An underwater photograph showing a large school of small, silvery fish swimming in clear blue water above a dark, rocky reef. Sunlight rays are visible filtering down from the surface.


**GLOBAL CHANGE ECOLOGY AND SUSTAINABILITY**  
**a.a. 2025-2026**

**Conservation and Management of Marine Ecosystems**  
**Prof. Stanislao Bevilacqua ([sbevilacqua@units.it](mailto:sbevilacqua@units.it))**

**Effects of protection**

# Sheltering


This occurs when one or more target species increase their abundance, size or biomass within the protected areas with respect to fished areas.



**Spillover**


# Buffering

This occurs when one or more target species exhibit less steep seasonal and/or interannual fluctuations within the protected area. Complex causes...reduction of post-recruitment mortality, increase of larval mortality (high density of predators)



# Cascading effects

This occurs when one or more target species have specific ecological roles in structuring marine communities. Protection, by increasing the abundance of this species, allows them to maintain their role in controlling lower trophic levels, triggering cascading effects.




So, a predator population, enhanced by protection, could control their prey population, which in turn has an effect on basal component of food webs.

# Effects on fish fauna



Giakoumi et al. 2017

a) Fully protected area

b) Partially protected area



# Comparing effects between fish and invertebrates





Halpern, 2003  
89 MPAs.


Density, size, biomass and diversity of fish fauna were significantly higher within than outside the reserve. Benthic invertebrates, however, showed significant difference only for density and size

# Effects on different ecological compartments


Smallhorn-West et al. 2020



# Relationship with reserve size





# Size again...



Using 58 datasets from 19 European marine reserves, they showed that reserve size and age do matter: Increasing the size of the no-take zone increases the density of commercial fishes within the reserve compared with outside. Moreover, positive effects of marine reserve on commercial fish species and species richness are linked to the time elapsed since the establishment of the protection scheme. (Claudet et al, 2008)

# Trophic cascades





Guidetti, 2006. *Ecol Appl*


Predation rates within reserves can be much more intense than outside

Increase of sea urchin predators due to protection reflects in decrease of sea urchins population within reserve boundaries, and the ensuing decrease of overgrazed substrates (Guidetti et al. 2008)



# Effects on target species





*Appolloni et al., 2017.*



Maintenance of depth structure in fish assemblages. Abundance-biomass patterns typical of healthy conditions




# Effects on fragile organisms





Diving frequentation in submarine caves. Effects on Benthic invertebrates. (Guarnieri et al., 2012)



# Mediterranean MPAs – subtidal rocky reefs



Fish biomass is significantly higher in well-enforced MPAs. Also, macroalgal stands (erect and canopy-forming species strongly varied, but were not related to protection. (Sala et al., 2012)



However, macroalgal stands were associated to low herbivore (sea urchins) pressure.

# MPAs and resilience: a manipulative experiment




Banned in 1998 in Italy and in 2006 in EU  
 Caused the destruction of tens of km<sup>2</sup> of rocky bottoms in the Mediterranean, and especially in Italy, Croatia, Albania, Greece  
 Fishermen destroy the rocky surface, and everything living on the substrate, to reach the endolithic bivalve for collection  
 Still practiced, although illegal; costs of date mussels on the black market can range between 60-80 euros per Kg

Date mussel (*Lithophaga lithophaga*) fishery

Full protection  
 Unprotected


Simulating disturbance

Comparing trends in recovery



H<sub>0</sub>: no difference in recovery between the no-take zone and controls

# Temporal patterns of recovery



Human impact (date-mussel fishery) simulated within a no-take zone and 2 control areas (NW Mediterranean)

Recovery of macrobenthic assemblages followed during 20 months (5 times of sampling) in disturbed plots

Filled symbols = disturbed plots; empty symbols = undisturbed plots

Bevilacqua et al., 2006. *J Animal Ecol*




Recovery at the no-take zone was faster than at the unprotected control areas

# Sea urchins


## ANOVA

Source of variation	df	SS	MS	F	F versus
Time = Ti	2	0.08	0.04		
Location = Lo	2	1402	7.01	12086*	Ti x Lo
Controls = Cs	1	0.85	0.85	0.988ns	Ti x Cs
P-v-Cs	1	1317	1317	22706***	Residual
Ti x Lo	4	233	0.58	1.289ns	Residual
Ti x Cs	2	1.71	0.86	2.263ns	Res Cs
Ti x P-v-Cs	2	0.62	0.31	0.689ns	Residual
Residual	171	7697	0.45		
Res Cs	114	4349	0.38		
Res P	57	3348	0.59		






# Does protection beget stability?

The MPA of Torre Guaceto (SE Adriatic Sea), instituted in 1991 and embedded into a human-dominated landscape, is a rare example of well-managed MPA where an adequate enforcement determined target fish recovery



This MPA provided the opportunity to follow the effects of protection on the stability of subtidal benthic assemblages, through the comparison of protected and unprotected locations, from 2002 to 2008

# Protection, stability, and heterogeneity




## SUBTIDAL ROCKY REEFS

The structure of subtidal sessile assemblages showed larger fluctuations outside the marine protected area than within the no-take zone where, in contrast, assemblage structure showed high temporal homogeneity.



# Buffering effects on seagrass decline




**Table 6.** Classification of the status of *P. oceanica* beds based on shoot density following Pergent et al. [54].

Location	Patch	2006	2007	2008	2009
P1	1	undisturbed	disturbed	Undisturbed	undisturbed
P1	2	undisturbed	undisturbed	Undisturbed	undisturbed
P2	1	undisturbed	disturbed	Undisturbed	undisturbed
P2	2	undisturbed	undisturbed	Undisturbed	undisturbed
C1	1	undisturbed	very disturbed	very disturbed	disturbed
C1	2	undisturbed	very disturbed	very disturbed	undisturbed
C3	1	disturbed	undisturbed	Disturbed	Disturbed
C3	2	undisturbed	very disturbed	very disturbed	Disturbed

Seagrass beds under reduction in the area due to general increase in sedimentation rates and turbidity. However, the decline is less steep within the no-take areas, where additional direct human impacts (e.g., anchoring) are alleviated or excluded.




# Further evidence



**unprotected**

**Higher spatial heterogeneity, high temporal variability, decrease in canopy cover**




**protected**


**Low spatial heterogeneity, high stability in canopy cover and associated understory assemblages**



## ROCKY INTERTIDAL



Fraschetti et al., 2012. Mar Ecol Progr Ser



Fraschetti et al., 2012. Mar Ecol Progr Ser

# Factors limiting protection effectiveness

## *Environmental*

---

Poor recruitment from El Nino  
(Preuss et al. 2009; Ferraris et al. 2005)

Environmental fluctuations  
(Preuss et al. 2009; Powel et al. 2016)

Eutrophication (Moore et al. 2013)

Confounding habitat effects  
(Dumas et al. 2010)

Discharge from river mouth  
(Jupiter and Egli 2011)

Cyclone (Thiault et al. 2019)

## *Study design*

---

Spillover into control sites  
minimizing impact (Berdach 2003;  
Ferraris et al. 2005; Preuss et al. 2009)

Habitat differences between  
control and MPA sites (Wantiez et al.  
1997; Jupiter et al. 2012)

Incorrect technique for question  
(Jupiter et al. 2013)

## *Biological*

---

Larval dispersal (Preuss et al. 2009)

Density dependent recruitment  
(Dumas et al. 2012)

High natural variability  
(Kulbicki et al. 2007)

Increased coral abundance attracts  
Crown of thorns starfish  
(Clements and Hay 2017)

Crown of thorns outbreak  
(Thiault et al. 2019)

Low overall abundance of target  
organisms (Dumas et al. 2010)

Complex life histories  
(Dumas et al. 2010)

Changing predator dynamics (Goetz and  
Fullwood 2013; Dell et al. 2015; Powel  
et al. 2016))

## *Social*

---

Insurmountable social barriers  
(Bartlett et al. 2009b)

Poacher aggression  
(Lalavanua et al. 2014)

Low overall fishing pressure  
(Berdach 2003; Carassou et al. 2013)

## *Reserve design*

---

Small reserve size (Preuss et al.  
2009; Dumas et al. 2010;  
Jupiter and Egli 2011)

Proximity to human populations  
(Preuss et al. 2009; D'agata et al. 2016)

Insufficient time  
(Dumas et al. 2010)

Unproductive habitat  
(Preuss et al. 2009)

Poor visibility from village  
(Jupiter and Egli 2011)

## *Management*

---

Poaching/lack of compliance  
(Bartlett et al. 2009b; Jupiter and Egli  
2011; Moore et al. 2013; Lalavanua  
et al. 2014; Albert et al. 2016;  
Peters 2017; Thiault et al. 2019)

Overharvest of periodic closures  
(Goetz et al. 2017)

Short periodic closure recovery time  
(Jupiter et al. 2012; Goetz et al. 2015;  
Goetz et al. 2016)

Smallhorn-West et al. 2020

# Impact on socio-economy

Type of Activity	Sub-type of Activities	Potential Positive Impacts on Users	Potential Negative Impacts on Users
Fisheries	Artisanal fisheries / small scale	Improved catch mix. Income and job increase, for professional and pleasure fisheries and for diving Exclusive access (less competence)	Closure of areas to fisheries If retention rates inside the MPA are high (dispersal ability is low comparing to MPA size) there might be no benefit for nearby fisheries
	Commercial fisheries / large scale	Improved catch mix Increased catch (“spillover effect” and also by the “recruitment effect”) Income and job increase, for professional and pleasure fisheries and for diving Increased biomass (reserve effect) Increased fish size (reserve effect)	Closure of areas to fisheries If retention rates inside the MPA are high (dispersal ability is low comparing to MPA size) there might be no benefit for nearby fisheries
	Recreational fisheries	Income and job increase, for professional and pleasure fisheries and for diving	Closure of areas to visitors If retention rates inside the MPA are high (dispersal ability is low comparing to MPA size) there might be no benefit for nearby fisheries



Navigation and Communications	Commercial shipping	NA	Effect on shipping lanes Increase transport time by reducing speed limits
	Ports & harbour service area	NA	Negative effects of anchoring on seabed (e.g. seagrass)
	Communication cables	NA	Limitation of allocation
Mineral, Water and Energy Resources	Offshore oil/gas platforms, resources extraction, pipelines and cables	NA	Limitation of extraction and allocation
	Offshore wind-farms	NA	Limitation of allocation
	Sailing	Increase sailing visitation; increase in tourism demand	Damage to ecosystem from tourist congestion (e.g. anchoring)
	Marine cruising	Increase in marine cruises relating to cetaceans or seabirds sightseeing	Negative effects of anchoring on seabed (e.g. Seagrass)
	Diving, snorkelling, nautical activities	Increase in divers' visitation. Income and job increase, for professional and pleasure fisheries and for diving	Damage to ecosystem from tourist congestion Negative non-consumptive divers impacts on the natural environment Closure of areas
	Cetacean and sea-bird watching	Increase in demand	Negative effects on cetaceans
Management	MPA management	Economic benefits to scientists and biologists (budget for their research, projects, etc.)	Economic cost for public finances of administration, supervision, monitoring, scientific information policies, prohibitions with financial compensation

# Effects on socio-economy

## Socioeconomic


### Instances of each impact

Community managed/No-take

Centrally managed/No-take

Community managed/Periodic closure

Centrally managed/Periodic closure



## Socioeconomic


Catch

Economic outcomes

Resource management decision making

Perceptions of ecological change

Perceptions of socioeconomic change







Instances of each impact

■ Negative ■ Neutral ■ Positive



Smallhorn-West et al. 2020

# How much does conservation cost?

Balmford et al. 2004



# How much does conservation cost?



Balmford et al. 2004

**Cost ranges between 0 and about 30 millions US dollars per square km year , depending significantly on the size of the MPA and the level of anthropization (population and urbanization)**

# Compliance

Bennet et al. 2019

Level of support for the MPA








Figure 12. Illegal activities reported to occur in Mediterranean MPAs (n = 45).

# The role of enforcement

Guidetti et al., 2008



# Key factors in MPA effectiveness



**Di Franco et al., 2016**

