



**Manchester
Metropolitan
University**

Canty, SWJ and Preziosi, RF and Rowntree, JK (2018) *Dichotomy of mangrove management: A review of research and policy in the Mesoamerican reef region*. *Ocean and Coastal Management*, 157. pp. 40-49. ISSN 0964-5691

Downloaded from: <http://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/620475/>

Publisher: Elsevier

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2018.02.011>

Usage rights: Creative Commons: Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0

Please cite the published version

<https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk>

1 Dichotomy of mangrove management: A review of research and policy in the
2 Mesoamerican reef region.

3 Steven W. J. Canty ^{a,b}, Preziosi Richard F.^b, Rowntree, Jennifer ^b

4 ^a Smithsonian Marine Station, Marine Conservation Program, 701 Seaway Drive, Fort
5 Pierce, Florida 34949, USA

6 ^b Manchester Metropolitan University, School of Science and the Environment, John
7 Dalton East, Manchester M1 5GD, UK.

8 **Abstract**

9 Mangroves are declining globally at faster rates than tropical forests and coral reefs,
10 with primary threats including, aquaculture, agriculture and climate change. Mangroves
11 provide ecosystem services to coastal communities of Mexico, Belize, Guatemala and
12 Honduras, which comprise the Mesoamerican Reef (MAR) ecoregion. Over the past two
13 decades mangroves within the MAR have declined. Current estimates of mangrove
14 cover in the region suggest that mangroves cover 239,176 ha of the MAR, equivalent to
15 1.7% of the world's mangroves. Concerted efforts to manage, conserve and protect
16 mangrove forest are apparent in all four countries. Comprehensive laws that prohibit the
17 cutting and clearing of mangroves have been implemented in Mexico, Guatemala and
18 Honduras. Belize has a permitting system to regulate mangrove alterations. In addition,
19 a total of seven international and regional agreements have been ratified. Across the
20 ecoregion, forty-three protected areas have been designated that contain mangroves,
21 providing protection to 111,396 ha of mangroves (47% of the total). However, our
22 findings suggest a lack of transparency in the governance framework, a disconnect
23 between management and research, and geopolitical differences have all played a role

24 in reducing management efficacy. A key finding of our study reveals a distinct division in
25 the perceived major threats to mangroves between Ramsar site managers and
26 researchers. Ramsar site managers identify anthropogenic disturbances as key threats,
27 while in contrast, the bulk of research focuses on natural disturbances. To promote the
28 inclusion of evidence-based research within mangrove management plans, greater
29 efforts to connect these important stakeholders are required.

30 **Keywords:** Mangroves, Management, Conservation, Research foci, Mesoamerica,
31 Threats.

32 **Introduction**

33 Mangroves are a diverse group of halophytic plant species, which form highly
34 productive forests in the area between mean sea level and the highest spring tide mark
35 along tropical and sub-tropical coastlines and estuaries (Tomlinson, 1994). Once
36 perceived as mosquito infested wastelands, mangroves have now been recognized as
37 highly productive and ecologically important ecosystems. Providing ecosystem services
38 to marine and terrestrial environments, and human societies (Gilman *et al.*, 2008;
39 Nagelkerken *et al.*, 2008), which are valued at US\$9,900–35,900 ha⁻¹yr⁻¹ (Costanza *et*
40 *al.*, 1997; Sathirithai and Barbier, 2001; Barbier, Hacker, Kennedy, Kock, Stier, 2011).
41 Some of the most important mangrove ecosystem services include: coastline protection
42 (in particular storm, hurricane and tsunami protection); waste water treatment;
43 production of extractable materials; and provision of cultural sites (Rönnbäck, Crona
44 and Ingwall, 2007; Warren-Rhodes *et al.*, 2011). Despite the known value of these
45 forests, mangroves are highly threatened. Deforestation estimates suggest mangrove
46 cover has declined by 30-86% since the mid 1990's (Duke *et al.*, 2007), and mangroves

47 continue to decline globally at unprecedented rates (FAO, 2007). Globally the main
48 threats to mangrove forests include: coastal development; logging for timber and fuel;
49 aquaculture; salt extraction; and agriculture (Valiela, Bowen and York, 2001; Alongi,
50 2002; Rönnbäck, Crona and Ingwall, 2007). The additional threats of climate change,
51 e.g. sea-level rise, are also of concern (Schaeffer-Novelli *et al.*, 2016; Short *et al.*,
52 2016). Understanding if or how mangroves can adapt to such changes is of particular
53 relevance to already threatened ecosystems, e.g. in the Caribbean (Godoy and De
54 Lacerda, 2015; Sasmito *et al.*, 2016).

55 The majority (over 70%) of mangroves are located within developing countries (Giri *et*
56 *al.*, 2011), where limited resources and capacity can inhibit effective management. At
57 the international level, a number of treaties and conventions afford some protection to
58 mangroves (Macintosh and Ashton, 2002), for example: the Ramsar Convention (1974);
59 the Cartagena Convention (1983); and the International Tropical Timber Agreement
60 (2011). However, few of these treaties provide any effective legal protection and none of
61 them address the conservation, preservation, or management of a particular mangrove
62 species (Polidoro *et al.*, 2010). National legislation pertaining to mangrove management
63 in the 1960's was primarily focused on mangrove exploitation (Carter, Schmidt and
64 Hirons, 2015). However, over the past five decades management has progressed and
65 has led to the integration of mangroves into coastal zone management plans (Carter,
66 Schmidt and Hirons, 2015).

67 Common tools for the preservation and management of mangrove and other marine
68 ecosystems include: marine protected areas (MPA's); nature reserves; wilderness
69 areas; national monuments and national parks. Since 1974, increasing protection has

70 been provided through Ramsar site designation. To date, 281 Ramsar sites (12.5% of
71 all Ramsar sites) are intertidal forested wetlands, which includes mangrove forests
72 (www.ramsar.org). Although increased recognition of mangroves in management plans
73 is encouraging, the majority of plans associated with MPA's and Ramsar sites are
74 based on generalized characteristics and threats, with limited reference to prior
75 scientific research. In fact, there appears to be no effective mechanism for creating links
76 between management activities for, and scientific research on, mangroves, thus
77 research is rarely incorporated into management plans. Similar observations have been
78 made in the management of coral reef ecosystems, where a mere 14% of information
79 cited in management plans for the reefs of Australia, Kenya and Belize was primary
80 research (Cvitanovic *et al.*, 2014). In this case, research was deemed to be inaccessible
81 to managers due to, long publication times, subscription only access to research and
82 poor articulation of management implications of the research (Cvitanovic *et al.*, 2014).
83 Yet, for effective management to take place, evidence based decision-making is critical
84 (Christensen *et al.*, 1996; Ruckelshaus *et al.*, 2008).

85 In this article we use the Mesoamerican reef (MAR) ecoregion as a case study, to
86 examine the current status of mangroves, the legislation implemented to protect,
87 manage and conserve mangroves, and review peer-reviewed scientific outputs from the
88 region. The aim of this paper is to understand the current management paradigms
89 within the MAR and identify threats to mangroves within the region. We compare the
90 foci of management strategies and research programs in order to determine where
91 overlap occurs and where there are gaps in the knowledge base.

92 **Methods**


93 *Study area*

94 We have chosen to focus on the Mesoamerican Reef (MAR) ecoregion because the
95 majority of mangrove research is concentrated in South-East Asia, where larger and
96 more diverse stands of mangroves are located (Saenger, 2002). Much less is known
97 about these ecosystems in Latin America and the Caribbean (but see, Ellison and
98 Farnsworth, 1997; Núñez-Farfán *et al.*, 2002; Ellison, 2004). The MAR ecoregion
99 extends over 1000 km from the Yucatan peninsula, Mexico (21.56°N; 087.09°W) to the
100 east coast of Honduras (14.97°N; 083.16°W), encompassing the Caribbean coastlines,
101 open-ocean, networks of cays, and offshore banks of Mexico, Belize, Guatemala and
102 Honduras (Kramer and Kramer, 2002) (Figure 1). It is home to the largest barrier reef in
103 the western hemisphere and supports the livelihoods of approximately two million
104 people (Kramer and Kramer, 2002), of particular importance are the fishing (Box and
105 Canty, 2010) and tourism industries (Doiron and Weissenberger, 2014). Considerable
106 attention has been given to coral reefs in the region, however seagrass and mangrove
107 ecosystems have often been overlooked. In this review we consider the entire
108 Honduran north shore as part of the MAR ecoregion, due to potentially high levels of
109 connectivity between the Honduran east coast and the MAR (Butler *et al.*, 2011;
110 Truelove *et al.*, 2015; Chollett *et al.*, 2017). The boundaries of the ecoregion were
111 originally defined by the presence of several physiogeographic boundaries, these
112 include the Gulf of Mexico, strong oceanic currents between the Yucatan penninsular,
113 Mexico and south west Cuba, the shallow waters of the Nicaraguan rise, Honduras, in
114 addition to a number of terrestrial environmental variables, e.g. rainfall. The ecoregion
115 was officially declared in 1997 as part of the Tulum agreement, where all four countries

116 came together recognizing the importance of the region and the need to jointly manage
117 a shared marine resource (Kramer and Kramer, 2002).

118 *Mangrove cover estimations*

119 First, we estimated mangrove forest cover for each country across the region. The three
120 true mangrove species: *Rhizophora mangle*; *Avicennia germinans* and *Laguncularia*
121 *racemosa* are considered as part of the mangrove forest system in all four countries.
122 However, the mangrove associate *Conocarpus erectus* (Buttonwood mangrove) is only
123 defined as part of the mangrove forest in Guatemala and Honduras. Regardless of a
124 country's definition of the mangrove complex, mangrove cover estimates herein include
125 all four species. Country specific estimates of mangrove cover were taken from the
126 most recent estimates available (Mexico (Rodríguez-Zúñiga *et al.*, 2013), imagery from
127 2010; Belize (Cherrington *et al.*, 2010), imagery from 2010; Guatemala (MARN, 2013),
128 imagery from 2010; and Honduras (Carrasco and Caviedes, 2014), imagery from 2008-
129 2010).



130

131 **Figure 1.** Map of the Mesoamerican Reef Eco-region. Solid line highlights the area
 132 included within the study, the official boundary of the MAR (dotted line) does not include
 133 the eastern north shore of Honduras.

134 *Mangrove management plans*

135 To ascertain the level of management and protection directly focused on mangroves in
 136 each country, we first reviewed national environmental legislation, using Google
 137 searches and accessing management plans. We subsequently identified which
 138 international and regional conventions and agreements relating to mangroves each
 139 country has signed or ratified. Within the Caribbean, protected areas that contain
 140 mangroves include Ramsar sites and Marine Protected Areas (MPAs). Ramsar sites

141 that contain mangroves were identified through the American Ramsar Secretariat (Pers.
142 Comms.) and the Ramsar website (www.ramsar.org). The Healthy Reefs for Healthy
143 People Initiative (HRI; www.healthyreefs.org) provides the names of all of the MPAs
144 within the MAR, which have marine territory, and provides the associated management
145 plan. If a management plan was not available on the HRI website a wider web search was
146 conducted, if after the search we did not identify a management plan we assumed that
147 one did not exist or is not publicly available. Web searches (in English and Spanish),
148 were used to identify management plans for each of the named protected areas.
149 Management plans for protected areas, where available, were downloaded and
150 searched using the keywords mangroves (mangr*) in English, and manglar (mangl*) in
151 Spanish to find explicit references to the management of mangroves. It must be noted
152 that the most recent management plans were used in this review and that management
153 plans within the region are generally designed for a five-year period. In many cases the
154 management period had expired, but we assume that current management strategies
155 are based on the most recent plans.

156 *Scientific literature review*

157 To determine the focus of scientific research on mangroves in the MAR, peer-reviewed
158 scientific publications were searched for using the Boolean search methodology.
159 Multiple combinations of the following keywords (and their equivalents in Spanish) were
160 used in the search: 'Mangrove'; '*Rhizophora*'; '*Avicennia*'; '*Laguncularia*'; '*Conocarpus*';
161 'Mesoamerica'; 'MBRS'; 'MAR'; 'Caribbean'; 'Mexico'; 'Belize'; 'Guatemala'; and
162 'Honduras'. Only articles published from 1997 to date were used, as this date coincides
163 with the declaration of the MAR as an ecoregion by all four countries, and therefore to

164 the direct management of the ecoregion. Books or book sections were not used, as we
165 could not be sure of the peer-review process, and reviews were not included.
166 Methodologies of articles were examined to ensure that research occurred in at least
167 one of the four MAR countries and within the boundaries of the MAR ecoregion, as we
168 delimited it. A total of 81 peer-reviewed publications (see supplementary materials for a
169 full list of publications) were identified and the research undertaken in each country was
170 tallied. Where research occurred in multiple countries in a single paper, each country
171 received a tally.

172 *Identification of threats*

173 A fine scale analysis of articles that were identified to focus on threats to mangroves
174 was conducted to categorize the type of threat. Eight different threats were identified, a
175 total of 29 times, and each threat was categorized as either natural or anthropogenic
176 disturbances. *Natural disturbances* were: hurricanes; sea-level change; light gaps;
177 seismic activity; tsunamis; and subsidence. *Anthropogenic disturbances* were:
178 commercial development and deforestation. Threats identified were tallied and a
179 proportion of each threat category was calculated based on the total number of threats
180 identified.

181 A list of threats to Ramsar sites was obtained from the American Ramsar Secretariat.
182 The threats were identified by future managers of Ramsar sites from a list of 51 options
183 supplied by Ramsar (see supplementary materials for the full list of threats and their
184 definitions) during the Ramsar site application process. The list of threats provided was
185 pre-defined, and as a result not all threats reported may be relevant to the protected
186 area, e.g. in Guatemala 'agriculture and aquaculture' was a reported threat. However,


187 aquaculture is currently not present in the Guatemalan Caribbean, in contrast
188 agriculture is present and is considered a threat to mangroves.

189 Thirty-seven different threats were identified by Ramsar managers, across the four
190 countries, a total of 236 times, with a maximum of twenty-two at a single site. We
191 categorized threats as either natural disturbances or anthropogenic disturbances.
192 *Natural disturbances* were: storms and flooding; fire and fire suppression; problematic
193 native species; invasive and other problematic species and genes; climate change and
194 severe weather; and invasive non-native/alien species. *Anthropogenic disturbances*
195 were: biological resource use; human settlements (non-agricultural); tourism and
196 recreation areas; housing and urban areas; fishing and harvesting aquatic resources;
197 natural system modifications; agriculture and aquaculture; pollution; logging and wood
198 harvesting; human intrusions and disturbances; hunting and collecting terrestrial
199 animals; vegetation clearance/land conversion; recreational and tourism activities;
200 gathering terrestrial plants; transportation and service corridors; water regulation;
201 household sewage; livestock farming and ranching; urban waste water; agriculture and
202 forestry effluents; drainage; dams and water management/use; energy production and
203 mining; unspecified development; wood and pulp plantations; mining and quarrying;
204 industrial and military effluents; water abstraction; garbage and solid waste; shipping
205 lanes; and air-borne pollutants. Individual threats that were reported were tallied as
206 either natural or anthropogenic disturbances, a proportion of each threat category was
207 calculated from the combined number of threats identified.

208 **Results**

209 *Mangrove cover*

210 Mangrove cover in the MAR is estimated at 239,176 ha, cover has declined across the
211 region since the 1990's, where mangroves covered approximately 350,000 ha (Figure
212 2), a loss of over 110,000 ha in a twenty-year period. Proportional cover of mangroves
213 in the MAR region varies considerably between and within the four countries. The
214 majority of mangrove cover within the MAR is located along the Yucatan Peninsula,
215 Campeche and Quintana Roo regions of Mexico (53.5%; 128,049 ha; Figure 2),
216 however Mexico has significantly greater mangrove cover in the Gulf of Mexico and on
217 the Pacific coastlines. Belize is the only country to have its entire coastline in the MAR,
218 and approximately one third of mangrove cover of the MAR is found in Belize (31.2%;
219 74,684 ha; Figure 2). Only a small fraction of the total mangrove cover of the region is
220 located in Guatemala (0.5%; 1,170 ha; Figure 2), the majority of Guatemalan
221 mangroves are located on the Pacific coast. Despite the size of its coastline, mangrove
222 cover in Honduras is a small proportion of the MAR total (14.7%; 35,273 ha; Figure 2).
223 Mangrove cover in Honduras is almost equally divided between the Caribbean and
224 Pacific coasts.



225 **Figure 2** Mangrove cover within the MAR region. (a) Historical (Kramer and Kramer, 2002) and recent
 226 estimations of mangrove cover. (b) Total mangrove cover in each of the four MAR countries, with
 227 hectares of protected and unprotected mangrove highlighted. (Mexico (Rodríguez-Zúñiga *et al.*, 2013);
 228 Belize (Cherrington *et al.*, 2010); Guatemala (MARN, 2013); Honduras (Carrasco and Caviedes, 2014).
 229 *Some data from Honduras is from 2008.
 230

231 **Legislation and management**

232 Comprehensive legislation exists within the region to protect mangroves. In Mexico,
 233 Guatemala and Honduras, mangroves are property of the state and stringent laws exist
 234 which prohibit the removal and cutting of mangroves and prevent changes in land use
 235 (Table 1). In contrast, the majority of Belizean mangroves are privately owned and only
 236 30% are state owned. However, national legislation in Belize is applicable to all
 237 mangroves regardless of ownership. Within Belize, the cutting and clearance of
 238 mangroves is controlled by a permitting system, however the dredging and landfill of
 239 mangroves is only permitted under exceptional circumstances.

240 At the international level, the four countries of the MAR have ratified a total of seven
241 international conventions and agreements to promote the management and sustainable
242 use of marine and wetland resources (Table 1). The most important of these for
243 mangroves is the Ramsar (wetlands) convention. Geopolitical differences influence
244 regional cooperation, e.g. Mexico, a North American country, is excluded from Central
245 American agreements, and Belize with a British rather than Spanish colonial heritage
246 exhibits preferences with Caribbean Community agreements. All four countries are
247 parties of the two main international conventions that are relevant to environmental
248 protection: the Cartagena convention and Ramsar convention (Table 1). Honduras is
249 the only country not to have ratified the Cartagena convention, but is a signatory to the
250 convention. Additionally, all four countries ratified the Tulum declaration and the
251 subsequent Mesoamerican barrier reef system project (www.mbrs.doe.gov.bz).

252 We identified a total of 43 protected areas in the MAR which have mangroves within
253 their borders (Table 2), and estimate that just under half (46.6%; 111,396 ha) of the
254 mangroves in the MAR are within the boundaries of a protected area. Over two thirds
255 (31) of the protected areas have management plans (Table 2), although implementation
256 of these plans may vary. The majority of management plans had no specific
257 management strategies for mangroves, other than a reference to the national
258 legislation, in the few instances where strategies were stated they were related to
259 mangrove restoration, e.g. Shipstern Conservation and Management Area, Belize.

260 In Mexico, mangroves are the responsibility of the Department of Ecology and
261 Environment, and the Institute for Flora, Fauna and Culture within the Secretariat of the
262 Environment and Natural Resources. In addition, the National Commission for Natural

263 Protected Areas (CONANP) assumes responsibility for mangroves when they are
264 located within a protected area. CONANP may co-manage protected areas with a local
265 non-governmental organization (NGO). We identified 13 protected areas that contain
266 mangroves in Mexico, these areas provide protection to approximately 80% (100,764
267 ha) of Mexican mangroves forests in the MAR (Table 2; Figure 2).

268 In Belize, the Forestry Department within the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries is
269 responsible for managing Belizean mangroves. The Coastal Zone Management
270 Authority and Institute and Fisheries Department may also assume a management role.
271 NGO's co-manage a number of protected areas in Belize and therefore assume a direct
272 role in the management of mangroves. Private protected areas are increasingly popular,
273 and these areas are coordinated by the Belize Association of Private Protected Areas.
274 We were not able to identify any private protected areas that provided protection to
275 mangroves. Only a small proportion (12.9%) of the total mangrove cover of Belize is
276 located within the 15 protected areas (Table 2; Figure 2).

Table 1. Legislation, Agreements and Protection of Mangroves in the Mesoamerican Reef Region.

Mangrove Legislation		Mexico	Belize	Guatemala	Honduras
<i>Legislation</i>		General Wildlife Act 2000, Article 60.	Forestry Act 1989, Article 52. Forests Act Chapter 213, revised in 2003	Forestry Act 1996, Article 35.	Fisheries Act 1959, Article 52.
		It is prohibited to remove, transplant, prune or conduct any work or activity that may affect the integrality of the hydrological flow of mangroves.	Dredging and landfill is strictly prohibited unless there is significant benefit to the general population. Three types of permits can be issued for the alteration of mangroves, depending on the area of mangrove to be altered. Permits can be denied.	Change of land use of mangrove ecosystems is prohibited. By-law Resolution No. 01.25.98, Article 15 allows family consumption to a maximum of 5m ³ .yr ⁻¹	The removal and cutting of mangroves is prohibited.
<i>State ownership of mangroves</i>		100%	30%	100%	100%
Government Agencies					
<i>Government hierarchy for the management of mangroves</i>	<i>Ministry</i>	Secretariat of the Environment and Natural Resources	Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries	Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources	Secretariat of Energy, Natural Resources, Natural Environment and Mines
	<i>Department</i>	Department of Ecology and Environment; Institute for Flora, Fauna and Culture	Department of Forestry	National Forest Institute	Fisheries department
	<i>External departments</i>		Coastal Zone Management Authority and Institute; Department of Fisheries	National Council for Protected Areas	Institute for Conservation and Forest Development, Protected Areas and Wildlife
	<i>Other Agencies</i>	National Commission for Protected Natural Areas		National Council for Protected Areas	Local Municipal Environment Units
	<i>Non-government organizations</i>	e.g. Comunidad y Biodiversidad Asociacion Civil; Amigos de Sian Ka'an	e.g. Belize Association of Private Protected Areas; Toledo Institute for Development Environment	e.g. Fundación para el Ecodesarrollo y la Conservación	e.g. Bay Island Conservation Association; Roatan Marine Park
International and Regional Agreements					
<i>Cartagena Convention (*Signatory only)</i>		1985	1999	1989	1983*
<i>Wetlands Convention (Ramsar²)</i>		1986	1998	1990	1993
<i>Tulum Agreement</i>		1995	1995	1995	1995
<i>Mesoamerican Barrier Reef System Project</i>		1997	1997	1997	1997
<i>Central American Policy for the Conservation and Rational Use of Wetlands</i>		N/A	2002	2002	2002
<i>Ramsar Regional Initiative for the Integral Management and Wise use of Mangroves and Coral Reefs</i>		2009	-	2009	2009
<i>Ramsar Caribbean Wetlands Initiative</i>		-	2009	-	-

Table 2. Protected areas of the Mesoamerican Reef ecoregion with mangroves within their borders.

	MPA /NP	Ramsar site	Management plan	Reference
Mexico (n=13)				
Área de Protección de Fauna y Flora Yum Balam	X	X	Y	(CONANP, 2013)
Parque Nacional Isla Contoy	X	X	Y	(SEMARNAT & CONANP, 2015b)
Manglares de Nichupte		X	Y	(SEMARNAT & CONANP, 2014)
Parque Nacional Arrecifes de Puerto Morelos	X	X	Y	(SEMARNAP, 2000a)
Manglares y humedales del norte de la isla Cozumel		X	Y	(SEMARNAT, 2014)
Parque Marino Nacional Arrecifes de Cozumel	X	X	Y	(SEMARNAP, 1998a)
Playa Tortuguera X'Caclé-X'Caclé		X	-	
Reserva de la Biósfera de Sian Ka'an	X	X	Y	(SEMARNAT & CONANP, 2015a)
Reserva de la Biósfera Banco Chinchorro	X	X	Y	(SEMARNAP, 2000b)
Parque Nacional Arrecifes de Xcalak	X	X	Y	(CONANP, 2004)
Parque Marino Nacional Punta Occidental Isla Mujeres, Punta Cancun y Punta Nizuc	X		Y	(SEMARNAP, 1998b)
Área Marina y Costera Protegida Actam Chuleb	X		-	
Zona Sujeta de Conservación Ecológica Santuario Manati	X		-	
Bahía Chetumal				
<i>Total:</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>10</i>	
Belize (n=14)				
Bacalar Chico National Park and Marine Reserve	X		Y	(BFD, 2004)
Laughing Bird Caye National Park	X		Y	(BFoD, 2010)
Payne's Creek National Park	X		-	
Sarstoon-Temash National Park	X	X	Y	
Shipstern Conservation & Management Area	X		Y	(PACT, 2016)
Corozal Bay Wildlife Sanctuary	X		-	
Swallow Caye Wildlife Sanctuary	X		-	
Half Moon Caye Natural Monument	X		Y	(BAS, 2007)
Caye Caulker Marine Reserve	X		Y	(BCZMIA & BFD, 2004)
Gladden Spit and Silk Cayes Marine Reserve	X		Y	(BFD, 2010a)
Glover's Reef Marine Reserve	X		Y	(BFD, 2007)
Hol Chan Marine Reserve	X		Y	(BFD, 2002)
Port Honduras Marine Reserve	X		Y	(BFD, 2012a)
Sapodilla Cayes Marine Reserve	X		Y	(BFD, 2010b)
South Water Caye Marine Reserve	X		Y	(BFD, 2009)
Turneffe Atoll Marine Reserve	X		Y	(BFD, 2012b)
<i>Total:</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>12</i>	
Guatemala (n=2)				
Reserva de usos múltiples río Sartsun	X	X	Y	(CONAP, 2009)
Punta de Manabique	X	X	Y	(CONAP, 2011)
<i>Total:</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>2</i>	
Honduras (n=13)				
Parque Nacional Sistema de Humedales de Cuyamel – Omoa	X	X	-	
Parque Nacional Jeannette Kawas	X	X	Y	(ICF, 2012a)
Refugio de Vida Silvestre Punto Izopo	X	X	Y	(ICF, 2012b)
Sistema Humedales Laguna de Zambuco		X	-	
Refugio de Vida Silvestre Cuero y Salado (Barras de Cuero y Salado)	X	X	Y	(ICF, 2011)
Parque Nacional de las islas de la Bahía	X		Y	(IHT y ICF, 2015)
Zona de Protección Especial Marina Turtle Harbour – Rock Harbour el Sistema de Humedales de la Isla de Utila	X	X	Y	(IHT y ICF, 2012)
Zona de Protección Especial Marina Sandy Bay West End	X		-	
Parque Nacional Port Royal	X		-	
Monumento Natural Marino Archipiélago Cayos Cochinos	X		Y	(CMCC, 2009)
Refugio de Vida Silvestre Laguna de Guaimoreto	X		-	
Reserva de la Biósfera del Río Platano	X		Y	(ICF, 2013)
Laguna de Bacalar		X	-	
<i>Total:</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>7</i>	
Grand totals	43	38	31	


277 Mangroves in Guatemala are the responsibility of the National Forest Institute within the
278 Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources. The National Council for Protected
279 Areas (CONAP) has a role in mangrove management when mangroves are located in
280 protected areas (Table 1). Protected areas are co-managed by CONAP and local
281 NGO's and these organizations assume the day to day responsibilities of the protected
282 areas. The majority of mangroves within Guatemala (88.2%) are located within the two
283 protected areas (Table 2; Figure 2).

284 The responsibility of mangroves in Honduras resides with the Department of Fisheries
285 under the Secretariat of Energy, Natural Resources, Natural Environment and Mines,
286 and local municipal environmental units have a role in mangrove management within
287 their jurisdiction. Within protected areas, mangroves receive additional management
288 from the Conservation and Forest Development, Protection and Wildlife Institute and
289 local NGO's. The NGO's assume the day-to-day responsibilities of the protected areas.
290 A total of 13 protected areas have been declared that have mangroves within their
291 boundaries, however limited mangrove cover data is available, which precludes an
292 accurate estimation of mangrove coverage within Honduran protected areas (Table 2).

293 *Threats to mangroves*

294 A total of 81 peer-reviewed articles focusing on mangroves were identified within the
295 MAR region. The majority of the research was conducted in Belize (68.2%), the
296 remaining studies were conducted in Mexico (22.0%) and Honduras (9.8%). No peer-
297 reviewed primary mangrove research identified from Guatemala. Of the 81 peer-
298 reviewed articles identified, 15 of these address threats to mangroves (Ellison and
299 Farnsworth, 1997; Feller *et al.*, 1999; Cahoon *et al.*, 2003; Piou *et al.*, 2006; Mckee,

300 Cahoon and Feller, 2007; McKee, Rooth and Feller, 2007; Taylor *et al.*, 2007;
301 Vaneslow, Kolb and Fickert, 2007; Granek and Ruttenberg, 2007; Carrillo-Bastos,
302 Elizalde-Rendón, Erika Marcela Torrescano Valle and Flores Ortiz, 2008; Islebe *et al.*,
303 2009; Macintyre *et al.*, 2009; Mckee and Vervaeke, 2009; Hiraes-Cota *et al.*, 2010;
304 McCloskey and Liu, 2013),, a total of 8 different threats were classified. A total of 37
305 different threats, were identified from the 20 Ramsar sites, the majority of which were
306 anthropogenic (90.7%), e.g. 'logging', 'aquaculture and coastal development' (Figure 3).
307 The majority of peer-reviewed mangrove research from the MAR region has focused on
308 natural disturbances (71.4%) of mangrove systems (Figure 3). These trends are not just
309 a regional trend, but hold for each of the individual countries, where researchers and
310 managers foci are on natural and anthropogenic disturbances, respectively (Figure 3).
311 Primary research interests include hurricanes and sea-level change, and Ramsar
312 managers across the region are concerned with deforestation, agriculture, and
313 development.



314

315 **Figure 3.** Threats to mangroves of the MAR as identified by Ramsar managers and within
 316 peer-reviewed publications (a) throughout the MAR; and (b) individual countries: M –
 317 Mexico; B – Belize; G – Guatemala; and H - Honduras.

318 **Discussion**

319 Despite the stringent national legislation and international agreements which provide
 320 protection to mangrove forests, and the additional protection provided by the 43
 321 protected areas (which contain mangroves), mangrove cover in the MAR declined by
 322 over 110,000 ha from 1990-2010, with an estimated current cover of 239,176 ha,
 323 equivalent to 1.7% of the world's mangroves (Giri *et al.*, 2011). The greatest losses
 324 were observed in Mexico and Honduras. The decline in mangrove cover suggests a
 325 problem with enforcement. We suggest a lack of resources for enforcement,
 326 transparency within the governance framework, and lack of political will as potential
 327 reasons for the failure in the enforcement of mangrove legislation. The number of
 328 organizations responsible for the management and protection of mangroves in each
 329 country varies and causes confusion, with the exact role of each party unclear. Each

330 country has a specific government department responsible for mangrove protection,
331 with additional oversight from external agencies and non-government organizations
332 (NGO's) when mangroves are located in protected areas. It must be noted that such
333 discrepancies are not unique to mangrove systems or to this region (Rife *et al.*, 2013).
334 Limited national budgets of the four countries reduce governmental institutional
335 capacity, which has resulted in civil society in the form of NGO's filling the void in the
336 management of protected areas. NGO's assume an important role as co-managers of
337 protected areas, fulfilling the day-to-day management duties. However, a lack of
338 authoritative power and a lack of human capacity to physically patrol often large and
339 remote areas, inhibits the ability of NGO's to enforce environmental legislation (Cudney-
340 Bueno *et al.*, 2009; Rife *et al.*, 2013). In essence many of the protected areas in each of
341 the four countries could be considered "paper parks", as they provide no greater
342 protection or management to mangroves than national legislation (Rife *et al.*, 2013). It is
343 important not to be too critical of these institutions, however, all of which are operating
344 on limited resources. The focus should be on how to support and build capacity of these
345 organizations to allow them to improve mangroves and natural resource management
346 efficacy.

347 Geopolitical interests of the different countries have reduced collaborative efforts of
348 mangrove protection. Despite the four countries sharing an ecoregion, significant
349 geopolitical divisions exist. This is exemplified by Belize ratifying a separate Ramsar
350 initiative to the other three countries. The paradox is that despite having the same or
351 very similar objectives, the four countries are not working together to achieve these
352 goals. A lack of collaboration and harmonization in how management strategies are

353 developed and implemented can reduce mangrove protection, especially in forests that
354 straddle international borders (McCallum, Vasilijević and Cuthill, 2015). Belize is the
355 only country where all of mangroves are within the boundaries of the MAR. In contrast
356 Mexico and Guatemala have significantly greater mangrove cover on other coastlines,
357 and a little more than half of the mangrove cover of Honduras is concentrated within the
358 Gulf of Fonseca, on the Pacific coast. Threats to mangroves may vary significantly on
359 the different coasts, and therefore influence how national mangrove legislation is
360 developed, and how governments prioritize limited management resources. Regardless,
361 greater collaborative efforts, such as the Mesoamerican Barrier Reef System Project,
362 need to be established to promote the protection of marine resources, and facilitate
363 transboundary initiatives that recognize that ecological populations do not align with
364 geopolitical boundaries. There is a high probability that mangrove forests within the
365 region are connected as recent studies have shown high levels of ecological
366 connectivity in the MAR region for lobster, fish and corals (Butler *et al.*, 2011; Truelove
367 *et al.*, 2015; Chollett *et al.*, 2017).

368 Evidence based decision-making has been well documented as an important
369 component of resource management (Christensen *et al.*, 1996; Ruckelshaus *et al.*,
370 2008). However, in the papers we reviewed there appears to be no discernible link
371 between researcher recommendations and resource manager decision-making or
372 actions. Concluding statements within articles may make some reference to
373 conservation or management, but usually included no advice on how to apply research
374 findings directly to management. Additionally, our study identified a disconnection
375 between Ramsar site managers and the scientific community. Managers were primarily

376 focused on localized anthropogenic threats (e.g. Macintyre *et al.*, (2009)), while
377 researchers focused on natural disturbances, such as hurricane events (Vaneslow, Kolb
378 and Fickert, 2007) and the impact of sea-level change (Mckee, Cahoon and Feller,
379 2007). Both anthropogenic and natural threats have either had, or have, the potential to
380 negatively affect mangrove cover, but the different foci of researchers and managers is
381 likely to hinder progress in mitigating threats from either source.

382 It is crucial that researchers and managers increase their communication and work
383 together to understand the full complexity of the threats to mangrove forests. Combining
384 these different priorities could bring important benefits. For example, the identification of
385 areas of mangrove forests resilient to climate change can focus management efforts
386 and create local priority conservation zones where anthropogenic disturbances should
387 be minimized. Both groups are focusing on important issues, however the assumed lack
388 of dialogue between stakeholders precludes the integration of science into mangrove
389 management plans. Cvitanovic *et al.* (2014) have reported similar disconnects in the
390 management of coral dominant marine protected areas. They proposed knowledge
391 brokers, boundary organizations, knowledge co-production and management-orientated
392 summaries in research articles as potential solutions to provide managers access to
393 scientific outputs. The HRI program has put some of these in place within the MAR
394 primarily focused on coral reefs, but these could be adapted to facilitate greater
395 communications between managers to promote science lead mangrove management.
396 In addition, discussion forums exist, such as the mangrove list
397 (majordomo@essun1.murdoch.edu.au). Listserves provide a forum where individuals

398 can pose questions to experts in an array of different fields and can provide useful
399 dialogue between practitioners and researchers.

400 These potential solutions provide important links between peer-reviewed conservation
401 science and conservation managers, but the dichotomy of researcher and manager foci
402 must also be addressed. Combining current research interests of natural disturbances
403 with local management concerns of anthropogenic stresses, in particular the
404 understanding of local drivers of deforestation, is critical. However, if institutional
405 capacity is lacking, then the implementation of management strategies will always be
406 problematic. Building capacity within and among government departments and NGO's
407 to ensure the effective enforcement of legislation and promote links with the scientific
408 community to facilitate science-based decision-making is vital for the management of
409 mangroves in the MAR, and elsewhere. It is important that managers have access to
410 and make use of current research, especially when developing management plans
411 (Adeel and Pomeroy, 2002; Iftekhhar and Islam, 2004; Schmitt and Duke, 2015). There is
412 also an onus on researchers to increase the availability of their research to
413 management authorities, not just government agencies, potentially through regional
414 online archives or data repositories. Additionally, researchers should engage managers
415 prior to conducting their research to foster a dialogue that can promote mangrove
416 management and conservation efforts. Promoting public awareness to garner political
417 will is also important, and a greater understanding of the ecosystem services provided
418 by mangroves to local communities and their inclusion in management has the potential
419 to increase the protection and conservation of mangroves (Shunula, 2002; Sudtongkong
420 and Webb, 2008; Datta, Chattopadhyay and Guha, 2012).

421 We propose the following recommendations to promote management of mangroves
422 within the region:

423 (1) Coordinated and detailed mapping projects in Belize and Honduras to provide more
424 recent estimates of mangrove cover that can be used to set baselines from which
425 management actions can be monitored and assessed;

426 (2) The implementation of a systematic, harmonized, mangrove monitoring protocol
427 throughout the region that will facilitate comparisons of mangrove forest status;

428 (3) A program of work to increase understanding of the connectivity of mangrove
429 populations throughout and beyond the MAR ecoregion, which can then be used to
430 identify areas where greater collaborations are needed;

431 (4) The creation of a repository of scientific literature of the region to which researchers
432 can submit their research, making it available for practitioners in the region and
433 providing another step towards an increased dialogue between managers and the
434 scientific community.

435 Our proposals require coordination and management of resources and information
436 across the MAR. The HRI program already brings together stakeholders from across
437 the region, but at present is heavily coral reef focused. Mangrove coverage was an key
438 indicator within the original HRI guide (McField and Kramer, 2007), and therefore could
439 become part of the biennially produced report card, which provides stakeholders an
440 update on the status of marine resources. Our suggestion is that the network of
441 contacts and collaborations within this program could be used to facilitate more

442 coordinated monitoring and assessment of mangroves and seagrass ecosystems in the
443 region.

444 **Conclusion**

445 The stringent national legislation and international agreements which should provide
446 protection to mangrove forests within the MAR are ineffective. A number of local
447 anthropogenic stressors threaten mangrove forests, and despite comprehensive
448 legislation, mangrove cover has declined in all four countries. Capacity building of
449 government and non-government institutions is required, as a lack of capacity has
450 reduced environmental regulation enforcement. Local anthropogenic stressors are of
451 greatest concern to managers of protected areas, whilst scientific research is focused
452 on natural disturbances, primarily climate change. These different focuses can be
453 advantageous if they can be linked effectively. For example, the identification of climate
454 change resilient mangrove forests can channel mangrove management efforts to
455 maximize effectiveness of limited resources. Greater understanding of drivers of local
456 anthropogenic threats to mangroves is required to provide managers with the necessary
457 tools to reduce these threats and promote mangrove forests and the ecosystem
458 services they provide. To promote successful management, we suggest the
459 reinforcement of institutional capacity, enhance links between government departments
460 and civil society and increase science-based decision-making within protected areas
461 management plans.

462 **Acknowledgements**

463 This is Smithsonian Marine Station at Ft. Pierce, Florida, Contribution No. 1081. We
464 thank Dr. Melanie McField, Marisol Rueda, Anan Giro and Ian Drysdale for their insights
465 on each of the four countries. SWJC received funding from the Summit Foundation.

466 **References**

- 467 Adeel, Z. and Pomeroy, R. (2002) 'Assessment and management of mangrove
468 ecosystems in developing countries', *Trees*, 16(2–3), pp. 235–238. doi:
469 10.1007/s00468-002-0168-4.
- 470 Alongi, D. M. (2002) 'Present state and future of the worlds mangrove forests',
471 *Environmental Conservation*, 29(3), pp. 331–349. doi: 10.1017/s0376892902000231.
- 472 Barbier, Edward B.; Hacker, Sally D.; Kennedy, Chris; Kock, Evamaria W.; Stier, A. C.
473 and B. R. S. (2011) 'The value of estuarine and coastal ecosystem services', *Ecological*
474 *Monographs*, 81(2), pp. 169–193. doi: 10.1890/10-1510.1.
- 475 BAS (2007) *Half Moon Caye and Blue Hole Natural Monuments Management Plan*.
- 476 BCZMIA & BFD (2004) 'Caye Caulker Forest and Marine Reserve - Integrated
477 Management Plan', *Belize Coastal Zone Management Institute/Authority and Belize*
478 *Fisheries Department*, p. 191.
- 479 BFD (2002) 'Hol Chan Marine Reserve Management Plan', *Belize Fisheries*
480 *Department*, p. 172.
- 481 BFD (2004) 'The Revised Bacalar Chico National Park & Marine Reserve Management
482 Plan', *Belize Fisheries Department*, p. 209.
- 483 BFD (2007) 'Management Plan Glover ' s Reef Marine Reserve World Heritage Site',
484 *Belize Fisheries Department*, p. 167.
- 485 BFD (2009) 'Management Plan South Water Caye Marine Reserve World Heritage

486 Site', *Belize Fisheries Department*.

487 BFD (2010a) 'Gladden Spit and Silk Cayes Marine Reserve Management Plan', *Belize*
488 *Fisheries Department*, p. 221.

489 BFD (2010b) 'Sapodilla Cayes Marine Reserve Management Plan', *Belize Fisheries*
490 *Department*, p. 238. Available at:
491 http://docs.lib.noaa.gov/noaa_documents/CoRIS/Sapodilla-Cayes-Mgmt-Plan_2011-
492 [16.pdf](http://docs.lib.noaa.gov/noaa_documents/CoRIS/Sapodilla-Cayes-Mgmt-Plan_2011-16.pdf).

493 BFD (2012a) 'Management plan Port Honduras Marine Reserve', *Belize Fisheries*
494 *Department*, 0, p. 212.

495 BFD (2012b) 'Turneffe Atoll Marine Reserve Management Plan', *Belize Fisheries*
496 *Department*, p. 293.

497 BFoD (2010) 'Laughing Bird Caye National Park Management Plan', *Belize Forestry*
498 *Department*, p. 225.

499 Box, S. and Canty, S. (2010) 'The Long and Short Term Economic Drivers of
500 Overexploitation in Honduran Coral Reef Fisheries Due to Their Dependence on Export
501 Markets', *Proceedings of the 63rd Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute*, 63, pp. 43–51.

502 Butler, M. J. *et al.* (2011) 'Behavior constrains the dispersal of long-lived spiny lobster
503 larvae', *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 422(Clarke 1933), pp. 223–237. doi:
504 10.3354/meps08878.

505 Cahoon, D. R. *et al.* (2003) 'Mass tree mortality leads to mangrove peat collapse at Bay
506 Islands, Honduras after Hurricane Mitch', *Journal of Ecology*, 91(6), pp. 1093–1105. doi:
507 10.1046/j.1365-2745.2003.00841.x.

508 Carrasco, J. C. and Caviedes, V. (2014) *Diagnóstico de los Ecosistemas Marino -*

509 *Costeros y de Agua Dulce de Honduras.*

510 Carrillo-Bastos, A., Elizalde-Rendón, Erika Marcela Torrescano Valle, N. and Flores
511 Ortiz, G. (2008) 'Adaptacion ante disturbios naturales, manglar de Puerto Morelos,
512 Quitana Roo, Mexico', *Foresta Veracruzana*, 10(1), pp. 31–38.

513 Carter, H., Schmidt, S. and Hirons, A. (2015) 'An International Assessment of Mangrove
514 Management: Incorporation in Integrated Coastal Zone Management', *Diversity*, 7(2),
515 pp. 74–104. doi: 10.3390/d7020074.

516 Cherrington, E. A. *et al.* (2010) *Forest Cover and Deforestation in Belize: 1980-2010*,
517 *Water Center for the Humid Tropics of Latin America and the Caribbean*. Panama City.

518 Chollett, I. *et al.* (2017) 'A case for redefining the boundaries of the Mesoamerican Reef
519 Ecoregion', *Coral Reefs*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 1–8. doi: 10.1007/s00338-017-
520 1595-4.

521 Christensen, N. L. *et al.* (1996) 'The Report of the Ecological Society of America
522 Committee on the Scientific Basis for Ecosystem Management', *Ecological Applications*,
523 6(3), pp. 665–691.

524 CMCC (2009) *Plan de Manejo Pesquero del Monumento Natural de Cayos Cochinos* ,
525 *Honduras*. Edited by S. Andraka, C. Bouroncle, and C. García-Sáez.

526 CONANP (2004) 'Programa de Manejo Parque Nacional Arrecifes de Xcalak.',
527 *Comisión Nacional de Áreas Naturales Protegidas*, p. 162. doi:
528 10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004.

529 CONANP (2013) 'Programa de Manejo Yum Balam', *Comisión Nacional de Áreas*
530 *Naturales Protegidas*, p. 154.

531 CONAP (2009) 'Plan Maestro 2010-2014 Área de Uso Múltiple Río Sarstun', *Consejo*

532 *Nacional de Áreas Protegida*, p. 142. Available at:
533 [http://www.conap.gov.gt/phocadownload/Centro_Documentacion/planes_maestros/plan](http://www.conap.gov.gt/phocadownload/Centro_Documentacion/planes_maestros/plan_maestro_rio_sarstun_200709.pdf)
534 [maestro_rio_sarstun_200709.pdf](http://www.conap.gov.gt/phocadownload/Centro_Documentacion/planes_maestros/plan_maestro_rio_sarstun_200709.pdf).
535 CONAP (2011) 'Plan de Conservación de Area Refugio de Vida Silvestre Punta de
536 Manabique', *Consejo Nacional de Áreas Protegida*.
537 Costanza, R. *et al.* (1997) 'The value of the world's ecosystem services and natural
538 capital', *Nature*, 387(6630), pp. 253–260. doi: 10.1038/387253a0.
539 Cudney-Bueno, R. *et al.* (2009) 'Governance and effects of marine reserves in the Gulf
540 of California, Mexico', *Ocean and Coastal Management*, 52(3–4), pp. 207–218. doi:
541 10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2008.12.005.
542 Cvitanovic, C. *et al.* (2014) 'Utility of primary scientific literature to environmental
543 managers: An international case study on coral-dominated marine protected areas',
544 *Ocean and Coastal Management*. Elsevier Ltd, 102(PA), pp. 72–78. doi:
545 10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2014.09.003.
546 Datta, D., Chattopadhyay, R. N. and Guha, P. (2012) 'Community based mangrove
547 management: A review on status and sustainability', *Journal of Environmental*
548 *Management*. Elsevier Ltd, 107, pp. 84–95. doi: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2012.04.013.
549 Doiron, S. and Weissenberger, S. (2014) 'Sustainable dive tourism: Social and
550 environmental impacts - The case of Roatan, Honduras', *Tourism Management*
551 *Perspectives*. Elsevier Ltd, 10(April), pp. 19–26. doi: 10.1016/j.tmp.2013.12.003.
552 Duke, N. C. *et al.* (2007) 'A World Without Mangroves?', *Science*, 317(5834), pp. 41–
553 42.
554 Ellison, A. M. (2004) 'Wetlands of Central America', *Wetlands Ecology and*

555 *Management*, 12, pp. 3–55. doi: 10.1023/B:WETL.0000016809.95746.b1.

556 Ellison, A. M. and Farnsworth, E. J. (1997) ‘Simulated sea level change alters anatomy,
557 physiology, growth and reproduction of red mangrove (*Rhizophora mangle* L.)’,
558 *Oecologia*, 112(4), pp. 435–446.

559 FAO (2007) ‘The world’s mangroves 1980-2005’, *FAO Forestry Paper*, 153, p. 89. doi:
560 978-92-5-105856-5.

561 Feller, I. C. *et al.* (1999) ‘Effects of Nutrient Enrichment on within-Stand Cycling in a
562 Mangrove Forest’, *Ecology*, 80(7), pp. 2193–2205.

563 Gilman, E. L. *et al.* (2008) ‘Threats to mangroves from climate change and adaptation
564 options: A review’, *Aquatic Botany*, 89(2), pp. 237–250. doi:
565 10.1016/j.aquabot.2007.12.009.

566 Giri, C. *et al.* (2011) ‘Status and distribution of mangrove forests of the world using earth
567 observation satellite data’, *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 20(1), pp. 154–159. doi:
568 10.1111/j.1466-8238.2010.00584.x.

569 Godoy, M. D. P. and De Lacerda, L. D. (2015) ‘Mangroves response to climate change:
570 A review of recent findings on mangrove extension and distribution’, *Anais da Academia*
571 *Brasileira de Ciencias*, 87(2), pp. 651–667. doi: 10.1590/0001-3765201520150055.

572 Granek, E. F. and Ruttenberg, B. I. (2007) ‘Protective capacity of mangroves during
573 tropical storms: a case study from “Wilma” and “Gamma” in Belize’, *Marine Ecology*
574 *Progress Series*, 343, pp. 101–105. doi: 10.3354/meps07141.

575 Hiraes-Cota, M. *et al.* (2010) ‘Drivers of mangrove deforestation in Mahahual-Xcalak,
576 Quintana Roo, southeast Mexico’, *Ciencias Marinas*, 36(2), pp. 147–159.

577 ICF (2011) ‘Plan de Manejo Refugio de Vida Silvestre Barras de Cuero y Salado’,

578 *Instituto Nacional de Conservacion y Desarrollo Forestal, Areas Protegidas y Vida*
579 *Silvestre*, p. 208.

580 ICF (2012a) 'Plan de Manejo del Parque Nacional Blanca Jeannette Kawas Fernandez',
581 *Instituto Nacional de Conservacion y Desarrollo Forestal, Areas Protegidas y Vida*
582 *Silvestre*, p. 251. Available at:
583 http://www.galapagospark.org/documentos/DPNG_plan_de_manejo_10_5.1.pdf.

584 ICF (2012b) 'Plan de Manejo Parque Nacional Punta Izopo', *Instituto Nacional de*
585 *Conservacion y Desarrollo Forestal, Areas Protegidas y Vida Silvestre*.

586 ICF (2013) 'Plan de Conservación de la Reserva del Hombre y la Biósfera del Río
587 Plátano', *Instituto Nacional de Conservacion y Desarrollo Forestal, Areas Protegidas y*
588 *Vida Silvestre*, p. 99.

589 Iftekhar, M. S. and Islam, M. R. (2004) 'Managing mangroves in Bangladesh: A strategy
590 analysis', *Journal of Coastal Conservation*, 10(1), p. 139. doi: 10.1652/1400-
591 0350(2004)010[0139:MMIBAS]2.0.CO;2.

592 IHT y ICF (2012) 'Plan de Manejo del Refugio de Vida Silvestre Turtle Harbour',
593 *Instituto Hondureño de Turismo y Instituto Nacional de Conservacion y Desarrollo*
594 *Forestal, Areas Protegidas y Vida Silvestre*.

595 IHT y ICF (2015) 'Plan de Manejo del Parque Nacional Marino Islas de la Bahia',
596 *Instituto Hondureño de Turismo y Instituto Nacional de Conservacion y Desarrollo*
597 *Forestal, Areas Protegidas y Vida Silvestre*, p. 160. doi:
598 10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004.

599 Islebe, G. A. *et al.* (2009) 'Efectos del impacto del Huracn Dean en la vegetacion del
600 sureste de Quinatan Roo, Mexico', *Foresta Veracruzana*, 11(1), pp. 1–6.

601 Kramer, P. A. and Kramer, P. R. (2002) *Ecoregional conservation planning for the*
602 *Mesoamerican Caribbean reef*. Edited by M. McField. Washington D.C.

603 Macintosh, D. J. and Ashton, E. C. (2002) *A Review of Mangrove Biodiversity*
604 *Conservation and Management*.

605 Macintyre, I. G. *et al.* (2009) 'Decimating mangrove forests for commercial development
606 in the Pelican Cays, Belize: Long-term ecological loss for short-term gain?',
607 *Smithsonian Contributions to the Marine Sciences*, (38), pp. 281–290.

608 MARN (2013) *Estudio de la cobertura de mangle en la República de Guatemala*.
609 Guatemala: MARN. vi +54p.

610 McCallum, J. W., Vasiljević, M. and Cuthill, I. (2015) 'Assessing the benefits of
611 Transboundary Protected Areas: A questionnaire survey in the Americas and the
612 Caribbean', *Journal of Environmental Management*, 149, pp. 245–252. doi:
613 10.1016/j.jenvman.2014.10.013.

614 McCloskey, T. A. and Liu, K. (2013) 'Sedimentary History of Mangrove Cays in Turneffe
615 Islands, Belize: Evidence for Sudden Environmental Reversals', *Journal of Coastal*
616 *Research*, 29(4), pp. 971–983. doi: 10.2112/JCOASTRES-D-12-00156.1.

617 McField, M. and Kramer, P. (2007) *Healthy Reefs for Healthy People A Guide to*
618 *Indicators of Reef Health and Social Well-being in the Mesoamerican Reef Region*. With
619 contributions by M. Gomez and M. McPherson.

620 Mckee, K. L., Cahoon, D. R. and Feller, I. C. (2007) 'Caribbean mangroves adjust to
621 rising sea level through biotic controls on change in soil elevation', *Global Ecology and*
622 *Biogeography*, 16(5), pp. 545–556. doi: 10.1111/j.1466-8238.2007.00317.x.

623 McKee, K. L., Rooth, J. E. and Feller, I. C. (2007) 'Mangrove recruitment after forest

624 disturbance is facilitated by herbaceous species in the Caribbean', *Ecological*
625 *Applications*, 17(6), pp. 1678–1693. doi: 10.1890/06-1614.1.

626 Mckee, K. L. and Vervaeke, W. C. (2009) 'Impacts of Human Disturbance on Soil
627 Erosion Potential and Habitat Stability of Mangrove-Dominated Islands in the Pelican
628 Cays and Twin Cays Ranges, Belize', *Smithsonian Contribution to the Marine Sciences*,
629 (April).

630 Nagelkerken, I. *et al.* (2008) 'The habitat function of mangroves for terrestrial and
631 marine fauna: A review', *Aquatic Botany*, 89(2), pp. 155–185. doi:
632 10.1016/j.aquabot.2007.12.007.

633 Núñez-Farfán, J. *et al.* (2002) 'Genetic divergence among Mexican populations of red
634 mangrove (*Rhizophora mangle*): geographic and historic effects', *Evolutionary Ecology*
635 *Research*, 4, pp. 1049–1064.

636 PACT (2016) *Management Plan Shipstern Nature Reserve 2011-2016*.

637 Piou, C. *et al.* (2006) 'Zonation patterns of Belizean offshore mangrove forests 41 years
638 after a catastrophic hurricane', *Biotropica*, 38(3), pp. 365–374. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-
639 7429.2006.00156.x.

640 Polidoro, B. A. *et al.* (2010) 'The loss of species: mangrove extinction risk and
641 geographic areas of global concern.', *PloS one*, 5(4), p. e10095. doi:
642 10.1371/journal.pone.0010095.

643 Rife, A. N. *et al.* (2013) 'When good intentions are not enough ... Insights on networks of
644 "paper park" marine protected areas', *Conservation Letters*, 6(3), pp. 200–212. doi:
645 10.1111/j.1755-263X.2012.00303.x.

646 Rodríguez-Zúñiga, M. T. *et al.* (2013) *Manglares de Mexico. Extension, distribution, y*

647 *monitoreo.*, *Comision Nacional para el Conocimiento y Uso de la Biodiversidad*. Mexico
648 D.F.

649 Rönnbäck, P., Crona, B. and Ingwall, L. (2007) 'The return of ecosystem goods and
650 services in replanted mangrove forests: perspectives from local communities in Kenya',
651 *Environmental Conservation*, 34(4), pp. 313–324. doi: 10.1017/S0376892907004225.

652 Ruckelshaus, M. *et al.* (2008) 'Marine Ecosystem-based Management in Practice:
653 Scientific and Governance Challenges', *BioScience*, 58(1), p. 53. doi:
654 10.1641/B580110.

655 Saenger, P. (2002) *Mangrove Ecology, Silviculture and Conservation*. Edited by Ist.
656 Kluwer Academic Publishers.

657 Sasmito, S. D. *et al.* (2016) 'Can mangroves keep pace with contemporary sea level
658 rise? A global data review', *Wetlands Ecology and Management*. Springer Netherlands,
659 24(2), pp. 263–278. doi: 10.1007/s11273-015-9466-7.

660 Sathirithai, S. and Barbier, E. B. (2001) 'Valuing mangrove conservation in southern
661 Thailand', *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 19(2), pp. 109–122.

662 Schaeffer-Novelli, Y. *et al.* (2016) 'Climate changes in mangrove forests and salt
663 marshes', *Braxilian Journal of Oceanography*, 64, pp. 37–52.

664 Schmitt, K. and Duke, N. C. (2015) 'Mangrove Management, Assessment and
665 Monitoring', *Tropical Forestry Handbook*, pp. 1–29. doi: 10.1111/btp.12004.

666 SEMARNAP (1998a) 'Programa de Manejo Parque Marino Nacional Arrecifes de
667 Cozumel , Quintana Roo', *Secretaría de Medio Ambiente, Recursos Naturales y Pesca*,
668 p. 164. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004.

669 SEMARNAP (1998b) 'Programa de manejo parque marino nacional costa occidental de

670 Isla Mujeres, Punta Cancun y Punta Nizuc', *Secretaría de Medio Ambiente, Recursos*
671 *Naturales y Pesca*, p. 161.

672 SEMARNAP (2000a) 'Programa de Manejo Parque Nacional Arrecife de Puerto
673 Morelos', *Secretaría de Medio Ambiente, Recursos Naturales y Pesca*, p. 225.

674 SEMARNAP (2000b) 'Programa de Manejo Reserva de la Biosfera banco Chinchorro',
675 *Secretaría de Medio Ambiente, Recursos Naturales y Pesca*.

676 SEMARNAT (2014) 'Programa de manejo de la reserva estatal selvas y humedales de
677 Cozumel', *Secretaría de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales*.

678 SEMARNAT & CONANP (2014) 'Programa de Manejo: Area de Proteccion de Flora y
679 Fauna, Manglares de Nichupte', *Secretaría de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales y*
680 *Comisión Nacional de Áreas Naturales Protegidas*, p. 142.

681 SEMARNAT & CONANP (2015a) 'Programa de Manejo Complejo Sian Ka'an: Reserva
682 de la Biosfera Sian Ka'an, Área de Protección de Flora y Fauna Uaymil y Reserva de la
683 Biosfera Arrecifes de Sian Ka'an', *Secretaría de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales*
684 *y Comisión Nacional de Áreas Naturales Protegidas*, p. 481. doi:
685 10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004.

686 SEMARNAT & CONANP (2015b) 'Programa de Manejo Parque Nacional Isla Contoy',
687 *Secretaría de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales y Comisión Nacional de Áreas*
688 *Naturales Protegidas*, p. 220.

689 Short, F. T. *et al.* (2016) 'Impacts of climate change on submerged and emergent
690 wetland plants', *Aquatic Botany*. Elsevier B.V., 135, pp. 3–17. doi:
691 10.1016/j.aquabot.2016.06.006.

692 Shunula, J. (2002) 'Public awareness, key to mangrove management and conservation:

693 The case of Zanzibar', *Trees*, 16, pp. 209–212. doi: 10.1007/s00468-001-0147-1.

694 Sudtongkong, C. and Webb, E. L. (2008) 'Outcomes of state- vs. community-based
695 mangrove management in Southern Thailand', *Ecology and Society*, 13(2). doi:
696 10.5539/mas.v3n5p179.

697 Taylor, D. S. *et al.* (2007) 'Mangrove removal in the Belize cays: effects on mangrove-
698 associated fish assemblages in the intertidal and subtidal', *Bulletin of Marine Science*,
699 80(3), pp. 879–890.

700 Tomlinson, P. B. (1994) *The botany of mangroves*. Cambridge University Press.

701 Truelove, N. K. *et al.* (2015) 'Genetic evidence from the spiny lobster fishery supports
702 international cooperation among Central American marine protected areas',
703 *Conservation Genetics*, 16(2), pp. 347–358. doi: 10.1007/s10592-014-0662-4.

704 Truelove, N. K. *et al.* (2015) 'Genetic evidence from the spiny lobster fishery supports
705 international cooperation among Central American marine protected areas',
706 *Conservation genetics*, 16, pp. 347–358. doi: 10.1007/s10592-014-0662-4.

707 Valiela, I., Bowen, J. L. and York, J. K. (2001) 'Mangrove Forests: One of the World's
708 Threatened Major Tropical Environments', *BioScience*, 51(10), pp. 807–815.

709 Vaneslow, K. A., Kolb, M. and Fickert, T. (2007) 'Destruction and Regeneration of
710 Terrestrial, Littoral and Marine Ecosystems on the Island of Guanaja/Honduras Seven
711 Years after Hurricane Mitch', *Erdkunde*, 61(4), pp. 358–371.

712 Warren-Rhodes, K. *et al.* (2011) 'Mangrove ecosystem services and the potential for
713 carbon revenue programmes in Solomon Islands', *Environmental Conservation*, 38(4),
714 pp. 485–496. doi: 10.1017/S0376892911000373.

715