

MPA (Country)	Surface (km ²)	Year Est. (Modified)	Planning Process and Prior Management Techniques	Proponents	Opponents	Objectives (Ecological & Economic)	Economic Outcomes (Include info on discount rate and methods used to evaluate)	Ecological Outcomes (Fish abundance, biomass, how these results related to ecological goals and if there is any uncertainty in measurements modeled/actual)
Great Barrier Reef Marine Park (GBRMP)	344400	1976 (2004)	The physical size and number of different ecosystems represented along the GBR shaped the planning process for its protection. From the beginning, multi-use zoning was used to protect especially sensitive areas, while allowing certain commercial and recreational activities in other zones. The federal and state governments (predominantly Queensland) led the planning process and share responsibilities for management activities. The major rezoning that took place in 2004 increased no-take areas from 4.5% to around 33% of the GBRMP, and included considerable public input over a multi year process, with over 31,000 formal submissions from individuals and stakeholder groups (Jago et al. 2004). Other management strategies in this area of Australia included effort restrictions and location closures for the East Coast Trawl Fishery in 2000, and an individual transferable quota (ITQ) system for the multi-species Queensland coral reef fin-fish fishery (CRFFF) on the GBR (Fisheries (East Coast Trawl) Management Plan 2010; Innes et al. 2014).	Australian Government, FAO, PEW, Majority of recreational fishers (68% thought rezoning was a good idea) (Sutton and Tobin 2009).	Many commercial fishers were generally unsupportive of rezoning 5 years after (Ledee 2012).	The main objective of establishing the GBRMP was to "provide for the long term protection and conservation of the environment, biodiversity and heritage values of the Great Barrier Reef Region", while allowing sustainable use of the reef for recreational, economic and cultural activities as other goals of the act as long as they didn't interfere with the main objective (Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Act 1975). The major rezoning that took place in 2004 aimed to better protect the biodiversity of the MPA which was seen as being degraded and not fully represented by existing no-take. The plan incorporated a new network of no-take areas into the Park that represented the numerous different ecosystems in this large area (Day et al. 2003; Olsson et al. 2008).	With the increase in no take areas the amount and value of fish caught commercially experienced an initial net reductions of 35% (Fletcher et al 2015). This decline was significantly higher than the government's prediction of 10% declines, and neither catch nor value generated have shown signs of recovering in the 9 years from implementation to publication of Fletcher et al. 2015. A number of external factors, along with the increase in closures led to the decline in profitability of fishing and resulted in a dramatic decrease in fishing effort which largely accounts for the decrease in catches (Gunn et al. 2010). The Australian government compensated fishermen and businesses negatively impacted by the loss of fishing effort for their losses, and bought many fishermen out of the fishery, spending around AUS \$205 million on assistance between 2004 and 2008 (Macintosh et al. 2010). The GBR is estimated to contribute Aus \$5.5 billion annually and support 53,800 jobs, with tourism estimated to be worth approximately 36 times more than commercial fishing (McCook et al. 2010). These buyouts and assistance to impacted fishing businesses were significantly higher than the original estimate of AUS \$10 million that would be needed to compensate for losses (Gunn et al 2010).	Increases in the density of coral trout, the primary target of line fishing, were observed within 1.5-2 years across the majority of no-take areas both inshore and offshore, and spanned the roughly 1000km north-south stretch of reserves (Russ et al. 2008). Empirical analysis of prey density in fished and un-fished reserves shows high density of prey in fished areas, which suggest that spillover of adult predators may increase over time (Graham et al. 2003). A number of species of sharks, thought to be in decline prior to rezoning, were observed at significantly higher densities in no-entry, and no-take reserves than in fished areas (Ayling and Choat 2009).
Morae Moana: Cook Islands Marine Park	1.1 million	2017	The Cook Islands Marine Park was first proposed by Kevin Iro to past Demo Government as a mechanism to improve the tourism industry. It was later proposed to Prime Minister Puna in 2011, with the area encompassing the southern portion of the Exclusive Economic Zone. Cabinet endorsed the proposition in July 2011 and a steering committee was formed to guide the process (Wright-Koteka, E. 2016). The committee conducted consultation with the islanders of Rarotonga in the latter part of 2011 and early part of 2012. Results of the consultation reinforced islanders' idea of having a MPA that balances conservation, sustainable development, economic development and culture (United Nations, 2017). Thereafter, the committee reviewed existing MPAs and decided on following the multi-use zone model of the Great Barrier Reef in Australia to manage the CIMP. In 2013, the steering committee ordered a legal analysis to explore appropriate legal framework for CIMP and included boundaries, legislative and policy considerations, and managing authority (Wright-Koteka, 2016). Management techniques for Cook Islands marine resources include the tuna fisheries managed via the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC), the longline fishery managed via the Large Pelagic Longline Fishery Plan and TAC, and the purse seine fishery is managed by the Purse Seine Fishery Plan (FAO, 2018).	Government, traditional leaders, Kevin Iro (well known rugby player)	None thus far	The Marea Moana Ocean Policy was developed to "conserve biodiversity and natural assets in the oceans, reefs and islands while ensuring sustainable development of economic growth interests" (Marae Moana Policy 2016-2020) and forms the basis for Marea Moana Marine Park. The objective of Marea Moana Marine Park is to "establish a marine park that will provide a framework to promote sustainable development by balancing economic growth interests such as tourism, fishing and deep-sea mining, with conserving core biodiversity and natural assets, in the ocean, reefs and islands" (www.sustainabledevelopment.un.org). The Marae Moana act 2017 (No. 10 of 2017) establishes the MMMP and Marae Moana Council "to protect and conserve the ecological, biodiversity, and heritage values of the Cook Islands marine environment" (www.maraemoana.gov).	Implementation time frame 2017-2020.	Implementation time frame 2017-2020. Fishery management objectives of the Cook Islands must align with the Marine Resource Act 2005. This act supports designated fishery that requires management measures. Typically, the islands councils manage the fisheries inside 12 nautical miles of the island and are supported by the Ministry of Marine Resources (FAO, 2018).
Kubulau District (Nassue, Namuri & Namena MPAs)	260 Km2 of qoliqoli and 120 Km2 of No-take MPA	2005 (2012)	The Kubulau Resource Management Committee (KRMC) was formed in 2005, comprised of representatives of each village that shared the qoliqoli (traditionally managed fishing areas) and supported by the high council of chiefs (Clarke and Jupiter, 2010). The MPA network design was based on socioeconomic and biological research done by KRMC, Wildlife Conservation Society, World Wildlife Fund, Wetlands International, and Coral Reef Alliance (Clarke and Jupiter, 2010) (Jupiter and Egli, 2011). In 2009, KRMC and partners developed an integrated "ridge-to-reef" management plan (WCS, 2009). However, in 2011, the MPAs were reconfigured via WCS scientific input, to maximize compliance (Weeks and Jupiter, 2013). The network of MPAs for Kubulau District went through a nine-year process of adaptive comanagement (Weeks and Jupiter, 2013). Prior management techniques used is the traditional community-level governance of marine resources through the qoliqoli and periodically harvested closures areas called Tabu (Clarke and Jupiter, 2010).	From 2004 to 2005, WCS introduced the concept of MPA network in communities and provided scientific recommendations on management to members of the Kubulau Resource Management committee (Weeks and Jupiter, 2013).	The Navatu Clan opposed the reserves since they have traditional fishing rights in the reserve and were seeking compensation. However, no compensation mechanism was implemented (Clarke and Jupiter, 2010).	The main goal of Kubulau's ecosystem-based management plan is "preservation of the functional integrity of Kubulau's ecosystems, from ridge-to-reef, through community-based management" (WCS, 2009). In the initial stage of drafting management plan for Kubulau qoliqoli, the main objective was to "ensure food security for communities" and "ensuring abundant resources at times of social importance (cultural objectives)" (Weeks and Jupiter, 2013).	Jupiter and Egli (2011) socioeconomic factors for MPA effectiveness focusses on	Conducted biological monitoring of fish and benthos in Kubulau qoli for Namena, Namuri and Nassue in 2007, 2008 and 2009. Reef fish biomass varied across MPAs but were high within village-managed closures (>1000Kg/ha) (Jupiter and Egli, 2011).

Palau National Marine Sanctuary	500,000	2015	Pristine Seas and Palau International Coral Reef Center conducted an assessment current MPAs to provide scientific data to the government of Palau for the establishment of the Palau National Marine Sanctuary (PNMS) (Friedlander et al., 2014). PNMS will be implemented through a five year process, where 80% of EEZ will be protected and 20% will be designated domestic fishing area. This will be a period of transition from from foreign fleets to domestic fishing. The government of Palau along with partners will develop a management and implementation plan for PNMS (CEA, 2016).	Due to dwindling tuna stocks in the Pacific and the value of Palau's marine environment, President Remengesau committed to protecting Palau's ocean through a national marine sanctuary (Friedlander et al., 2014). In 2015, the Palau Congress approved the Palau National Marine Sanctuary Act (CEA, 2016).		Palau National Marine Sanctuary aims to (www.glispa.org): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrate with other Pacific Island Countries in furthering the Mixed Management Approach ('Mixed Plate Approach') envisioned by the Pacific Islands Forum in its Pacific Oceanscape Vision and incorporating appropriate management, transition and set-aside strategies appropriate to Palau's National interests; Strengthen fish stocks for traditional fishing; Strengthen, reform and modernize Palau's domestic fishing industry for the development of Palau's Eco-tourism; Re-stock pelagic fish stocks within and beyond the Palau Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ); Re-stock and protect associated by-catch within and beyond the Palau EEZ; Continue to actively partner with our Pacific neighbors, through the Parties to the Nauru Agreement (PNA), the Forum Fisheries Association, and the Pacific Islands Forum, in building a sustainable regional fisheries in the Pacific. 	In 2014, "coastal commercial fisheries production was estimated at US\$3.2 million" for Palau (CEA, 2016). Fleets working offshore of Palau caught 3.987 mt of fish, a value of \$US31 million to fishers (CEA, 2016).	In 2014, fishery diversity and abundance assessment, deep sea habitats exploration and underwater visual surveys for coral and fish inside and outside eight existing MPAs were conducted in Palau by a team of scientist and researchers. In sites surveyed, hard coral made up 50% of total coral coverage. There were no significant difference in coral cover between existing MPAs and control sites as well as for the benthic community composition. In MPAs, target commercial species accounted for 78% of the total biomass (MPA Ngemelis had 3 tons per ha). Biomass of top predators were higher inside MPA than outside, accounting for 30% (biomass inside MPA). Based on ordination analysis, the biomass results were due to MPA age, size and proximity to shore (Friedlander, et al. 2014).
West Hawaii Regional Fishery Management Areas (network of 9 MPA - North Kohala, Puako-Anaehoomalu, Kaupulehu, Kaloko-Honokohau, Kailua, Red Hill, Honaunau, Hookena, Milolii)	35% of coast	1999	Following years of declines in coral reef fish, contention between dive operators and aquarium collectors in the West Hawai'i region and "resource depletion caused by aquarium fish collectors" the Hawaii government passed legislation to set up at least 30% of coastal waters in West Hawai'i as "fish replenishment areas" (Act 306 1998). This act also called for significant involvement of the community including residents and resource users in this nearshore management area. In Act 306 the legislature cites the United States, the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, and scientific research as examples that support establishing 30% of coastal waters as replenishment areas. Along with promoting reserves Act 306 enabled the West Hawaii Fishery Council to limit entry into commercial and aquarium fisheries and ban certain gear.	Dive charter operators, West Hawai'i Reef Fish Working Group (70 members including aquarium collectors and charter operators in the area), University of Hawaii-Hilo, Lost Fish Coalition	Some aquarium collectors	The legislature noted in Act 306 that the West Coast of Hawai'i Island has some of the world's most impressive coral reefs which are valued by dive tourists, recreational, commercial and subsistence fishers. The legislature states that the purpose of establishing a regional fishery management area with 30% closures of coastal waters to aquarium and reef fish fishing is to "enhance nearshore resources and to minimize conflicts of use" (Act 306, 1998).	Since 2000, one year after the implementation of the fish replenishment areas, the total catch and value of the West Hawai'i aquarium fishery have increased by 22% and 45% respectively. The catch from the West Hawai'i region represents around 70% of the total fish caught in the state, and 67% of the value (Dept. of Land and Natural Resources 2014). Fishermen reported that the cost of fishing and the distance traveled to fishing grounds increased after MPA implementation, as they continued to use the same boat launching areas but had to travel further to fish outside of MPAs (Stevenson et al. 2013). However, fishermen experienced higher catch revenues and CPUE in these new areas, and reported a significant increase in their economic status after the MPAs. These changes are also likely tied to an increased demand and price paid for live fish in this area.	The aquarium fishery in West Hawai'i is dominated by two species the Yellow Tang and the Kole which account for 84.3% and 8.3% of the fish caught in this region respectively. After 15 years of protection in Fish Replenishment Areas (FRAs) Yellow Tang populations increased by 64.5% in FRAs, with no significant change in abundance in the adjacent open areas (Dept. of Land and Natural Resources 2014).
Apo Reef National Park (Philippines)	0.225	1982	Apo Island Marine Protected Area was one of the earliest examples of protected areas in the Philippines. Under The Marine Conservation and Development Program the Philippines aimed to generate community based management of coral reef areas. Marine conservation and education programs were led at the community level by Silliman University for 6 years before implementation. Apo Island had seriously degraded fish stocks and fishermen partnered with the university to develop a protected area with support from both the federal government and local stakeholders (Russ and Cicala 1999; White et al. 2010).	Silliman University, USAID, NGOs, Fishermen		Apo Island Marine Reserve was established to protect the biodiversity of the coral reef ecosystem, and to enhance fish stocks. Fish harvest had been declining for roughly 15 years, and the reserve was established with the goal of increasing biomass and the expectation that some of these fish would spillover into fished areas and sustain the fishing community's livelihood and food sources (Alcala 1998).	Initially after implementing the no take reserve fishermen saw a significant increase in income as they played a role in tourism by transporting tourists and working with resorts which accounted for around US \$18,000 annually to the fishing community (Vogt 1998). Fishermen and other residents also state that the reserve has significantly increased incomes from tourism and SCUBA diving in the reserve (Alcala 1998). After implementation of the reserve effort decreased, but an increase in catch per unit effort allowed catch to stay relatively stable in the years after the closure (Russ et al. 2004). While CPUE increased near the reserve, most of the fishing effort moved further away from the reserve than the expected spillover would reach. Spillover of target species from the reserves likely could only account for a maximum of 10% of the yield from the fishery, with the actual value coming from reserves probably less than that (Abesamis et al. 2006).	The biomass of surgeonfish and jacks, two families of fish that make up between 40-75% of Apo Island's fishery yield tripled in the no take reserve over 18 years from 1983-2001 (Russ et al. 2004). Outside of the protected areas these reef fish biomass did not show a significant change, but after 8 years of monitoring, fish biomass closer to the reserves was significantly higher than areas further away from the reserve, suggesting export of fish from the reserve (Russ et al. 2004).

Cabo Pulmo National Park , Mexico	71 Km2 (25 Km2 is no-take zone)	1995	Cabo Pulmo was established via a presidential decree in 1995 due to the deterioration of the reef from commercial and recreational fishing, diving and tourism (Decreto, 1995). Zoning? Community decide to protect all even though there was zoning.	The residents of Cabo Pulmo proposed to protect Cabo Pulmo's reef where fishing would be banned (Starks, 2017). Jesus Castro was one of the founding members of Cabo Pulmo (www.gulfprogram.ucsd.edu).	NA	According to Arispe and Covarrubias (2010), several management goals to declare Cabo Pulmo as a national park included: (1) To preserve the coral reef, its components, associated habitats and biotic communities; (2) To preserve ecological processes and life support systems; (3) To maximise economic and social benefits from the area; (4) To promote conservation compatible uses; and (5) Promote environmental education between general public and research initiatives. Objectives to achieve the goals were: (1) To implement monitoring and research programs to protect benthic communities; (2) To preserve the viability of the coral community by sustained environmental conditions to favour coral development; (3) To restore and preserve target populations of game and artisanal fish; (4) To promote economic alternatives for local residents; and (5) To implement an environmental education program at several levels, starting with the local residents. CPNP declared to protect its coral communities (Aburto-Oropeza et al., 2011). The purpose of CPNP decree is to "conserve the coral reef, turtles, oceanographic and ecological processes, fish species of commercial importance. Promote and support sustainable tourism practices by local community. Promote environmental education" (NAWPA Committee Fact Sheet??) (CONANP, 2006).	Economic benefits due to the transition into small-scale tourism resulted in US\$538, 800 generated in 2006 or US\$18, 000 (?) per capita (Aburto-Oropeza et al., 2011).	Aburto-Oropeza et al., 2011 conducted biological study on reefs inside and outside CPNP in 1999 and 2009. Results of fish biomass and diversity indicate significant increase inside CPCP in comparison to other MPAs and open access areas in the Gulf of California. CPNP fish species richness increased from 15 species per transect to 25 species per transect from 1999 to 2009, respectively. CPNP fish total biomass increased from 0.75 to 4.24 t ha ⁻¹ from 1999 to 2009, respectively. For each trophic group and top predators, biomass increased significantly at CPNP since 1999 to 2009.
Galapagos Marine Reserve	138000	1998 (2016)	Since the 1990's, tourism has been growing, increasing the number of visitors to the islands while fisheries resources has been dwindling, especially for lucrative species such as sea cucumber and lobster. The Ecuadorian government developed law to limit migration to the islands, policies to regulate tourism and established GMR (Toral-Granada, 2008). The declaration of GMR included extension of reserve boundaries to 40 miles offshore from the baseline, creation of exclusive fishing rights for the local artisanal fishing sector and banning of industrial fishing, moratorium on the registration of new local artisanal fishermen, jurisdictional responsibility for management of the GMR to the Galapagos National Park Service, and establishment of Inter-institutional Management Authority (IMA) & Participatory Management Board (PMB). Through a "consensus-based participatory process" (Castrejon and Charles, 2013), a zoning scheme was developed for the reserve by representatives from the fishing sector, tourism industries, non-governmental organizations and the Galapagos National Park Services (GNPS) (Goldstein et al 2016). The proposed zonation included multiple use zone, limited use zone and port zone. However, in 1999, the zoning plan became a provisional coastal zoning and the GMR Management Plan was approved as is. It was until 2000 that the zones were developed and approved by the Participatory Management Board and consisted of 130 management zones (Castrejon and Charles, 2013).	The proponents of GMR was the Ecuadorian government whom legislated the "Special Law for the Conservation and Sustainable Development of the Province of Galapagos" in 1998 (Goldstein et al. 2016).	There were conflicts among fishers and tour operators.	The main management objective of GMRMP is to "protect and conserve the coastal and marine ecosystems of the archipelago and its biological diversity for the benefit of humanity, the local population, science and education". The objectives of GMR marine zoning plan is to "(1) contribute to the sustainability of Galapagos fisheries by providing potential areas from which fishery stocks can recover and spill-over over fishing ground; (2) reduce conflicts among users as a result of incompatible demands for ocean space (e.g., tourism vs. fishing; small-scale vs. large-scale fishing); and (3) mitigate the impact of uses on sensitive ecological areas of the archipelago, which are critical to the functioning of marine ecosystems and the conservation of threatened species" (Castrejon and Charles, 2013).	Tourism has always been an integral sector for Galapagos economy, providing 1 out of every three jobs (Goldstein et al., 2016). In 2014, tourism generated \$258 million in revenue for GMR and attracting over 215,000 visitors (Goldstein et al. 2016). While tourism employ 40% of Galapagos population, artisanal fishing support 5% of residents. The lobster fishery is the most important commercial species to fishers in Galapagos, generating \$1.77 million in revenue in 2014. Since the collapse of the sea cucumber fishery, fishers have been focussing in the whitefish fishery (wahoo, tuna, and swordfish) but revenue estimates have been difficult to quantify since data is limited (Goldstein, 2016).	In 2000 to 2001, surveys were conducted to obtain ecological baseline data. Results indicated "(1) the mean sea cucumber density in the western sector of Galapagos, the most productive sector of this species, was three times higher in zones open to fishing; (2) in comparison with conservation zones; (2) the mean density of spiny lobster and Galapagos grouper was not different between management zones; (3) the mean shark density was five times higher in tourism zones in comparison with conservation and fishing zones" (Edgar et al., 2008 in Castrejon and Charles, 2013). These results were the basis for finalizing a zoning design for GMR and the development of a long-term ecological subtidal monitoring program (Castrejon and Charles, 2013).
Georges Bank MPAs (United States)	22000	1994	These five MPA's were established progressively in 1994, 1996 and 1998 in areas heavily fished by trawlers for groundfish. Georges Bank uses year-round closures for ground fish protection and excludes all gear that could catch groundfish. However, the MPAs are open to gear such as lobster traps, midwater trawls and limited dredge fishing. The MPAs include Closed Areas 1, Closed Areas II, Nantucket Lightship, Western Gulf of Maine closure and an area in the central part of the Gulf of Maine. After these closures, fishers had to report catch and effort of the groundfish species (Muraswski et al., 2015).	National Marine Fisheries Association; National Marine Fisheries Service; Commerce Department (www.csmonitor.com).	New England's fishers (appr. 20,000) (www.csmonitor.com).	The objectives of the year round closures were to protect and recuperate overfished groundfish resources. In addition, seasonal closures were implemented in the Gulf of Maine and Georges Bank to reduce mortality of the groundfish stocks. The objectives of the seasonal closures are to "limit exploitation on populations of Atlantic cod, Gadus morhua, and harbour porpoise, Phocoena phocoena, which are taken as bycatch in demersal gillnet fisheries in the Gulf of Maine" (Muraswski et al., 2015).	In the first years of implementation the Northeast Multispecies Sector Program, the National Marine Fisheries Service spent \$47.2 million on the program. By 2013, it was declared as a commercial fishery failure (http://www.catchshareindicators.org). Muraswski et al., 2005 noted that fishing effort closer to the boundaries of the MPA resulted in an average of \$470 h ⁻¹ (per fishing hour) within proximity 0 to 3 Km to closure and \$273 h ⁻¹ (per fishing hour) at greater distance from closure.	The all-year round closures significantly replenished the scallop stock after 5 years (Gell and Roberts, 2002). However, when the regulations were initially implemented to protect the groundfish fisheries, it interfered with fishers' ability to reach TAC for species. In Georges Bank, between 2006 and 2009, fishers caught 6% of their 322 thousand metric ton of GB haddock. In 2009, the Northeast Multispecies Sector Program was implemented, reducing harvest limits of key species in the Northeast groundfish fishery (http://www.catchshareindicators.org). Link et al., 2015 reports groundfish

Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary (United States)	9515	1990	<p>Planning for the sanctuary and the reserve took place over a number of years, with the designation of the sanctuary predating the first management plan by seven years. Prior management of fisheries in particular were largely managed in open access, which had led to the overcapitalization of the numerous and diverse fisheries throughout the Keys (NOAA 1996). In 1997 around 5% of the sanctuary was designated as larger Replenishment Reserves and multiple small Sanctuary Preservation Areas where there was no take permitted. The reserve system was also supplemented by other fisheries management techniques, like efforts to reduce lobster traps in the area by 50%, in an attempt to address the overcapitalization and increase the efficiency of fisheries (Harper 1995). In the planning process the cost of managing reserve areas was estimated to be \$1.65 million annually (NOAA 1996, Appendix M). When predicting costs to fishermen, planning documents state that fishermen may incur relocation costs and would be negatively impacted in the short term, but didn't believe these negative impacts would be sustained and significant long term (NOAA 1996, Appendix M).</p>	Federal government, NOAA, Environmental NGOs	Commercial and recreational fishers	<p>The primary objective of the National Marine Sanctuaries is resource protection. After years of declines in sensitive habitats, outbreaks of coral disease, and three major ship groundings in the keys, one of the specific goals of the reserves was to curb habitat loss and degradation within the sanctuary (NOAA 1996). Making sure management strategies allow for economic use that is sustainable is another stated objective of the sanctuary and reserves but is clearly marked as a secondary goal.</p>	<p>In the two years following implementation of no-take zones, the majority of commercial fishermen reported no change in landings, effort, or income (Dobrzynski and Nicholson 2000). Both commercial and charter fishermen believed they had to spend more time on the water to catch their desired level of fish, and attributed this change to the network of reserves. In the two years after creating no-take reserves the displaced commercial fishermen's net earnings grew at rates similar or slightly higher than fishermen who did previously fish in the reserves, contradicting claims that displacement would cost fishermen in the short term (Leeworthy 2001). It is important to note that these short term trends came in the wake of Hurricane George, which may overstate the growth in net earnings, and also coincided with a lobster trap removal program that had demonstrated its ability to increase CPUE. These caveats are important, but would likely impact fishermen that were displaced and were not displaced similarly.</p>	<p>There was no significant difference in species richness between areas inside and outside of the no-take areas (Ault et al. 2006a). Trends in abundance varied by species, with four of eight targeted species either decreasing or increasing significantly, with the remaining four species not changing significantly (Ault et al. 2006b). This may be because recovery is expected to take longer than the time that has passed with some estimates suggesting it may take decades to see significant impacts from reserves (Russ et al. 2004). Within the reserves though, there were no significant declines of species that are targeted by fishing outside of the reserves (Ault et al. 2007). There is also considerable environmental differences year to year and some uncertainty that is acknowledged when analyzing these coral reef ecosystems (Jeffrey et al. 2012).</p>
Sggann Kinghlas-Bowie Seamount (SK-B) MPA (Canada)	6000	2008	<p>The Sggann Kinghlas-Bowie (SK-B) Seamount MPA was planned as a partnership between the Canadian federal government and the Haida People. They designated 3 zones, with the most protected zone 1 consisting of only 44 km². Commercial fishing was allowed in zone 2 with similar restrictions to how the sable fishery was managed elsewhere (traps only). Recreational fishing was also permitted, as there is very little fishing in the area due to its distance from shore (180km). In planning documents regulators rejected status quo protection of the area because of the expected increase interest of commercial fishing, and the damage it could do.</p>	Haida Nation, World Wildlife Fund, Canadian Federal Government		<p>The SK-B MPA was established under Canada's Ocean Act. The stated goal in planning documents is to "conserve and protect the biodiversity and biological productivity of the area's marine ecosystem" (Science Advisory Report 36 2011). These goals were broad, and the planning documents justify a general approach to goal setting because of the diversity of the area represented in the MPA with seamounts spanning thousands of meters through the water column.</p>	<p>In planning documents, the predicted outcomes of the reserve counted preventing species loss, the international recognition for conservation efforts, and meeting the national goals of protecting a set percent of the ocean as expected benefits from protection. Costs for monitoring and research were expected to be between CAD \$200,000-360,000 annually (Regulatory Impact Analysis Statement 2008). Little empirical analysis has been performed on the economic impacts of designating the seamount as a preserve as fishing was not displaced, however recent legislation prohibiting bottom fishing gear in the reserve could impact the sablefish fishery in this area.</p>	<p>The protected areas have remained relatively stable, without increased pressure from fisheries. Concern over sablefish traps that drag along the bottom, negatively impacting sensitive benthic habitat, led to an agreement between the Haida Nation and Canadian government to close the previously fished Zone 2 to fishing of any kind where gear touches the bottom (Haida Nation 2018).</p>