebooks from partners and beyond to integrate information
- terms of reference for partner and project (and consultant as appropriate) contributions developed
- (Proposed) March 2017 – online meeting of Governance Working Group (via webinar)
 - review materials identified; identify gaps and next steps
 - finalize format
- June 2017 – second meeting of Governance Working Group (in conjunction with UN Meeting on SDG14, New York)
- September 2017 – third meeting of Governance Working Group (in conjunction with the International MPA Congress, Coquimbo, Chile)
 - further develop Toolbox content
 - draft dissemination and communications plan
- Late Fall 2017 – fourth meeting of the WG (Paris or the venue of the LME:Learn science and governance conference)
 - finalize Toolbox content and its dissemination / communications plan

SESSION D: WORKING GROUP ON ECOSYSTEM BASED MANAGEMENT

Chair: Keith Lawrence, CI	
Rapporteur: James Oliver, IUCN	
Speakers	
Objectives and expected outcomes of the session:	James Oliver, IUCN and Keith Lawrence, CI
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role, purview and membership of the WG • What, if any, changes are needed to the list of toolkits? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large marine ecosystem scorecard • Discussion on audience/customers, uses, design issues, pilots 	Keith Lawrence, CI and Johanna Polsenberg, CI
'Carousel' session (15 minutes each), with small groups rotating around 5 stations to discuss 5 toolkits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF LME project toolkit • Stakeholder participation in environmental policy • LME strategic approach • Marine Spatial Planning • Environmental Economics Discussion on each toolkit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customers / audiences • Uses • Features / design • Implementing partners 	Small groups
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback from carousel session • Next steps 	James Oliver, IUCN and Keith Lawrence, CI

Six EBM toolkits are proposed under the LME:Learn: Large Marine Ecosystem scorecard, LME Project Toolkit, Stakeholder Participation Toolkit, LME Strategic Approach Toolkit, Marine Spatial Planning Toolkit and Environmental Economics Toolkit. In addition, the seventh toolkit, one on the Governance, was discussed in Session C. The toolkits may overlap but an attempt will be made to avoid repetition. There should be web-based integration of toolkits, not just within the EBM component but also with other work areas under the LME:Learn project and the IW:Learn project. The toolkits should also fit with the TDA/SAP approach and incorporate Marine Spatial Planning concerns up to the transboundary scale.

The session's objectives were to: (1) clarify the role, purview and membership of the WG; (2) revisit the 6 toolkits proposed, in light of a review of existing tools and outline its scope; (3) discuss the target audience/customers and uses of each toolkit - and the implications for their design; (4) identify partners to produce each toolkit; and (5) identify next steps.

Main points given by the speakers

The LME scorecard (toolkit) has been designed to serve as a rapid snapshot of the management effectiveness of large marine areas of varying scale. It was developed and scaled up from a working tool to measure MPA effectiveness. The aim was to produce a survey tool that is inexpensive and rapid to complete and that is targeted at both individuals and groups. It generates single and component scores that serve to identify strengths and weaknesses. No primary data collection is necessary and the tool's use is repeatable giving the possibility to make a time series and results that are comparable between sites as well as applicable to both active and non-active projects. The scorecard has already been drafted and has been tested, for example in the Western Indian Ocean region. For the LME

project, the tool will be adapted to LME scale before finalisation of the design and the dissemination process ahead of rollout.

There are at least two scales at which the tool can be deployed in an LME context: at LME scale with a layer for transboundary situations and at country (EEZ) scale. MPA networks also need consideration. The tool can be tailored to local context as part of its flexible structure enabling LME managers to pick top priorities for analysis. They can also be linked back and compared to MPA effectiveness tools. The results should help practitioners to assess those resilience factors that underlie all the other measurements that determine their success levels. This tool can fulfil a similar role to the Ocean Health Index diagnostic tool in that it can act as a useful starting point for addressing deficiencies. The tool's primary intention is to assess whether the primary components and resources are present to manage successfully a given marine area.

Summary of the discussion on the LME score card

- It would be good if the scorecard tool could help assess biophysical data and trends, integrating the array of information on LMEs that is already compiled.
- There is some degree of overlap with GEF evaluation tools, but at area level rather than at project level. The timeline capability is an additional plus.
- The GEF International Waters Tracking tool is calculated differently but the scorecard needs to be designed differently to avoid duplication.
- The IW tracking tool is also project specific, especially for the purpose of milestone tracking, but pieces are worth adding.
- Calibration with the TWAP and the tracking tool should be possible.
- The scorecard toolkit should be closely tied to other toolkits, e.g. the stakeholder engagement toolkit. This is not duplication as the purposes are different. A connection to MPA Guidelines could also be useful.
- Lessons could be learned from the Ocean Governance scorecard and Marine Sanctuary Condition Report.
- Its success will be dependent on people's willingness to fill in the form and if it is deemed useful.
- Red-Yellow-Green traffic light grading features are a useful outreach feature.
- Combining process-orientated data with the scorecard assessment tool will help with streamlining.
- "Large Marine Ecosystem scorecard" could be a confusing name in LME context; too many acronyms!
- Using LME in title does not prevent work at the national level.
- Would be good to provide info on the indicators for the assessing process.
- If online guidance can be attached to poor scores, it would be beneficial.

Main points of the Carousel Session

1. GEF LME project toolkit

The question was raised whether a specific project preparation manual is needed, but the majority agreed that such manual is needed considering that currently there is a wide variety of approaches to the project preparation as well as different versions of the project documents as a result. It was a common understanding that such toolkit will save project preparation time as experts will have a clearer idea what needs to be done and will be well acquainted with the exact steps, and their contents, that they will have to take. Existing guidebooks and policies, such as MSP guidelines, should be inspected first.

It would be useful to analyse the experience that already exist in various project manuals of a general nature because, essentially, the generic steps should be practically the same. Audience using the toolkit would be relatively large and it should include project PCUs when they are developing new project proposals as a follow up of the projects they have been managing, project partners, national ministries and other stakeholders, and trainers in charge of the respective training courses. The toolkit could be presented as a separate document, but it could also be uploaded on the LME:Learn web site in a special section. The toolkit should be closely related to the governance toolkit.

2. Stakeholder participation in environmental policy

The strategic approach to the Stakeholder participation toolkit should be to anchor cultural differences and values, institutional cultures and legal frameworks. All “visible” stakeholders, decision-makers and private sector should be included, and incentives should be specified for their inclusion. Rationale for their inclusion should be to learn from them, raise awareness, respond to their complaints, etc. In order to minimise their “fatigue”, the purpose of their involvement should be stated very clearly and benefits for their participation should be obvious. This should be done by clearly stating the goals and scope of the project stakeholders. The toolkit should clearly state generic principles of stakeholders’ participation.

Existing guidebooks but also academic literature on the subject should be studied to extrapolate basic principles. These should not differ much. The most active stakeholders should be identified but the use should also be made of existing regional networks. Special attention should be given to conflict resolution. An idea was floated that this toolkit should be a part of the governance toolkit (or be a chapter) as well as have a chapter in the LME project toolkit. Current experience shows that during the LMEs’ TDA and SAP phases, main stakeholders have been governments while during the implementation other stakeholders came to the fore. However, private sector has been conspicuously absent from both. The participation of interdisciplinary staff was mentioned as important.

3. LME strategic approach

The initial idea that this toolkit be combined with the LME project toolkit (and called LME Strategic planning and Project management toolkit) because they are both elements of a closely related process that includes TDA and SAP. However, this idea was later abandoned because it was felt that TDA needs to be prepared taking in consideration new scientific findings, while SAP needs to be more adaptive and should include various stakeholders in its preparation. All these aspects require a specific strategic approach, which also deserves a specific toolkit. It should be different from the project toolkit, which is essentially a set of precisely determined steps leading to a coherent project document. However, the participants noted that the LME Strategic approach toolkit should take consideration of the project development steps.

4. Marine Spatial Planning

The audience/customers of the MSP toolkit should be public authorities, LME practitioners, key stakeholders, NGOs, leading social and participatory authorities, academia, technical experts and other, such as regional economic commissions. The toolkit should be used to improve knowledge on MSP related subjects; enhance the capacities; promote MSP as a collaborative tool; establish synergies amongst public, private and other societal actors; disseminate good practices and MSP recommendations, such as EU’s; awareness raising; demonstrate case studies, etc. Challenges and limitations of MSP are: heterogeneity of contexts where MSP is implemented as well as needs and expectations; lack of an implementation strategy and a step-by-step action plan; lack of institutional and human capacities; lack of adequate mediation, coordination and cooperation initiatives; inadequately active involvement of LME projects; the fact that countries do not share data and

information on transboundary issues, etc. Participants suggested that the toolkit contains, among other, a section on the “state-of-the-art” of MSP, identification of gaps, step-by-step approach at regional scale, evaluation and monitoring template, etc.

5. Environmental Economics

The current scope as per Terms of Reference, with some edits, is as follows: (a) strategies (standards, taxes, incentives, subsidies) ; (b) cost-effect analysis (incl. discounting & socioeconomic drivers); (c) cost-benefit analysis (& distribution) ; (d) risk analysis ; (e) EIAs and SEAs ; (f) EE accounting ; (g) valuation of ecosystem services ; (h) climate change economics.

It was suggested that document be reorganised under above sub-headings and, eventually, merged where possible because overlaps are too numerous. The participants noted that the first priority audience should be practitioners but it should also cater to lawmakers, politicians, civil society and academics (as a platform to bring through new ideas). Environmental economics methodologies exist but what is needed is guidance on what they are, how economics can be useful in achieving objectives and why it is an essential step and component in the TDA/SAP process. They also stressed that the toolkit should aim to:

- Promote cost-efficient investment
- Raise awareness, especially at policy level
- Promote the willingness to pay for ecosystem services
- Pay attention to scale (a regional approach can help at local and national level)
- Ensure that the data feeding the toolkit is still valid (10-year shelf life?)
- Assess what are the data needs by activity/assessment category
- Provide an inventory, baseline and organisation of reference documents
- Include a checklist approach
- Tackle emerging issues
- Address shifts in carbon markets
- Identify incentives
- Link strongly to Marine Spatial Planning
- Develop a matrix/scenario analysis to cover different questions and situations
- Present the cost of not taking action
- Describe the Blue Economy approach , what it means and how to get there with scenarios developed and links between tools and positive outcomes
- Put less emphasis on dollar values (for certain audiences) and more on benefit flows
- Provide communications advice to avoid unintended reactions

For each topic area listed in the TORs, the tool should aim to explain: what it is, why it is important, when it is important, when it is a valid option, how do you talk to policy makers about how it can be integrated into decision making, and where to go for more information. Concerning valuation, the toolkit should provide decision support, especially at country level; identify when good decisions are made more readily with locally managed EVs and when in partnership; make use of results as a key component of the toolkit and cover wealth accounting. With regards to EIAs, they stressed that they are an umbrella approach but ecosystem-level information and analysis is often missing; are often local and specific in scope; are often considered the only environmental tool; perception is limited; that beyond EIAs there is a seascape approach promoting strategic sectoral investments; and that they are useful if they can estimate health impacts in economic terms.

SESSION E: WORKING GROUP ON DATA AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Chair : Peter Pissierssens, IODE/IOC -UNESCO	
Rapporteur : Mish Hamid, IOC of UNESCO	
Speakers	
Objectives and expected outcomes of the session	
Presentation of and discussion on the results of the survey on project database	Peter Pissierssens, IODE/IOC-UNESCO
Presentation on the visualisation of the results of IW:Learn and discussion	Miles Macmillan-Lawler, GRID Arendal
Presentation of the progress of discussion on the preparation of Google layers	James Oliver, IUCN
Summary of the discussion and next steps	Peter Pissierssens, IODE/IOC-UNESCO

Objectives of the session were to recommend actions regarding the structure of the database, including linkages with other platforms: IW/LEARN, Google layers, etc.

Main points given by the speakers

One of the services that will be developed by the LME:Learn project is a database of projects that will present large marine ecosystems, marine spatial planning, coastal area management, marine biodiversity, coastal climate change adaptation and other relevant projects. The database should help regional and international organizations, governments, NGOs, private sector and scientific/technical experts to identify other projects active in subject areas relevant to their own geographic area in order to utilize the experience/expertise gained and to avoid duplication of effort. The database will also serve as a means to guide LME/ICM/MPA/MSP/coastal climate adaptation practitioners towards specific knowledge resources (case studies, newsletters, publications, scientific articles, etc.) pertinent to their work as well as gain access to knowledge and project results across a suite of pertinent crosscutting themes.

A questionnaire was sent to 182 LME contacts and 41 responses were received, which was not enough. After a detailed presentation of the survey results, the next steps proposed were as follows: get and study scope notes of IW:LEARN fields (Do we need all IW:LEARN fields? Should all fields be visible to users? How to link to "data" (project related numerical data); select final list of fields; get IW:LEARN controlled vocabularies; develop/ identify other controlled vocabularies; develop database structure? Decision should be made on who will manage centralized input and editing (secretariat); who would import content from IW:LEARN; who will call for additional input and when will the beta version be launched.

GRID Arendal presented visualization of the IW:Learn data including project database, map based exploration, basin maps, IW:LEARN GeoNode, and project results. The participants were informed that they are currently updating project database while the dynamic visualisation is in development.

IUCN informed that with regards to the "Google Layer" component, Google will make an announcement re their new platform by the end of Q1 or in Q2 2017, while the release will be later in 2017. Google Earth layers, as we know them, will be discontinued and existing ones will disappear (already no longer supported or updated). It will be replaced with new concept of "selective showcasing" and "guided navigation". Finally, some mapping features will likely be subcontracted to

GIS specialists ESRI (Google and ESRI are working closely), hence, IUCN will also need to partner with ESRI. During the next few months, detailed discussions with Google (explore selective showcasing opportunities), ESRI (explore LME mapping capabilities), Smithsonian (explore the internationalisation of the Ocean Portal with over 1 million visitors per year, using LMEs as a regional perspective and with emphasis on education) and Mission Blue (explore development of a common platform) on technological solutions, scope and design will take place. The LME community should: organise electronic info and materials for easy access; identify new and existing showcasing opportunities; develop communication strategies and share with IUCN team (some degree of harmonised branding would be beneficial); share with IUCN any relevant visualisation tools ready or in development. IUCN team should meet with Data & Information Management WG to ensure alignment of objectives (possibly in Q2 2017).

Summary of the discussion

- It would be useful to offer a different user search interface for different target user groups (managers, scientists ...).
- The following should be included as additional searchable fields: “indicators”; “SDG” (will need deeper options) whereby it should then be possible to show a map of projects that address specific SDGs within a region; “LME”; country groups (to allow searching by UNEP regional seas, regional commissions etc.).
- The working group (or technical group and advisory group) should define the detailed terms of reference, guide the developer and allow stakeholder advice during development;
- In order to maximize input into the database the group should seek a cooperative arrangement with other organizations (especially regional) to ensure continued adding and updating of records.

Main recommendations and follow-up actions

- The group agreed to proceed according to the proposed steps forward.
- The group requested to re-survey during the week of the LME conference to seek further advice on additional fields (and to counter the bias that was seen at first survey). Outcome of this new survey will then be used to decide on final list of additional fields.
- While the project database and some of the products may be hosted in various locations it is important that the database and products be served to users through one “window” site.
- Good coordination and collaboration need to be ensured between the different partners involved in LME:Learn data and information management services i.e. IOC/IODE, LME:Learn PCU, GRID Arendal and IUCN. This is mainly to ensure compatibility between the systems.

SESSION F: WRAP UP SESSION

During the Wrap-up session, the following was concluded:

- All the toolkits have a common purpose of improving the management of LMEs. The core audience is the LME community.
- The toolkits presented should be integrated (e.g. as modules of a single LME Managers' Toolkit), so that it is easily accessible by the end user. The toolkits have to be developed by building upon existing material.
- The product should be an attractive and effective web page to deliver LME information to the target audiences.
- Capacity building has to be placed up front. This effort will not be successful if information that is not used by LME projects is compiled.
- Members complimented the “carousel” session as excellent opportunity for interaction and discussion.

Annexes

ANNOTATED AGENDA

MONDAY 5 DECEMBER 2016			
LME:LEARN PROJECT MEETING			
Session	A-Introductory session		
Chair	Julian Barbieri, IOC-UNESCO / Vladimir Mamaev, UNDP		
Room	XIV		
Time	Title	Name	
09 :00 09 :15	Welcome	Julian Barbière, IOC-UNESCO Vladimir Mamaev, UNDP Christian H. Severin, GEF	
09 15 09:30	Progress made in the implementation of LME: LEARN	Ivica Trumbic, IOC/UNESCO	
Session	B-Introduction to Working Groups: Review of Existing Tools		
Chair	Lauren Wenzel, NOAA / Keith Lawrence, CI		
Rapporteur	Tbd		
Room	XIV		
Time	Title	Name	Objectives of the session
09:30 10:00	Review of a dataset of existing tools for oceans EBM and governance. Identify whether or not the proposed toolkits under LME:Learn meet currently unmet needs; are any changes needed to the list of toolkits?	Keith Lawrence, CI	Understand what tools already exist, and use this to critically assess the list of toolkits proposed under LME:Learn. The session will distinguish between "creating a new tool" vs "helping users to implement existing tools" vs a "navigation guide" to help users pick between existing tools.
10:00 10:30	Discussion on the set of toolkits proposed. What, if any, linkages are needed between the tools? Are there mechanisms to deliver them in a consistent way?	Lauren Wenzel, NOAA	
Coffee break 15 minutes (10:30 – 10:45)			
Session	C-Working Group on Governance		
Chair	Wojciech Wawrzynski, ICES / Lauren Wenzel, NOAA		
Rapporteur	Ivica Trumbic, IOC/UNESCO		
Room	XIV		
Time	Title	Name	Objectives of the session
10:45 11:00	Objectives and expected outcomes of the session	Wojciech Wawrzynski, ICES / Lauren Wenzel, NOAA	The WG Governance session seeks to 1) define contents, format and timeline for the

11:00 11:15	Proposal for the Governance Toolkit Outline	Ellen Johannesen, ICES	Governance toolkit for GEF LME/ICM/MPA/Climate Adaptation projects; 2) review governance frameworks that are relevant for the Toolkit. The participants will discuss and agree on the target audience as well as on the most appropriate product(s) of their endeavours. The session should result in clear workplan and timeline of the WG’s activities.
11:15 11:30	Review of governance frameworks and best practices	Emma Kelley, NOAA	
11:30 13:15	Discussion on the contents, format, timeline, workplan and target audience of the Governance Toolkit	Wojciech Wawrzynski, ICES	
13:15 13:30	Summary of the discussion and next steps	Lauren Wenzel, NOAA	
Lunch break 75 minutes (13:30 – 14:45)			
Session	D-Working Group on Ecosystem Based Management		
Chair	Keith Lawrence, Conservation International		
Rapporteur	James Oliver, IUCN		
Room	XIV		
Time	Title	Name	Objectives of the session The session will: (1) clarify the role, purview and membership of the WG (2) revisit the 6 toolkits proposed, in light of a review of existing tools (3) discuss the target audience/customers and uses of each toolkit - and the implications for their design (4) identify partners to produce each toolkit, and (5) identify next steps.
14:45 15:15	Objectives and expected outcomes of the session: Role, purview and membership of the WG What changes, if any, are needed to the list of toolkits?	James Oliver, IUCN / Keith Lawrence, CI	
15:15 15:45	Large marine area score card Discussion on audience/customers, uses, design issues, pilots	Keith Lawrence, CI / Johanna Polsenberg, CI	
Coffee break 15 minutes (15:45 – 16:00)			
16:00 17:30	‘Carousel’ session (15 minutes each), with small groups rotating around 5 stations to discuss 5 toolkits: i) GEF LME project toolkit ii) Stakeholder participation in environmental policy iii) LME strategic approach iv) Marine Spatial Planning v) Environmental Economics Discussion on each toolkit: - Customers / audiences	Small groups	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Uses- Features / design- Implementing partners		
17:30 18:00	Feedback from carousel session Next steps	James Oliver, IUCN / Keith Lawrence, CI	
TUESDAY 6 DECEMBER 2016			
LME:LEARN PROJECT MEETING			
Session	E – Working Group on Data and Information Management		
Chair	Peter Pissierssens, IODE/IOC-UNESCO		
Rapporteur	Mish Hamid, IOC/UNESCO		
Room	XIV		
Time	Title	Name	Objectives of the session To recommend actions regarding the structure of the database, including linkages with other platforms: IW/LEARN, Google layers, etc.
09 :00 09 :15	Objectives and expected outcomes of the session	Peter Pissierssens, IODE/IOC - UNESCO	
09:15 10:15	Presentation of and discussion on the results of the survey on project database	Peter Pissierssens, IODE/IOC- UNESCO	
10:15 11:00	Presentation on the visualisation of the results of IW:Learn and discussion	Miles Macmillan-Lawler, GRID Arendal	
Coffee break 15 minutes (11:00 – 11:15)			
Session	E – Working Group on Data and Information Management (continued)		
11:15 11:30	Presentation of the progress of discussion on the preparation of Google layers	James Oliver, IUCN	
11:30 12:30	Summary of the discussion and next steps	Peter Pissierssens, IODE/IOC- UNESCO	
Session	F – Wrap up session		
Room	XIV		
12:30 13:00	Wrap up on WG sessions	Lauren Wenzel, NOAA/ Ivica Trumbic, IOC/UNESCO	The session will present a synthetic view on the Working Groups’ products and target groups and chart the next steps.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

ORDER	NAME	INSTITUTION	PROJECT	EMAIL
1	Adnan Awad	International Ocean Institute IOI		aawad@ioisa.org
2	Alejandro Iglesias Campos	UNESCO IOC		a.iglesias-campos@unesco.org
3	Andrea Salinas	UNOPS - CLME+ Project		andreas@unops.org
4	Andreas Kannen	Helmholtz-Zentrum Gesthacht		Andreas.Kannen@hzg.de
5	Andrew Hudson	UNDP		andrew.hudson@undp.org
6	Aurélien Dumont	UNESCO Section Groundwater Systems and Settlements		au.dumont@unesco.org
7	Birane Sambe	FAO	Canary Current LME	Birane.Sambe@fao.org
8	Bradford Brown	Brd Brown Consultant		jabaribrad@aol.com
9	Cesar TORO	UNESCO IOC		c.toro@unesco.org
10	Chris O'Brien	FAO	ABNJ, Bay of Bengal	chris.obrien@fao.org
11	Chris Paterson	SPC/SEAFDEC		chrispaterson@yahoo.com.au
12	Christian Severin	Global Environment Facility		cseverin@thegef.org
13	Christian Susan	UNIDO	Gulf of Mexico LME SAP Implementation	C.susan@unido.org
14	Christopher Corbin	UN Environment Caribbean Regional Coordinating Unit	Caribbean LME SAP Implementation	cjc@cep.unep.org
15	Dan Laffoley	IUCN, International Union for Conservation of Nature		danlaffoley@btinternet.com
16	David Hugh Vousden	Rhodes University South Africa	Benguela Current	david.vousden@asclme.org
17	Dixon Waruinge	UN Environment	Somalia and Agulhas Large marine Ecosystems	dixon.waruinge@UNEP.org
18	Ellen Johannesen	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES)		ellen.johannesen@ices.dk
19	Emma Kelley	ECS Federal in support of NOAA		emma.kelley@noaa.gov
20	Harry Coccossis	UNIVERSITY OF THESSALY		hkok@aegean.gr
21	Hugh Walton	Pacific Island Forum Fisheries Agency	Pacific SIDS Fisheries Conventions	hugh.walton@ffa.int
22	Ibukun Adewumi	UNESCO IOC		ibukun_adewumi@yahoo.com
23	Ivica Trumbic	UNESCO IOC		i.trumbic@unesco.org
24	James Oliver	IUCN, International Union for Conservation of Nature		james.oliver@iucn.org
25	Joel Kamdoun Ngueuko	UNESCO IOC		j.kamdoun-ngueuko@unesco.org
26	Johanna Polsenberg	Conservation International		jpolsenberg@conservation.org
27	Josu Icaza	UNESCO IOC		iosu@iwlearn.org
28	Julian Barbiere	UNESCO IOC		J.Barbiere@unesco.org
29	Keith Lawrence	Conservation International		klawrence@conservation.org
30	Lauren Spurrier	World Wildlife Fund		lauren.spurrier@wwf.us.org
31	Lauren Wenzel	NOAA		lauren.wenzel@noaa.gov
32	Leah Karrer	GEF Secretariat		lkarrer@thegef.org
33	Lorenzo Gabiati	UN Environment - Mediterranean Action Plan	Mediterranean Regional Project & Mediterranean ICZM	lorenzo.gabiati@unep.org
34	Lucy Scott	ex-ASCLME	Somalia and Agulhas Large marine Ecosystems	Lucy.Scott@asclme.org
35	Marc Wilson	Pacific Community (SPC)	Pacific Island Countries Ridge to Reef	marcw@spc.int

ORDER	NAME	INSTITUTION	PROJECT	EMAIL
36	Marina Markovic	PAP/RAC	MSP Adriatic	marina.markovic@paprac.org
37	Mika Odido	UNESCO IOC		m.Odido@unesco.org
38	Miles Macmillan-Lawler	GRID-Arendal		miles.macmillan-lawler@grida.no
39	Mish Hamid	UNESCO IOC		m.hamid@unesco.org
40	Mohammad Badran	Regional Organization for Conservation of the Environment of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden	Red Sea and Gulf of Aden "PERSGA"	mohammed.badran@persga.org
41	Ned Cyr	Department of Fisheries Sabah, Malaysia		ned.cyr@noaa.gov
42	Patrick Debels	UNOPS	Caribbean LME SAP Implementation	PatrickD@unops.org
43	Peter Pissierssens	UNESCO IOC		p.pissierssens@unesco.org
44	Selina Stead	Newcastle University		selina.stead@ncl.ac.uk
45	SM Daud Hassan	School of Law, University of Western Sydney		daud.Hassan@westernsydney.edu.au
46	Soizic Brun	UNDP/GEF CLME+ Project Coordination Unit		cs@clmeproject.org
47	Vladimir mamaev	UNDP		vladimir.mamaev@undp.org
48	Wojciech Wawrzynski	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES)		wojciech@ices.dk
49	Yinfeng Guo	UNOPS		guoyf8888@gmail.com