



Document title	Good MSP practices (input from Capacity4MSP)
Code	3-10
Category	INF
Agenda Item	3 - Development of the regional MSP framework
Submission date	26.3.2020
Submitted by	Poland
Reference	

Background

This document was submitted after the deadline due to the situation with COVID-19. It should also be noted that this document has not been discussed within the Capacity4MSP consortium and it is for the Working Group's internal use only.

Capacity4MSP project ([website](#)) is compiling good MSP practices from several MSP projects. The projects include at least BalticLines, BalticBlueGrowth, Baltazar, Basmati, Knowledge Flows, InnoAquaTech, BaltSeaPlan, Grass, Plan4Blue, Plan Bothnia, Baltic Scope, Pan Baltic Scope, Land Sea Act and Coast4us. The good practices are collected for the following themes: (a) cumulative impact assessment, (b) green infrastructure, (c) land-sea interactions, (d) transboundary actions, (e) climate change, (f) blue growth and carrying capacity of the marine environment, (g) data, (h) MSP education, (i) safety, (k) socio-economic analysis, (l) multi-use and conflict analysis, (m) energy, (n) new shipping, (o) aquaculture, (p) maritime cultural heritage, (r) recreation, (q) vision, (s) ecosystem approach, (t) monitoring and evaluation. In the second part, the conclusion of this examination will be proposed in terms of: (a) installing synergies between themes, (b) list of issues/activities of key importance for development of BSR MSP (gaps in good practices, needs for further transnational co-operation) (c) criteria and indicators for process, content and performance of MSP.

The task is led by Jacek Zaucha from the Maritime Institute in Gdansk. The task is not yet finalised and this document presents summary of the findings acquired so far.

Action requested

The meeting is invited to take note on the information presented in the document.

Good MSP practices (input from Capacity4MSP)

Introduction

This report is under preparation by the project partners under the Interreg project Strengthening the capacity of MSP stakeholders and decision makers (Capacity4MSP). The overall aim of this report is to synthesize and multiply the gained knowledge from various MSP projects and MSP practice within and outside the BSR in order to supplement EU, pan-Baltic and national commitments towards well-functioning MSP in the BSR by 2021. The report ambition is to increase the visibility and impact of the concluded and ongoing MSP transnational projects, demonstrate synergies between their achievements in order to facilitate successful alignment of new sea-uses (such as renewable energy production, aquaculture, protection of underwater heritage, etc.). The report will also enhance the synergies in MSP with regard to application of horizontal issues - for example, the 'multi-use' concept, 'land-sea interaction', 'cumulative impacts', etc. - from the perspective of new sea uses. The target group is MSP decision & policy makers (in particular HELCOM-VASAB MSP Working Group, relevant ministries, etc.) with regard to revision processes of MSP policy frameworks. The report will also bring additional input to the future MSP agenda post 2020, as well as identify potential themes for MSP cooperation projects for the next EU financial perspective 2021/27. A proposal for a methodology to follow up on the previous accomplishments of regional MSP commitments will be formulated. This proposal could be utilized to investigate a suitable future regional follow-up system for the HELCOM-VASAB MSP WG. The report will also contribute to the efforts of coherent MSP implementation in the BSR and especially the Russian Federation, where the development of the MSP is lagging behind compared to EU Member States. In this regard, the report provide proposals to the enhancement of the Russian MSP and marine management framework. The report will be composed of two parts. In the first part the good practices in the themes important for future of BSR MSP will be screened and analysed. The following themes will be probably investigated: (a) cumulative impact assessment, (b) green infrastructure, (c) land-sea interactions, (d) transboundary actions, (e) climate change, (f) blue growth and carrying capacity of the marine environment, (g) data, (h) MSP education, (i) safety, (k) socio-economic analysis, (l) multi-use and conflict analysis, (m) energy, (n) new shipping, (o) aquaculture, (p) maritime cultural heritage, (r) recreation, (q) vision, (s) ecosystem approach, (t) monitoring and evaluation. In the second part, the conclusion of this examinations will be proposed in terms of: (a) installing synergies between themes, (b) list of issues/activities of key importance for development of BSR MSP (gaps in good practices, needs for further transnational co-operation) (c) criteria and indicators for process, content and performance of MSP. All these will result in Policy Pointers.

In the Annex all background analysis will be attached.

Below the preliminary conclusions and observation for each theme are presented. These conclusions and observations have not been discussed by the project partners yet and therefore should be seen as the tentative ideas of the authors of the report. They are submitted on the request of the Project Lead Partner.

Good practices

1. Visions

The good practices related to visions are scarce. Despite their great potential to influence the planning process and outcomes they have not been frequently used. Probably the reason is in lack of trust into vision practical power in changing reality or concentration on concrete planning topics as suggested by VASAB-HELCOM WG. However, visions are important for stakeholder integration , adding social sustainability to the economic and environmental ones and for discussing on a long term development goals. At least in the BSR a more complex cross-sectoral vision (integrating sectors) prepared by different authorities have not been sufficiently developed (such as BSR ICM vision as proposed by students at the VASAB young planner summer school). Perhaps exercise with BSR MSP Vision 2030 should be repeated around 2022 having in mind new knowledge accumulated within

recent 10 years and inviting other authorities. For pursuing visions political commitment is necessary (also for mesh grid).

2. Transboundary planning cases

Transboundary planning has firm ground and tradition in the BSR. The MSP planners are aware in which situation such planning makes sense. Also procedures for coordination of the official plans have been established. Moreover, elements requiring transnational MSP co-operation (identified in Vision 2030) have been operationalised under various projects. Information is available at MSP EU Platform. Key dilemma is extension of the existing modus of co-operation to implement broader i.e. more multi-level governance transboundary model. This should engage other ministries at national level.

3. Socio-economic analysis

Work on socio-economic analysis is progressing in the BSR. It is still in the infancy phase testing some tools and approaches but it has reached the critical mass to serve as the Boundary spanning object. Such work should be supported in the future. There is a need to continue the work in this direction in particular to come up with a spatial oriented tools telling MSP planners what will be the socio-economic consequences (primary, secondary and tertiary i.e. through the multiplier effect) of allocating a given amount of sea space to the given sea use. The various tools should be developed since the MIX of tools provides for the best picture. There is a need much more expand this theme among others by involving more economists.

4. Safety

The good practices related to safety are scarce. They were developed mainly with regard to navigation and some sectoral policies, but there is no sufficient number of good practices showing how MSP should deal with other safety concerns such as extreme weather events, massive oil leakages, potential environmental disasters. There is a need to address what should be done by MSP and what by SEA/EIA in this regard.

5. Recreation

Practices on inclusion of tourism and recreation in to MSP are scarce in the BSR. Tourism sector is extremely diverse and dispersed and therefore it is not an easy MSP stakeholder. But its economic power is high mainly through local governments. There is a deficit of good practices showing how in practice tourism related conflicts can be handled in MSP. Multi-use, development of new form of tourism (diving) might be an option but it only partially solves the problems related a traditional 3S tourism model. MSP also should develop know-how how to handle mobile tourism e.g. yachting. One of the options could be better co-operation between ICZM and MSP.

6. Shipping

Practices on inclusion of shipping in to MSP are sufficient in the BSR in particular thanks to Baltic Lines. In many MSP plans shipping receives sufficient attention. However, some unclear issues remain such as impact on MSP of new shipping technologies.

7. Multi-use (MU)

Multi-use is a new issue under MSP. It is one of the key tasks that should be developed in the future in order to enhance wise and responsible management of the sea ecosystems under MSP. Practical good practices related to different combinations are necessary similar to the one developed under Baltacar on the underwater cultural park. The multi-uses identified under MUSES for the BSR should be tested as separate transnational projects.

8. MSP Education

Transboundary education on MSP takes various forms and formats. Know-how and experience is available and can be adopted to the needs of various BSR countries. Necessary critical mass was achieved in the BSR, target groups have been offered specific for them (or fine tuned to their needs) educational endeavours. If training should be supported in the future it should be targeted towards authorities from the countries with the biggest problems to pursue their MSP or social groups negatively affected by the ongoing MSP processes. Thus additional local courses would make sense but their content should be focused on problems and challenges of smaller maritime regions like Gulf

of Finland or Danish straits. The existing fora for information exchange like BSR MSP Forum should be continued, but they should better engage stakeholders not only planners and authorities.

9. Monitoring and evaluation

This is one of the most topical issues for the future BSR collaboration on MSP. The theoretical foundations do exist but the issue needs deepening and further practical testing. It should be done in the frame of transboundary project and the professional discourse (exchange of experience) at the VASAB-HELCOM MSP WG level. Attention should be given to monitoring governance of MSP. Implementation has to be shown much more clearly and possible consequences for other agencies / ministries should be assessed and monitored. This is a key precondition for an adaptive MSP.

10. Land sea interactions (LSI)

There is growing number of good practices related to LSI. This is a popular research and discussion topic also in the BSR. The body of know-how and experience will further grow on in the future due to progress in official MSP in the BSR. The current support to LSI is sufficient. If further incentives should be foreseen they should aim at enhancing inclusion of the local actors to the MSP process and examination of the interactions related to the social sustainability (how allocation of the sea space benefits various social groups on land)

11. Green Infrastructure

The methodology, proposed and tested so far needs to be developed further on to include a connectivity analysis of ecologically valuable areas, a more comprehensive ecosystem service assessment and an improvement in input data quality. The results should be discussed at the level of the VASAB-HELCOM WG on MSP for vigorous experience sharing

12. Ecosystem Based approach (EBA)

There are necessary foundations for applying EBA. In the future some education support makes sense. The EBA results should be monitored and discussed at the level of the VASAB-HELCOM WG on MSP for vigorous experience sharing.

13. Data

Data is a key MSP concern. One cannot expect to achieve full data coverage necessary for MSP, so MSP must be conducted under limited data constraint. Support for collecting new data under a BSR harmonised way and schedule should be continued also in the future. More handy tools for sharing and discussing data between planners and stakeholders should be also welcomed. MSP should have much stronger voice on how and which data is generated also with use of which modern technologies. MSP planners should be trained for that.

14. Cumulative impact assessment

The work on cumulative impacts should be continued. The existing tools should be disseminated and tested under the official MSP. There is a need to connect existing models with economic impact models. The results should be discussed at the level of the VASAB-HELCOM WG on MSP for vigorous experience sharing.

15. Climate Change

The theme of the climate change and MSP adaptation to this issue has not been sufficiently developed despite the importance of the problem. More good practices and collaboration are needed in the future. The critical mass of experience and evidences is non-existent to allow any HELCOM-VASAB MSP WG decisions on that issue. Here MSP should better co-operate with blue sectors and coastal planners to achieve more meaningful results.

16. Aquaculture(mariculture) and fishery

The future support to aquaculture should cover mainly technological readiness and spatialisation of sectoral policies. Also environment policy should be examined how it can support plant and mussel aquaculture improving good environmental status.

17. Blue growth and carrying capacity

Despite many blue growth good practices the genuine one covering both blue growth and carrying capacity of the environment are scarce. The issue of carrying capacity is one of the least researched under MSP so far and it requires further support and investigations. There is a need of political

commitment to this issue at the HELCOM and VASAB level in order to enhance holistic collaboration between environmental and blue growth stakeholders and authorities.

18. Energy

Energy inclusion under MSP is equipped with numerous good practices so body of knowledge related to this issue is large. Still pending is support for multi-use of energy sites. Many questions remain open in this regard from technical to administrative and economic ones. A Baltic or European energy Vision will help a lot in this regard.

19. Marine Cultural heritage

There is a need to enhance the change of MSP approach towards MCH. The smaller UCH/MCH categories such as shipwrecks, lighthouses or the archaeological sites on a given area should be connected and analysed in order to define a protected underwater or maritime landscape area, also connected and analysed together with such issues like culturally and emotionally valuable areas. For development of this theme governance component will play a crucial role in the future.