**************South Africa: EBSA Review, Threat Status and Management**

*Minutes from the National EBSA Working Group Meeting
Cape Town, 18 October 2018*

**EBSA Review**

***Table 1.*** *Summary of the review of South African EBSAs by the National EBSA Working Group (Cape Town, 18 October 2018) and recommendations and comments for consideration on the delineation, descriptions and criteria ranks. EBSA Types are: Type 1 = static feature; Type 2 = group of features; Type 3 = ephemeral features; Type 4 = dynamic features. For a full explanation of the EBSA types, refer to the text from Johnson et al. 2018 Marine Policy 88: 75-85 in the footnote below.*

| **EBSA**  | **Type1** | **Recommendations and suggestions** | **EBSA Team Actions** | **Changes made** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NAMIBIA-SOUTH AFRICA** |  |
| **Orange Seamount and Canyon Complex** | 2 | * No comments, EBSA approved.
 | * None
 | * NBA 2018 Ecosystem type stats included in the description and supplementary table
* Added EBSA type to the description
 |
| **Orange Cone** | 1 | * Barry has data for macrofauna in the Orange Cone area that we could potentially use for EBSA management recommendations.
 | * **SH**: Engage with Barry about these data.
 | * NBA 2018 Ecosystem type stats included in the description and supplementary table
* Added EBSA type to the description
 |
| **SOUTH AFRICA** |  |
| **Namaqua Fossil Forest** | 1 | * Change the EBSA type to III: Spatially stable features whose individual positions are not known.
* De Beers may have more data for the greater area, and could be approached to share it.
* It is likely that the area falls within area 2C, 3C or 6C where there may be a diamond mining lease or application. Alan Boyd has information.
 | * **SK:** DEA to formally request data from De Beers, with specific mention of how the data will be used and for what purpose.
 | * NBA 2018 Ecosystem type stats included in the description and supplementary table
* EBSA presented as a Type 3 as suggested
* Followed up with Andrea Pulfrich about updated mining licence information about the area. Included the latest information in the Condition and Future Outlook section.

(Note that Belton Park Trading 127 (Pty) Ltd now have prospecting rights; may be a source of information as well. De Beers should be more willing to share their data now because they have given up their rights in that area.) |
| **Childs Bank and Shelf Edge** | 2 | * Need strong emphasis on the pelagic resources in this EBSA.
 | * **LH:** Make sure this is captured in the description.
 | * Noted the importance of the site for marine living resources in the feature description
* NBA 2018 Ecosystem type stats included in the description and supplementary table
* Added EBSA type to the description
 |
| **Namaqua Coastal Area** | 1 | * No comments, EBSA approved.
 | * None
 | * NBA 2018 Ecosystem type stats included in the description and supplementary table
* Added EBSA type to the description
 |
| **Cape Canyon & Associated Islands, Bays & Lagoon** | 2 | * We may need to include the other patch of (CR) Southern Benguela Muddy Shelf Edge north-west of Cape Canyon where the MPA will be. It is in better ecological condition compared to the patch of Southern Benguela Muddy Shelf Edge that is already in the EBSA.
* Change the number of islands noted in the summary slide and in the description; since the revision, it’s now 8 islands, not 3, and also include mention of Saldanha Bay
* Suggested that the Biological Diversity criterion rank is upgraded from Medium to High based on the number of ecosystem types present, and also because it’s the only place where two genomic clusters for *Zostera capensis* are present (in Langebaan).
* Suggested that the Uniqueness and Rarity criterion rank is also upgraded from Medium to High for the size of the canyon, uniqueness of the lagoon (only one in SA) and for Saldanha, which is the largest natural harbour in SA.
 | * **SH:** To consider a boundary revision to include the second patch of Southern Benguela Muddy Shelf Edge, north-west of Cape Canyon.
* **LH:** Make recommended changes to the descriptions and supporting materials.
 | * Boundary revised as suggested
* Islands updated in the description and presentations; Saldanha Bay included in the description and presentation
* Criterion rank upgraded for Biological Diversity from Medium to High, as suggested
* Criterion rank upgraded for Uniqueness and Rarity from Medium to High as suggested
* NBA 2018 Ecosystem type stats included in the description and supplementary table
* Added EBSA type to the description
 |
| **Browns Bank** | 1 | * We need to possibly look at fossil coral records in the north of the area that are currently outside of the EBSA boundary. There are three records.
* Check and revise the description – there are no gravels in the eastern portion of the EBSA.
 | * **SH:** Check with Kerry about the fossil coral records and consider a boundary revision.
* **LH:** Revise the description so it reflects the latest map of ecosystem types.
 | * EBSA boundary revised
* NBA 2018 Ecosystem type stats included in the description and supplementary table
* Added EBSA type to the description
* Removed reference to gravel habitat
* Updated description with information from the Deep Secrets Cruise Report
 |
| **Agulhas Bank Nursery Area** | 1 | * No comments, EBSA approved
 | * None
 | * NBA 2018 Ecosystem type stats included in the description and supplementary table
* Added EBSA type to the description
 |
| **Mallory Seamount, Trough & Slope Complex** | 2 | * Also include in the description that it is a Mako shark nursery.
* Suggestion to split this EBSA into two: the seamounts, and the escarpment and trough.
 | * **SH:** Look into splitting the EBSA, and potential extension into a “Three Oceans Meeting” EBSA.
* **LH:** Ensure the mako shark information is in the description.
* **LH:** Revise old and write new description for the split EBSA.
 | * EBSA split into two: Mallory Escarpment and Trough EBSA, and Shackleton Seamount Complex EBSA
* New descriptions written for each EBSA
* Added Mako nursery area to Shackleton Seamount Complex EBSA description
* NBA 2018 Ecosystem type stats included in both descriptions and supplementary tables
* Added EBSA types to the descriptions
 |
| **Secret Reef** | 1 | * Suggestion to expand this along the ridge to link up with the rocky ridge and kingklip koppies currently in Algoa to Amathole.
 | * **SH:** Look at revising the EBSA boundary.
* **LH:** Revise the Algoa to Amathole and Secret Reef descriptions to reflect the new EBSA boundaries.
 | * Algoa to Amathole split into two EBSAs: Algoa to Amathole EBSA and Secret Reef, Kingklip Ridge and Kingklip Koppies EBSA, as suggested
* Descriptions revised/rewritten to reflect the EBSA boundary changes, and to frame this as an EBSA revision and not a new proposed site
* NBA 2018 Ecosystem type stats included in both descriptions and supplementary tables
* Added EBSA type to the description, and changed it to a Type 2 because it is the reef, koppies and the ridge
 |
| **Algoa to Amathole** | 2 | * Suggestion to split this EBSA around Algoa Bay and link the rocky ridge and kingklip koppies with Secret Reef.
 | * **SH:** Look into splitting the EBSA
* **LH:** Revise the Algoa to Amathole and Secret Reef descriptions to reflect the new EBSA boundaries
 | * Algoa to Amathole split into two EBSAs: Algoa to Amathole EBSA and Secret Reef, Kingklip Ridge and Kingklip Koppies EBSA, as suggested
* Descriptions revised/rewritten to reflect the EBSA boundary changes
* NBA 2018 Ecosystem type stats included in both descriptions and supplementary tables
* Added EBSA type to the description
 |
| **Protea Banks and Sardine Route** | 3 | * There are unique algae on Protea Banks, noted in a book by Olivia De Clerck (ask Kerry).
 | * **LH:** Follow up with Kerry about this reference to include in the description.
 | * Reference on endemic algae requested and included
* NBA 2018 Ecosystem type stats included in the description and supplementary table
* Added EBSA type to the description and changed to a Type 2/4
* Changed Naturalness from Low to Medium – the NBA 2018 data showed almost the whole EBSA to be good or fair ecological condition.
 |
| **Natal Bight and uThukela River** | 1 | * There was a suggestion to include more of the canyon in Natal Bight and uThukela.
* Change “Natal Bight” to “KwaZulu-Natal Bight” throughout.
 | * **SH:** Look at revising the EBSA boundary.
* **LH:** Revise the name and description as suggested.
 | * Boundary revised to include the canyon
* “Natal Bight” changed to “KwaZulu-Natal Bight” throughout
* NBA 2018 Ecosystem type stats included in the description and supplementary table
* Added EBSA type to the description, and revised it to a Type 2 because of the additional features
 |
| **Cape Point to Cape Agulhas** | 2 | * Theoni Photopolou has data on residency of white sharks in this EBSA.
* High genetic diversity in this region.
 | * **LH**: check that the Kock et al. 2018 paper is the white shark information mentioned, and include in the description.
* **LH**: Ask Sophie for genetic information that we can include in the descriptions.
 | * Added white shark information to the description
* NBA 2018 Ecosystem type stats included in the description and supplementary table
* Added EBSA type to the description
* Genetic information requested
 |
| **Protea Seamount Cluster** | 2 | * There is limited evidence for threatened species in Protea Seamount Cluster; suggestion to downgrade this criterion rank from High to Medium was supported.
* Possibly include Mount Marrick to the north-east of Protea Seamount Cluster.
* Also consider inclusion of the Simpson Seamounts in area south-west of the EBSA and still within our EEZ.
 | * **SH:** Look at revising the EBSA boundary
* **LH:** Revise the criteria rank, and description if necessary
 | * Boundary revised to include Mount Marrick, but not the smaller Simpsons Seamounts
* EBSA criterion rank changed from High to Medium for Importance for threatened species/habitats, as agreed
* NBA 2018 Ecosystem type stats included in the description and supplementary table
* Added EBSA type to the description
 |
| **Tsitsikamma-Robberg** | 2 | * Consider extending to include Noetsie and Knysna: important, natural habitat.
 | * **SH:** Look at revising the EBSA boundary.
* **LH:** Revise the description to reflect boundary changes if necessary.
 | * Boundary revised as suggested
* Descriptions revised to reflect the EBSA boundary changes
* NBA 2018 Ecosystem type stats included in the description and supplementary table
* Added EBSA type to the description
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **General comments to be applied across EBSAs and descriptions** |  |
| **Descriptions [LH to follow up]*** Unique is an absolute attribute, check that we don’t say “very unique”.
* “Functional estuary” … make sure this is defined, or check the definition and see if you can delete the “functional” part.
* Sophie von der Heyden to provide supporting text on genetic aspects, where relevant, to existing and proposed EBSA descriptions.
* Check the CBD thresholds for the Productivity criterion ranks and see if these can be applied.

**Delineations*** No general comments.

**Supporting Information [SH to follow up]*** Need to provide NBA 2018 stats in the tables.
 | * “Very unique” or similar phrasing corrected
* “Functional” in “functional estuary” deleted
* Sophie von der Heyden requested to provide genetic content
* Couldn’t find CBD productivity thresholds
* NBA 2018 stats included in all SA EBSA descriptions
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **General comments for the MARISMA Project** |
| * None
 |

**1Guide to the EBSA Types (text from Johnson et al. 2018)**

*(First defined: UNEP/CBD/RW/EBSA/NP/1/4. Report of the North Pacific Regional Workshop to facilitate the description of Ecologically Or Biologically Significant Marine Areas. 25 February − 1 March 2013. Moscow, Russia 〈https://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/mar/ebsa-np-01/official/ebsa-np-01-04-en.pdf〉 accessed 17 October 2017).*

**[Type 1]** **Spatially stable features whose positions are known and individually resolved on the maps.** Examples include individual seamounts and feeding areas for sharks and seabirds. Such areas do not have to be used as important habitats all year round, nor does all the area have to be used every year. However, the feature(s) is entirely contained in the corresponding map polygons.

**[Type 2]** **Spatially stable features whose individual positions are known, but a number of individual cases are being grouped.** Examples include a group of coastal areas, seamounts or seabird breeding sites where the location of each is known but a single polygon on the map and corresponding description encompasses all the members of the group. The grouping may be done because there may be insufficient knowledge to evaluate each separately or the information is basically the same for all members of the group, so one description can be applied to all group members.

**[Type 3]** **Spatially stable features whose individual positions are not known.** Examples include areas where coral or sponge concentrations are likely, based on, for example, modelling of suitable habitats, but information is insufficient to specify the locations of each individual concentration. Each such area may be represented by a single map polygon and description, but the entire area inside the polygon is not to be interpreted as filled with the feature(s) meeting the criteria. Narrative about these areas should stress the importance of getting better information on the spatial distribution of these features.

**[Type 4]** **Features that are inherently not spatially fixed.** **The position of this feature moves seasonally and among years.** The map polygon for such a feature should include the full range occupied by the front (or other feature) during a typical year. However, the description and its narrative should describe seasonal movement of the key feature(s). The text for description should also make very clear that at any given time, the ecological importance usually is highest wherever the feature is located at that time and often decreases as distance from the feature increases. It may even be the case that at any given time some parts of the total area contained in the polygon are ecologically little different from areas outside the polygon.

**EBSA Threat Status and Management**

**The proposed way forward:**

1. Start with the EBSAs’ criteria, and distribution of features
2. What is the status of these features? (Ecological condition)
3. What are the pressures acting on them? (Pressure layers)
4. Careful delineation of management areas (Biodiversity Zone: Conservation; Biodiversity Zone: Management) using a systematic approach with some expert input.
5. Use survey process to gather inputs from experts and stakeholders
6. Consolidate into single view, highlighting any major divergence.
7. Robust discussion – activities, other measures in the management areas
8. Consolidate our sector’s input to the MSP process
9. Finalize the environmental ask for the EBSAs (including alignment with any other biodiversity priority areas outside of EBSA)
10. Feed results into MSP process and OCIMS database

To determine what the management area options are, the intent is to develop an SDF-style activity compatibility matrix, supplemented with other possible measures for intervention. Examples of what we are thinking are given below, and we will start this process properly using and online survey to get initial consensus.

**Example of what the compatibility matrix might look like:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Pressure | Conservation Management Area | Other Management Area |
| Bottom trawling (existing) | Prohibited for benthic priority areas | Consent |
| Bottom trawling (expansion) | Prohibited | Prohibited |
| Pelagic longlining | Consent | Consent |
| Midwater trawling | Prohibited | Prohibited |

**Examples of other measures**

* Avoid condition loss
* Better research on canyons and other sensitive habitats
* Mining issues, permitting, management plan processes
* Sector-specific management should consider key features of EBSAs
* Sector-specific reviews
* Gear restrictions
	+ E.g., hake trawl to habitat management objectives in the plan… in this EBSA it means xyz
* Bycatch management
* Seasonal closures for oil and gas seismic surveys
* Small-scale fisheries management issues (permitting)
* Permit issues
* Rehabilitation plans for mining
* Non-renewal of “problem area” permits
* Awareness programmes with industry (and other)
* Explore technology-based interventions e.g., whale avoidance
* Temporal closures
* Conflict matrix for pressures
* Recommendations for all EBSAs, specifics for some of them