

Recommendations of the Baltic SCOPE project

RED included in PanBaltic SCOPE-application

GREEN included in other project eg. Baltic LINES

BLUE relevant for HELCOM-VASAB MSP WG

BLACK not relevant for HELCOM-VASAB MSP WG

HELCOM-VASAB MSP Working Group Work Plan 2017-2019

1. Intergovernmental cooperation on MSP
2. Public participation
3. Ecosystem Approach in MSP
4. Information and data for MSP
5. Education for MSP
6. National and BSR regional frameworks for MSP in place

General recommendations

TRANSBOUNDARY COOPERATION

1. Where appropriate, planning authorities should **draw attention to panBaltic and bilateral issues** at the national political level to deal with **conflicting national interests** that **cannot be solved through informal dialogue between planners**.
*Target groups: policy-makers, planning authorities and ministries:
SE: Espoo? PanBaltic Scope at planners level
(1, 3)*
2. Planning authorities should **strengthen cooperation with sectorial agencies, which act as contact points to international decision organs**, including the Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission - Helsinki Commission (HELCOM) and Visions and Strategies Around the Baltic Sea (VASAB) at the regional sea level, and the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and The International Association of Marine Aids to Navigation and Lighthouse Authorities (IALA) at the global level.
*Target group: planning authorities
(1, 3, 4, 6)*
3. Planning authorities should **develop a more symbiotic relationship with sector authorities**, and the respective sector authority should **involve** the planning authorities if there are **spatial implications** in sector negotiations across borders.
Target groups: planning authorities, maritime administrations and sector authorities
4. Develop a common policy framework that can contribute towards the initiation and **development of common policy level agreements on environment-related aspects**, such as renewable energy.
*Target group: policy-makers
(1, 6?)*

PROCESS

1. **Ensure that sectoral authorities understand and agree** with relevant MSP recommendations in order to promote the successful implementation of MSP.
*Target groups: planning authorities and sector authorities
(1, 3)*

2. **Map transboundary synergies and conflicts**, so planners can identify which areas require special attention.
Target groups: planning authorities and maritime administrations
SE: Already included in HELCOM with the environmental perspective
(1, 4)
3. Apply experiences from **conflict management** in other areas to MSP.
Target groups: planning authorities and process managers
(1)
4. Apply recognized **risk assessment methods**
Target group: planning authorities
(3)

PLANNING EVIDENCE

1. Apply and develop **common approaches** for assessing and evaluating the **cumulative impact of human activities** on the marine environment.
Target group: planning authorities
(3, 4)
2. Develop **guidelines or criteria for social, economic and environmental impact assessment** procedures for MSP.
Target group: research
3. Develop **pan-Baltic criteria**, based on international guidance, **outlining safety distances** between offshore installations, fairways, routes and TSSs.
Target group: policy-makers
(1)
4. Establish what **planning evidence** is **required within a transboundary context** and **share data widely to increase knowledge** on MSP planning processes, particularly in relation to MSP projects, Strategic environmental assessment (SEA) and Environmental impact assessment (EIA).
Target groups: planning authorities and data hosts
SE: MSP data considered in the Data Expert Group
(3, 4)
5. Include an **analysis in transboundary perspective** in all national MSP actions and topics.
Target group: planning authorities
6. Planning authorities should **use the three checklists on the ecosystembased approach developed in Baltic SCOPE** when starting up and doing maritime spatial planning.
SE: Helcom/Vasab focus on testing of the checklists
Target group: planning authorities
(3)

STAKEHOLDERS & PLATFORMS

1. Establish the HELCOM-VASAB MSP Working Group as a **permanent forum** for networking and sharing knowledge and experience, to ensure close cooperation of planning authorities.
Target group: policy-makers
SE: Not relevant now.
(1)

2. Find **appropriate forms to contact and mobilize commercial stakeholders and NGOs in transboundary MSP**, to enhance knowledge exchange and consultation.
SE: Review consultation/participation guidelines.
Target group: planning authorities
(2?)
3. **Involve sectoral experts and sectoral authorities early**, to avoid conflicts and obtain transboundary coherent plans.
Target group: planning authorities
(1)
4. Develop an **early warning system to alert and create awareness of potential transnational conflict areas** for planning authorities and sector representatives.
SE: Information exchange
Target group: planning authorities
(1)
5. Organize lots of **informal meetings** with coffee and cake, because informal meetings are **crucial in building understanding, trust and solutions**.
Target group: planning authorities

Sectoral recommendations

ENERGY

Problems

Lack of transnational coordination regarding

- national planning of renewable offshore energy installations
- cumulative assessment of potential impact on the environment and other sectors

Needs

- development of a Pan Baltic long-term picture on renewable offshore energy,
- **need to consider existing or approved infrastructure and plans of neighbouring countries as well as potential cumulative effects on the environment and impacts on other sectors,**
- development of cross-border gates for linear infrastructure.

1. **Develop a pan Baltic long-term picture on renewable offshore energy** – needs, capacity, other sectors' needs, impacts, etc.
Target groups: policy-makers, research, energy sector and planning authorities
SE: HELCOM/VASAB can identify need but not be responsible for development of such a plan.
(1)
2. Take into consideration **existing or approved infrastructure and plans of neighbouring countries** as well as the **potential cumulative effects** on the environment and other sectors of the combined development.
Target group: planning authorities
(1, 3)
3. **Aim to develop joint cross-border gates for linear infrastructure** in MSP, such as power lines, data cables, pipelines.
Target group: planning authorities
(1)

4. **Notify concerned countries early** on about spatial plans and projects with transnational impact.
SE: Information exchange
Target group: planning authorities

ENVIRONMENT

1. **Map and highlight areas of high ecological value** across the Baltic Sea. **Create value criteria** that can be harmonized across countries.
Target groups: research and development projects, HELCOM and national marine data institutions
(3, 4)
2. Apply and **develop common approaches to assess cumulative pressures and impacts of human activities** on the marine environment.
Target groups: research and development projects and the HELCOM regional cumulative tool to implement marine policies
(3, 4)
3. Improve the **assessment of ecological coherence** of the Marine Protected Area (MPA) network in the Baltic Sea and identify potential areas for designation of MPAs.
Target groups: research and development projects, HELCOM and national marine data institutions
(1, 3, 4)
4. Develop a **methodology to apply** Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) **descriptors and indicators for assessment** of impacts within MSP related SEA and EIA procedures.
Target groups: environmental authorities, HELCOM and the EU
(1, 3, 4)
5. Elaborate **criteria to apply the precautionary principle** in regulating sea uses through MSP.
Target group: planning authorities
(3)
6. Neighbouring countries should **cooperate** in the process of planning and in management of cross-border marine protected areas.
Target groups: planning authorities and environmental authorities
7. Provide continuous **access to and build a base for comprehensive and reliable data and information, knowledge and expertise**, on cross-border protected areas.
Target groups: planning authorities and the HELCOM regional MPA database

FISHERY

1. **Jointly identify essential fish habitat**, including spawning, nursery and growth areas, for the whole Baltic Sea for species of interest to fisheries.
Target groups: national agencies responsible for fisheries data collection and processing, and ICES
(4)
2. Joint planning evidence of fishing activities should be provided through ICES. **Discuss and agree with ICES on the methodology to improve the usability of aggregated data** for national maritime spatial planning.

Target groups: policy-makers, planning authorities and the ICES Workgroup on Spatial Fisheries Data

SE: Coordinate MSP needs of data with ICES and other HELCOM groups (FISH)

(4)

3. **Inform other countries** about areas in their exclusive economic zone that are of national fishing interest to your country.

Target group: planning authorities

(1)

4. Show awareness of **other countries' fisheries interests in your maritime spatial plan**, such as their **fishing grounds, routes and ports**.

Target group: planning authorities

5. Fisheries should be considered from a **dynamic perspective** both over time and space, as conditions and important areas will change over time. It is also important to have a **sea basin perspective** in mapping and impact assessment of fisheries.

Target group: planning authorities

(1, 3)

SHIPPING

1. Countries should take each other's shipping routes into consideration in MSP and strive for cross-border coherence by aligning shipping routes at the border, **using the centre-line**.

Target groups: planning authorities and sector authorities

2. Cross-boundary MSP should **ensure safety at sea** for shipping and navigation through the integration of common safety guidelines and regulations into national plans. This should include **criteria for safety distances between offshore installations and shipping routes**, based on IALA-recommendations (Involvement of maritime authorities within MSP) and IALA-guidelines (Navigational Safety within Marine Spatial Planning) that are to be approved in 2017. Requirements for ensuring collision-friendly installation design should also be considered, for example for offshore turbines.

Target groups: policy-makers, planning authorities and sector authorities

(1)

3. Existing shipping lanes with major international traffic flow and IMO Routing Measures should **only be rerouted when the current route is proven unsuitable**; potential rerouting should be **addressed in cooperation** with other affected countries when of transnational concern. Upon rerouting, planners should find the best possible alternative route and take potential impacts on other sectors into account, for example fishing grounds, environmentally sensitive areas, etc.

Target groups: planning authorities and sector authorities

(1)

4. Shipping interests in MSP should be **classed according to their importance** in international trade, passenger routes or national significance.

Target groups: planning authorities and sector authorities

5. When carrying out **traffic analysis**, also **take into consideration small vessels** without an Automatic Identification System (AIS) or a Vessel Monitoring System (VMS).

Target groups: planning authorities and sector authorities