

Bunnefeld N, Hoshino E & Milner-Gulland EJ (2011)
Management strategy evaluation: a powerful tool for
conservation? (Opinion), *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 26
(9), pp. 441-447.

This is the peer reviewed version of this article

NOTICE: this is the author's version of a work that was accepted for publication in Trends in Ecology and Evolution. Changes resulting from the publishing process, such as peer review, editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms may not be reflected in this document. Changes may have been made to this work since it was submitted for publication. A definitive version was subsequently published in Trends in Ecology and Evolution, [VOL 246 ISS 9 (2011)] DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2011.05.003>

1 **Management Strategy Evaluation: A powerful tool for conservation?**

2 Nils Bunnefeld¹, Eriko Hoshino^{1,2}, Eleanor J. Milner-Gulland¹

3 ¹Department of Life Sciences, Imperial College London, Silwood Park, Buckhurst Road,
4 Ascot, SL5 7PY, UK

5 ²School of Economics and Finance, University of Tasmania, Private Bag 85, Hobart, TAS
6 7001, Australia

7 Corresponding author: Bunnefeld, N. (n.bunnefeld06@imperial.ac.uk)

8

9 **The poor management of natural resources has led in many cases to population decline**
10 **and extirpation. Recent advances in fisheries science have the potential to revolutionize**
11 **management of harvested stocks by evaluating management scenarios in a virtual**
12 **world, by including stakeholders, and by assessing its robustness to uncertainty. These**
13 **advances have been synthesized into a framework, Management Strategy Evaluation**
14 **(MSE), which has hitherto not been used in terrestrial conservation. We review the**
15 **potential of MSE to transform terrestrial conservation, emphasizing that the behavior**
16 **of individual harvesters must be included since harvester compliance with management**
17 **rules has been a major challenge in conservation. Incorporating resource user decision-**
18 **making required to make MSEs relevant to terrestrial conservation will also advance**
19 **fisheries science.**

20

21 **Management of natural resources**

22 The management of natural resources is a complex process driven by interactions between
23 the dynamics of the natural system, the decision-making and behavior of stakeholders and
24 uncertainty at various levels of the management process and the natural system. Traditional
25 forms of natural resource management, such as fixed harvest quotas, do not respond to

1 system dynamics and uncertainty and so are prone to failure [1, 2]. The realization of the
2 importance of learning about the dynamics of the system led to adaptive management [1], in
3 which monitoring of the system allows updating of managers' models of system dynamics,
4 which then produces alterations in the harvest in an iterative process. Adaptive harvest
5 management (AHM) has been successfully applied to ducks, mule deer and sandhill cranes in
6 the USA [3-6].

7
8 Despite the advances made by AHM, harvest management models still do not explicitly
9 incorporate the social processes underlying harvester behavior, and are based on the use of a
10 "best" management solution to achieve a single objective given the current best knowledge.
11 Where the system is relatively simple and harvesters abide by rules, such as in some
12 recreational hunts in the developed world, this may not be problematic. However, in complex
13 systems, with multiple stakeholders and severe uncertainties, it is generally difficult to
14 provide a single best harvest policy [7]. Instead, there is a need to find robust approaches that
15 meet management objectives under a range of potential states of the world [8]. One approach
16 that aims to do this has gained considerable ground within fisheries science, Management
17 strategy evaluation (MSE), uses simulation models within an adaptive framework that
18 enables the comparison of alternative strategies in a virtual world under multiple and often
19 conflicting objectives [9]. In this paper we argue that MSE is a potentially valuable tool for
20 terrestrial conservation if the framework is expanded to include individual harvester decision
21 making.

22
23 MSE, in common with adaptive management more generally, has four major advantages over
24 standard approaches to providing management advice: (i) *It allows experimentation with a*
25 *range of possible management procedures under a range of circumstances.* Real world

1 experimentation is highly desirable in order to disentangle the drivers of a system, but is
2 difficult to pursue for the majority of natural resources because of the dependence of
3 individuals and firms on resources for their livelihoods and the spatial extent of the systems.
4 In conservation, real world experimentation poses ethical dilemmas: local people often
5 depend on ecosystem services for subsistence, while endangered species may face extinction.
6 *(ii) Stakeholders can be directly involved in the development of the management scenarios*
7 *and the evaluation of the metrics by which the performance of different management options*
8 *is assessed. A key feature of the MSE approach is that an optimal strategy or solution is not*
9 *pursued, but instead policies are sought that are feasible, robust to uncertainty and provide*
10 *adequate management performance with respect to multiple criteria [9, 10]. This allows for*
11 *more transparency in the management process and promotes stakeholder acceptance and*
12 *support. (iii) MSE enables researchers and managers to examine the implications of various*
13 *forms of uncertainty, including process, measurement and structural uncertainty, on the*
14 *performance of different management options. (iv) MSE carries out prospective rather than*
15 *retrospective evaluations of the performance of different management procedures under a*
16 *range of circumstances. By comparing the performance of a range of alternative strategies*
17 *under plausible scenarios upfront, the response of the system can be compared to the desired*
18 *goals and evaluated in advance of implementation (Box 1) [11].*

19
20 In this paper we start with an explanation how MSE works (Figure 1). We pay special
21 attention to the improvements in management of a real fishery system that MSE has enabled,
22 illustrated with a case study (Box 1). We then outline the role of individual harvester
23 decision-making and socio-economic drivers on management effectiveness, and argue that
24 there is a need to explicitly include this in order to develop the MSE approach further, both
25 for fisheries and for terrestrial conservation. We show how MSE can be applied to terrestrial

1 conservation using two case studies, brown bear *Ursus arctos* hunting in Slovenia and
2 Croatia and bushmeat hunting in the Serengeti (Box 2). Finally, we conclude that explicitly
3 including harvester decision-making in the MSE approach increases its realism and opens
4 new horizons to improve the sustainability of harvesting for exploited species.

5

6 **How management strategy evaluation works**

7 The MSE approach is based upon a set of models of the “true” population dynamics of the
8 species (called “operating model”; Figure 1, Glossary). The operating model aims at
9 capturing the key processes in the dynamics of the fish population given the best ecological
10 knowledge available and can be thought of as a minimum realistic model [12].

11

12 The next step in the MSE is to simulate the process of monitoring the stock, resulting in
13 simulated measurements such as biomass or number of individuals. Information from
14 monitoring is always imperfect as it is impossible to detect every single individual or cover
15 the entire area of interest. Monitoring is represented by the “observation model”, whereby the
16 statistical features of the collection of relevant data are simulated, including both error and
17 bias.

18

19 The observation data are then passed to the “management model”. The management model
20 encompasses the harvest control rule (HCR) but may also contain an implementation error
21 component. The HCR can be either model based, which includes an assessment of resource
22 status, or an empirical algorithm. The HCR may reference biological or socioeconomic
23 reference points to produce management actions in the form of a harvest or effort level,
24 changes in gear or spatial and temporal restrictions. Management actions are rarely
25 implemented without error. This error can come from two main sources: (i) resource users do

1 not comply with the regulations, and (ii) the individual dynamics of resource users (e.g. when
2 and where harvest is taken) are not accounted for in the HCR. Neither source of
3 implementation error is generally modeled based on human decision-making in standard
4 MSEs, instead implementation is simulated as a probability distribution around the HCR [13,
5 14]. The full system model therefore contains the operating model (biological “truth”), the
6 observation model, the management model, by which the HCR feeds back into the resource
7 operating model as the model updates to the next time-step (Figure 1).

8
9 By evaluating a range of HCRs against a set of plausible operating models, using multiple
10 performance metrics, MSE enables fisheries scientists to give resource managers advice on
11 robust management procedures (see Glossary), and on the trade-offs involved with each
12 procedure. The learning process can be incorporated into (i) the assessment component of the
13 management procedure when new observations become available; or (ii) the decision process
14 based on a review of the performance of the management strategy. Together with modeling
15 tools such as sensitivity analysis, MSEs can evaluate which data and how much of it should
16 be collected and how often monitoring should be carried out to improve management
17 performance. Stakeholders can be involved at various points in the process of proposing and
18 evaluating different HCRs and assessment approaches. There is ample evidence from both
19 terrestrial conservation and fisheries that stakeholder involvement throughout the process of
20 resource management is key to compromise between stakeholders, acceptance of the rules
21 and hence the sustainability of resource use [15, 16].

22

23 **Uncertainty in natural resource management**

24 One of the main strengths of MSE is that it brings uncertainty to the centre-stage in the
25 modeling process. Uncertainty plays a fundamental role in the dynamics of ecological and

1 economic systems, in our measurement and understanding of these systems, and in the
2 devising and implementation of rules to control harvesting. Various classifications exist, and
3 we use that of Milner-Gulland and Rowcliffe [17]: Process uncertainty comes from the
4 variation in the system itself (e.g. weather affecting demographic rates). Measurement
5 (observation) uncertainty occurs in any process of collecting field data and might be due to
6 crude devices or mistakes during measurement. These two forms of uncertainty combine to
7 form parameter uncertainty. Structural uncertainty, also called model uncertainty, has
8 received increased attention in modeling natural resources and represents our lack of
9 understanding of the dynamics of the system [18]. For example, implications of structural
10 uncertainty on whale stocks was examined extensively by the International Whaling
11 Commission [19] and whether hunting mortality is additive or compensatory was
12 incorporated in ducks in the USA [3]. Representing structural uncertainty is generally
13 difficult because a model representing the real system according to our perceptions is only
14 one possible way in which the system could function. Implementation uncertainty surrounds
15 the translation of policy into practice, and has been poorly covered in the natural resource
16 literature, as its causes lie within social science; one example is institutional inertia, another is
17 non-compliance with rules. Because MSE models the entire resource management system,
18 rather than just the resource stock dynamics, it can incorporate all these types of uncertainty
19 and quantify their relative importance.

20

21 **Future directions for natural resource management**

22 *Including the wider ecosystem*

23 Most applications of the MSE approach to date have focused on harvest strategies for target
24 species. The indirect effects of harvesting on the ecosystem are still rarely incorporated into
25 MSEs, but this is changing as fisheries science increasingly takes an ecosystems approach

1 (e.g. Atlantis model for south-eastern Australia [20, 21]). Multi-species population models
2 and effects on the wider ecosystem have recently been included in an MSE for a prawn
3 fishery in Australia [22, 23]. Similarly, MSEs are now being used to evaluate strategies for
4 limiting bycatch [11] including cetaceans [24].

5

6 *More realistic economics*

7 Economically-based management has been demonstrated to be better both in terms of the
8 sustainability of the stock and the profitability of fishing [25]. However, many fisheries
9 management plans are still based on outdated concepts of Maximum Sustainable Yield [26].
10 Although more effort is now being directed towards including economics explicitly into
11 MSEs [27, 28], the development of approaches that allow MSEs to incorporate broader social
12 and economic objectives remains an important and urgent area for future research [8]. One
13 fundamental constraint is the lack of reliable economic data, particularly cost data, as the
14 fishing industry is not always willing to release their financial information. Further
15 institutional effort is required to establish a mechanism to collect reliable cost data, such as
16 through strengthening stakeholder involvement and industry collaboration in developing
17 management objectives.

18

19 *Realistic representation of implementation*

20 Hunting and fishing are crucial contributors to people's livelihoods in many parts of the
21 world. Management often works against the short term economic interests of those who
22 depend on resources by decreasing the harvest or closing areas to protect its natural
23 resources. Given the vast areas involved and budgetary constraints, enforcement is generally
24 poor and attempts to control resource use are therefore often ineffectual. The assumption in
25 the vast majority of MSEs that rules are implemented either directly or with simple random

1 errors is clearly inadequate. Instead, rules affect the resource population indirectly, via the
2 decisions of resource users. Research into factors affecting compliance with conservation
3 rules is starting to blossom [29-31].

4

5 In commercial fisheries, non-compliance and deviations from set quotas are due to the
6 economic incentives faced by individual fishers; their knowledge of current and past stock
7 status and its spatial distribution have recently been included in MSE models [22, 23, 32, 33].
8 Furthermore, models on the line fishery of the Great Barrier Reef include how individual
9 fishers select reefs, infringe into marine protected areas, and communicate information
10 amongst each other [34, 35].

11

12 Subsistence or artisanal harvesters operate at the household, rather than the firm level. This
13 means that rather than maximizing profit, the harvester aims to maximize household utility
14 (“satisfaction” or “happiness”). Utility is maximized based upon household consumption of a
15 range of goods, met from production and sale of products derived from livelihood activities
16 such as agriculture, bushmeat hunting or aboriginal subsistence whaling [36, 37]. Models of
17 household utility could be incorporated into an MSE as part of the operating model,
18 representing the “true” state of the harvester component of the system [37-39] (Figure 1). The
19 harvester operating model mediates the effect of management rules on the resource stock, and
20 can also be observed, with uncertainty, by the manager.

21

22 This enhanced framework allows the inclusion of a wider range of management objectives
23 and performance metrics than standard MSEs; not just the maximization of biological or
24 economic yield and minimization of the risk of population reduction below a threshold, but
25 also maximizing household utility [40]. The welfare of resource users is of key importance in

1 current conservation thinking, which focuses on the importance of considering human
2 welfare, securing ecosystem service provision and integrating conservation and development.

3

4 *Trade-offs in model complexity*

5 With further advancement of knowledge on ecosystems and species interactions and faster
6 computing power, there is a tendency to increase model complexity. Simple HCRs based on
7 empirical data and threshold rules make management more transparent, faster and less
8 technically challenging to implement and should be integrated within model-based
9 assessments that may more accurately reflect resource stock dynamics [41]. Improving the
10 apparent realism of the management procedure through more complex model structure may
11 not necessarily improve performance [42]. The operating models used in the testing process
12 need to include as much complexity as necessary to adequately capture key dynamics of the
13 system [43]. Including harvest behavior is a key factor in many natural systems and by
14 including this explicitly progress may be made more rapid than by increasing the complexity
15 of the resource operating model. However, performance statistics based on harvester utility
16 should be simple and transparent to ensure stakeholders engagement and understanding.

17

18 *Technical challenges to MSE application*

19 If MSEs are to become widely applied outside fisheries, technical capacity building is
20 required, and theory and models need to become more accessible to less quantitatively
21 orientated researchers. Collaborative software development projects have started to make
22 MSE models more widely available [44], but the inclusion of a harvester operating model
23 would add further difficulty, as these models come from another discipline. Collaboration
24 between natural scientists, economists and sociologists is required to overcome these
25 disciplinary barriers. A freely available suite of methods in the R statistical language, FLR

1 (Fisheries Library in R [44]), already exists. FLR has a wide array of MSE examples across a
2 range of fishery systems and could be adapted to meet the needs of the wider resource
3 management community.

4

5 *Strengthening links to active adaptive management*

6 Active adaptive management (AAM) is a subset of AHM in which managers set out
7 deliberately to learn from the system through experiments and monitoring in a real-world
8 system [45, 46]. By contrast, in MSE learning is carried out in a virtual world. Since the
9 formulation of the AAM framework, many studies have suggested it could be useful, but
10 seldom have researchers and stakeholders actually implemented the complete framework
11 [47]. Integration of periodic MSEs into the AAM cycle could give added impetus to both,
12 given the great success of the MSE approach in real-life fisheries management [11], and this
13 is already happening in an ad hoc manner in many fisheries.

14

15 *Limitations of MSE*

16 The management of natural resources is plagued by uncertainty and feedbacks between the
17 dynamics of resources and users. Although MSE goes some way towards addressing these
18 difficulties, it has been criticized for: (i) having a longer development time, and thus
19 increased costs, than traditional methods such as reference-based off-take rules; (ii) an
20 upfront MSE can provide an overly rigid framework without room for decision makers to
21 change management in an adaptive way; and (iii) poor data inputs, such as gaps in monitoring
22 or extremely low estimates of uncertainty, impact the performance of MSE, which needs to
23 be recognized and explored within the MSE process [48-50]. These criticisms point to the
24 need for an iterative process of monitoring, learning and adaptation, which is entirely in

1 keeping with the MSE approach if practitioners are prepared to engage with the issues being
2 raised.

3

4 There are barriers to the implementation of MSE in terrestrial conservation, and it is not
5 appropriate to every situation. Hockley *et al.* [51] show that the effort and costs involved in
6 monitoring crayfish trends are too high for the development of a locally-based monitoring
7 system to be worthwhile which implies the need for more precautionary and risk averse
8 management. Monitoring must have the potential to inform interventions aimed at changing
9 the behavior of resource users (whether these are direct HCRs or other approaches such as
10 alternative livelihoods). If the links in the chain in Figure 1 are non-existent, then a MSE is
11 not feasible; for example in some natural resource user systems, monitoring needed for the
12 observation model or a manager might be missing. In some systems harvesters might abide
13 by the rules set by managers and then a simpler framework would be more parsimonious.
14 Even in these cases, however, an MSE approach would be a useful tool for highlighting the
15 effects of uncertainty on management decision-making.

16

17 **Conclusions**

18 To date, the only application of a comparable approach to MSE outside fisheries has been by
19 Chee and Wintle [52], for management of over-abundant species. However, the MSE
20 approach has enormous potential for exploited resources that face competing objectives and
21 where harvester decision-making is an important consideration. The MSE approach is no
22 longer limited to top-down management of a single species by an all-powerful manager.
23 Work has already started to extend the MSE approach to more complex systems, to include
24 the ecosystem effects of harvest and to improve the economic realism of the models. Further
25 expansion of the approach to include explicit models of harvester decisions would

1 dramatically increase the applicability of the approach outside commercial fisheries.
2 However modeling complexity, particularly when models from different disciplines are
3 combined, comes at the cost of potential loss of transparency and the link to reality. Joint
4 efforts to develop tools to handle, visualize and communicate the models underlying MSEs
5 are ongoing [44], and need to be extended to encompass this wider agenda if the full potential
6 of MSE to improve management of natural resource use is to be realized.

7

8 **Box 1**

9 **Example of the successful use of MSE in fisheries**

10 The Southern and Eastern Scalefish and Shark Fishery (SESSF) in Australia is a complex
11 multi-species, multi-gear fishery with 34 stock units managed under a quota system as well as
12 restrictions on gear and input controls implemented based on expert judgment. Despite the
13 introduction of a quota system in 1992, a number of quota-managed species remained
14 overfished. In 2005 a comprehensive harvest strategies framework was introduced and
15 implemented into the SESSF. This framework is similar to a management procedure, where
16 the process of monitoring and assessment is included as well as explicit harvest control rules
17 [41], but at that time, the performance of candidate strategies had not yet been formally
18 evaluated through simulation prior to adoption (such as is done in MSE). Instead, the harvest
19 strategy framework was implemented based on expert judgment and prior experiences of
20 MSE and harvest strategies for other fisheries. The framework involves a “tiered” approach,
21 where 4 different harvest control rules are applied for stocks based on the information
22 available about the stocks and the levels of uncertainties involved in their stock assessments.
23 For example, a stock is classified as tier 1 if there is a “robust” quantitative assessment, and
24 tier 2 if it has a less certain or preliminary assessment. From 2006, a full MSE was
25 conducted, including formal evaluation of harvest strategies. In 2008, Smith et al. [11]

1 evaluated the lessons learnt from this fishery concerning the benefits of a harvest strategy
2 framework compared to conventional fisheries management. Since the introduction of the
3 framework in 2005, there has been an overall net decrease in the total quota level set for the
4 fishery, with concomitant conservation benefits, but also a more favorable response to
5 science-based policy recommendations from both industry and managers due to the well-
6 specified and adopted decision rules. This is testified to by the fact that the time and effort
7 taken to reach agreement on the total allowable catch (TAC) limits each year has significantly
8 reduced, from several weeks to less than two days. The general lessons learnt from this case
9 study include the importance of formally testing management options using MSE prior to
10 implementation, rather than post-hoc, the difficulty in defining rules to deal with bycatch
11 TACs for this multi-species and multi-fleet fishery, and the need for flexible and pragmatic
12 implementation by managers [11].

13

14 **Box 2**

15 **The potential for MSE in conservation**

16 A recent workshop highlighted examples where an MSE approach would shed new light on
17 the issues surrounding the management of harvested terrestrial systems [53]. The first
18 example considers the management of the brown bear (*Ursus arctos*) in Croatia and Slovenia
19 [54] (Figure 1 within Box 2). Traditionally, the brown bear was hunted as a trophy species in
20 both countries but since Slovenia entered the EU in 2004 the species is protected under EU
21 law. Slovenian bears are now culled to control population size. With their neighboring non-
22 EU country Croatia continuing to manage bears as a trophy species, two contrasting systems
23 are currently managing the same population. The MSE approach could contribute to a
24 cooperative approach between the two countries by demonstrating the potential benefits of a
25 joint monitoring and management decision framework. Collaborative monitoring could

1 potentially reduce uncertainty in the estimated total population size, allowing more informed
2 quota-setting. Furthermore, the incentives of hunters differ between the two countries based
3 on their hunting regimes. Finally, manager decision-making is strongly dependent on social
4 and political conditions in the two countries, and these social issues as well as hunter
5 decision-making need to be incorporated in the development of scenarios for the management
6 of this population.

7
8 The second example comes from bushmeat hunting in Tanzania which is in theory state-
9 controlled by licenses and quotas (Figure 2 within Box 2) [55, 56]. However, non-compliance
10 is high and hard to quantify because hunting is dispersed and heterogeneous both spatially
11 and temporally, and in terms of catch compositions. For the sustainable management of such
12 a system it is crucial to understand the incentives of local people who hunt. The current
13 management system faces high uncertainties due to a lack of governance and control, such
14 that the system is effectively open access hunting for an illegal good. There is also no benefit
15 distribution to act as an incentive not to hunt bushmeat. This case study is an excellent
16 example of a linked social-ecological system, where MSE could be used to explore feedbacks
17 between conservation incentives and livelihood decisions (Figure 1). Instead of focusing on
18 testing just the performance of HCRs, the MSE approach can be adapted to investigate the
19 effectiveness of a range of other conservation policies through their effects on hunter's
20 decision-making (for example providing alternative livelihoods or direct payments for
21 conservation services).

22

23 **Acknowledgements**

24 NB and EJMG were supported by the European Commission under the HUNT project of the
25 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development. Neither the

1 European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for
2 the use made of the information. The views expressed in this publication are the sole
3 responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European
4 Commission. EJMG also acknowledges the support of a Royal Society Wolfson Research
5 Merit award, and thanks Franck Courchamp and the Department of Ecology, Systematics and
6 Evolution at the Université Paris Sud for hosting EJMG during working on this paper. We
7 thank Justin Irvine, Emily Nicholson, Ana Nuno and Lynsey McInnes, Charles Edwards,
8 Julia Blanchard, Andre Punt and two anonymous referees for invaluable comments.

9

10 **Figure 1:** Flow diagram for the Management Strategy Evaluation framework comprising a
11 resource operating model (simulating the “true” population biology of the species), the
12 observation model to monitor the species (with error) and the management model, using the
13 perceived stock to create and implement the harvest control rules. In the extended model
14 (dotted line) the harvest control rule is fed into an additional harvester model which allows
15 for individual decision-making by harvesters. In this model, the harvester can also be
16 monitored through the observation model (dotted line).

17

18 **Glossary**

19 **Assessment model:** A mathematical model coupled to a statistical estimation process that
20 integrates data from a variety of sources to provide estimates of reference points and past and
21 present abundance, mortality, and productivity of a resource.

22 **Harvest control rule (HCR):** A set of well-defined rules used for determining management
23 actions in the form of a total allowable catch (*TAC*) or allowable effort.

24 **Harvest strategy:** Intended meaning may be synonymous with *MP*.

1 **Implementation model:** The process of application of the management action, including the
2 uncertainty involved in the process.

3 **Management model:** A model of the process of management, which encompasses the
4 harvest control rule (*HCR*) and may also contain implementation error.

5 **Management procedure (MP):** The process of using monitoring data and a formula or
6 model to generate *TAC* or effort control measure.

7 **Management strategy evaluation (MSE):** The process of testing the performance of generic
8 *MPs* or harvest strategies against predefined metrics such as mean and variance in yield.

9 **Management strategy:** Usually synonymous with *MP* but sometimes used to mean an *HCR*.

10 **Observation model:** The component of the *OM* that generates simulated monitoring data
11 from observation of the dynamics of the natural resource stock, for input into an *MP*.

12 **Operating model (OM):** A mathematical–statistical model used to describe the true state of
13 the system in terms of (i) the natural resource dynamics and (ii) the harvester behavior.

14 **Total allowable catch (TAC):** Catch limit to be taken from a resource within a specified
15 period.

16 **Utility:** Measure of relative satisfaction or happiness from consumptive and monetary goods
17 (e.g. amount of harvest) and non-monetary goods (e.g. leisure time, satisfaction from
18 recreational hunting).

19

20 **Figure 1 within Box 2**

21 Brown bear (*Ursus arctos*) management in Slovenia and Croatia as a case study in terrestrial
22 conservation where a Management Strategy Evaluation approach could give new insights.

23 Photo by Miha Krofel.

24

25

1 **Figure 2 within Box 2**

2 A case study for the potential of the Management Strategy Evaluation in conservation:
3 bushmeat hunting in Tanzania. Examples of species hunted for bushmeat: a) zebra (*Equus*
4 *quagga*); b) buffalo (*Syncerus caffer*), c) impala (*Aepyceros melampus*) and d) blue
5 wildebeest (*Connochaetes taurinus*) [57, 58].

6

7 **References**

- 8 1 Walters, C.J. and Hilborn, R. (1976) Adaptive control of fishing systems. *J Fish Res Board*
9 *Can* 33, 145-159
- 10 2 Packer, C., *et al.* (2009) Sport hunting, predator control and conservation of large
11 carnivores. *PLoS One* 4, e5941
- 12 3 Runge, M.C., *et al.* (2002) A revised protocol for the adaptive harvest management of mid-
13 continent mallards. In *U. S. Department of the Interior Technical report*, Fish and Wildlife
14 Service
- 15 4 Nichols, J.D., *et al.* (2007) Adaptive harvest management of North American waterfowl
16 populations: a brief history and future prospects. *J Ornithol* 148, S343-S349
- 17 5 Kendall, W.L. and Drewien, R.C. (2001) Models for the adaptive harvest management of
18 Rocky Mountain sandhill cranes: problems and potential In *Proceedings of the Eighth North*
19 *American Crane Workshop*, pp. 217
- 20 6 Mason, R., *et al.* (2006) A case for standardized ungulate surveys and data management in
21 the western United States. *Wildlife Soc B* 34, 1238-1242
- 22 7 Nicholson, E. and Possingham, H.P. (2007) Making conservation decisions under
23 uncertainty for the persistence of multiple species. *Ecol Appl* 17, 251-265
- 24 8 Mapstone, B.D., *et al.* (2008) Management strategy evaluation for line fishing in the Great
25 Barrier Reef: Balancing conservation and multi-sector fishery objectives. *Fish Res* 94, 315-
26 329
- 27 9 Smith, A.D.M., *et al.* (1999) Implementing effective fisheries-management systems -
28 management strategy evaluation and the Australian partnership approach. *Ices J Mar Sci* 56,
29 967-979
- 30 10 Cooke, J.G. (1999) Improvement of fishery-management advice through simulation
31 testing of harvest algorithms. *Ices J Mar Sci* 56, 797-810
- 32 11 Smith, A.D.M., *et al.* (2008) Experience in implementing harvest strategies in Australia's
33 south-eastern fisheries. *Fish Res* 94, 373-379
- 34 12 Punt, A.E. and Butterworth, D.S. (1995) The effects of future consumption by the Cape
35 fur seal on catches and catch rates of the cape hakes. 4. Modelling the biological interaction
36 between Cape fur seals *Arctocephalus pusillus pusillus* and the cape hakes *Merluccius*
37 *capensis* and *M-paradoxus*. *S Afr J Marine Sci* 16, 255-285
- 38 13 Needle, C.L. (2008) Management strategy evaluation for North Sea haddock. *Fish Res* 94,
39 141-150
- 40 14 Fulton, E.A., *et al.* (2011) Human behaviour: the key source of uncertainty in fisheries
41 management. *Fish Fish* 12, 2-17

1 15 Cochrane, K.L., *et al.* (1998) Management procedures in a fishery based on highly
2 variable stocks and with conflicting objectives: Experiences in the South African pelagic
3 fishery. *Rev Fish Biol Fisher* 8, 177-214
4 16 Waylen, K.A., *et al.* (2010) Effect of local cultural context on the success of community-
5 based conservation interventions. *Conserv Biol* 24, 1119-1129
6 17 Milner-Gulland, E.J. and Rowcliffe, M.J. (2007) *Wildlife Conservation and Sustainable*
7 *Use: A handbook of techniques*. Oxford University Press
8 18 Hill, S.L., *et al.* (2007) Model uncertainty in the ecosystem approach to fisheries. *Fish*
9 *Fish* 8, 315-336
10 19 IWC (2010) The Annual Report of the International Whaling Commission The
11 International Whaling Commission
12 20 Fulton, E.A., *et al.* (2004) Biogeochemical marine ecosystem models I: IGBEM - a model
13 of marine bay ecosystems. *Ecol Model* 174, 267-307
14 21 Smith, A.D.M., *et al.* (2007) Scientific tools to support the practical implementation of
15 ecosystem-based fisheries management. *Ices J Mar Sci* 64, 633-639
16 22 Dichmont, C.M., *et al.* (2008) Beyond biological performance measures in management
17 strategy evaluation: Bringing in economics and the effects of trawling on the benthos. *Fish*
18 *Res* 94, 238-250
19 23 Dichmont, C.M., *et al.* (2010) On implementing maximum economic yield in commercial
20 fisheries. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* 107, 16-21
21 24 Punt, A.E. and Donovan, G.P. (2007) Developing management procedures that are robust
22 to uncertainty: lessons from the International Whaling Commission. *Ices J Mar Sci* 64, 603-
23 612
24 25 Grafton, R.Q., *et al.* (2007) Economics of overexploitation revisited. *Science* 318, 1601-
25 1601
26 26 EU (2006) Implementing sustainability in EU fisheries through maximum sustainable
27 yield In *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament*
28 *COM 360*, Commission of the European Communities
29 27 Maravelias, C.D., *et al.* (2010) Stochastic bioeconomic modelling of alternative
30 management measures for anchovy in the Mediterranean Sea. *Ices J Mar Sci* 67, 1291-1300
31 28 Hoshino, E., *et al.* (2010) Economically optimal management strategies for the South
32 Georgia Patagonian Toothfish Fishery. *Mar Resour Econ* 25, 265-280
33 29 Keane, A., *et al.* (2008) The sleeping policeman: understanding issues of enforcement and
34 compliance in conservation. *Anim Conserv* 11, 75-82
35 30 John, F.A.V.S., *et al.* (2010) Testing novel methods for assessing rule breaking in
36 conservation. *Biol Conserv* 143, 1025-1030
37 31 Gavin, M.C., *et al.* (2010) Measuring and monitoring illegal use of natural resources.
38 *Conserv Biol* 24, 89-100
39 32 Agnew, D.J., *et al.* (2009) Estimating the worldwide extent of illegal fishing. *PLoS One* 4
40 33 van Oostenbrugge, H.J.A.E., *et al.* (2008) Linking catchability and fisher behaviour under
41 effort management. *Aquat Living Resour* 21, 265-273
42 34 Little, L.R., *et al.* (2005) Effects of size and fragmentation of marine reserves and fisher
43 infringement on the catch and biomass of coral trout, *Plectropomus leopardus*, on the Great
44 Barrier Reef, Australia. *Fisheries Manag Ecol* 12, 177-188
45 35 Little, L.R., *et al.* (2009) An agent-based model for simulating trading of multi-species
46 fisheries quota. *Ecol Model* 220, 3404-3412
47 36 Tillman, M.F. (2008) The International Management of Aboriginal Whaling. *Rev Fish Sci*
48 16, 437-444

1 37 Barrett, C.B. and Arcese, P. (1998) Wildlife harvest in integrated conservation and
2 development projects: Linking harvest to household demand, agricultural production, and
3 environmental shocks in the Serengeti. *Land Econ* 74, 449-465

4 38 Damania, R., *et al.* (2005) A bioeconomic analysis of bushmeat hunting. *P Roy Soc B-Biol*
5 *Sci* 272, 259-266

6 39 Winkler, R. Why do ICDPs fail?: The relationship between agriculture, hunting and
7 ecotourism in wildlife conservation. *Resource and Energy Economics*

8 40 Milner-Gulland, E.J. (2011) Integrating fisheries approaches and household utility models
9 for improved resource management. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* 108, 1741-1746

10 41 Rademeyer, R.A., *et al.* (2007) Tips and tricks in designing management procedures. *Ices*
11 *J Mar Sci* 64, 618-625

12 42 Walters, C.J. (1985) Bias in the estimation of functional relationships from time-series
13 data. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci* 42, 147-149

14 43 Fulton, E.A., *et al.* (2004) Biogeochemical marine ecosystem models II: the effect of
15 physiological detail on model performance. *Ecol Model* 173, 371-406

16 44 Kell, L.T., *et al.* (2007) FLR: an open-source framework for the evaluation and
17 development of management strategies. *Ices J Mar Sci* 64, 640-646

18 45 Sainsbury, K.J., *et al.* (2000) Design of operational management strategies for achieving
19 fishery ecosystem objectives. *Ices J Mar Sci* 57, 731-741

20 46 Hauser, C.E. and Possingham, H.P. (2008) Experimental or precautionary? Adaptive
21 management over a range of time horizons. *J Appl Ecol* 45, 72-81

22 47 Walters, C.J. (2007) Is adaptive management helping to solve fisheries problems? *Ambio*
23 36, 304-307

24 48 Butterworth, D.S. (2007) Why a management procedure approach? Some positives and
25 negatives. *Ices J Mar Sci* 64, 613-617

26 49 Rochet, M.J. and Rice, J.C. (2009) Simulation-based management strategy evaluation:
27 ignorance disguised as mathematics? *Ices J Mar Sci* 66, 754-762

28 50 Butterworth, D.S., *et al.* (2010) Purported flaws in management strategy evaluation: basic
29 problems or misinterpretations? *Ices J Mar Sci* 67, 567-574

30 51 Hockley, N.J., *et al.* (2005) When should communities and conservationists monitor
31 exploited resources? *Biodivers Conserv* 14, 2795-2806

32 52 Chee, Y.E. and Wintle, B.A. (2010) Linking modelling, monitoring and management: an
33 integrated approach to controlling overabundant wildlife. *J Appl Ecol* 47, 1169-1178

34 53 Milner-Gulland, E.J., *et al.* (2010) New directions in management strategy evaluation
35 through cross-fertilization between fisheries science and terrestrial conservation. *Biol Letters*
36 6, 719-722

37 54 Zedrosser, A., *et al.* (2001) Status and management of the brown bear in Europe. *Ursus*
38 12, 9-20

39 55 Loibooki, M., *et al.* (2002) Bushmeat hunting by communities adjacent to the Serengeti
40 National Park, Tanzania: the importance of livestock ownership and alternative sources of
41 protein and income. *Environmental Conservation* 29, 391-398

42 56 Sinclair, A.R.E. (2008) Historical and future changes to the Serengeti ecosystem. In
43 *Serengeti III: Human Impacts on Ecosystem Dynamics* (Sinclair, A.R.E. and Packer, C., eds),
44 pp. 7-46, University of Chicago Press

45 57 Metzger, K.L., *et al.* (2010) Evaluating the protection of wildlife in parks: the case of
46 African buffalo in Serengeti. *Biodivers Conserv* 19, 3431-3444

47 58 Campbell, K. and Hofer, H. (1995) People and wildlife: spatial dynamics and zones of
48 interaction. In *Serengeti II: dynamics, management, and conservation of an ecosystem*
49 (Sinclair, A.R.E. and Arcese, P., eds), pp. 534-570, Chicago University Press

50