



Document title	Summary of questionnaire results on the MSP Roadmap update
Code	2-1
Category	INF
Agenda Item	2 - Update of the Regional MSP Roadmap
Submission date	4.5.2020
Submitted by	HELCOM and VASAB Secretariats
Reference	

Background

The [Outcome](#) of the 20th meeting of the HELCOM-VASAB MSP Working Group included a link to an online questionnaire (item 3.5). It collected expert inputs from the WG members and observers on the scope and focus of the new MSP Roadmap. This document presents a summary of the input received by April 29th from seven countries and one observer.

Action requested

The meeting is invited to take note on the information provided in this document

Summary of the questionnaire results on the MSP Roadmap update

The HELCOM-VASAB MSP Working Group members and observers were invited to give their views on the update of the MSP Roadmap. The input was expected to be given as expert contributions and not to reflect the contracting parties official positions. The views were collected in an online [questionnaire](#). It had five questions:

- 1) What will be different and/or important for the time period after 2021 in relation to the current MSP Roadmap and the time when it was written?
- 2) What type (format) of new Roadmap would be needed and what would be its role?
- 3) What should be the main focuses of the overall goal in the new Roadmap?
- 4) What should be the KEY elements for the “new Roadmap”?
- 5) What would be the time period for the next roadmap?

The questionnaire included also a section to give other comments.

This document – that is a background for further work on the update of the MSP Roadmap – presents a summary of the responses to each question. Inputs were received from seven countries and from one observer. All responses are available in the original survey, but here were aimed to identify common threads and also to show the range of topics raised in the inputs. We do indicate also how many times certain topics were mentioned in the responses, but at this stage the assessment of the “merit and worth” of inputs should not be based only on frequency of responses. At this “brainstorming” phase an input can be valuable even if it is mentioned only once. A summary table at the end of each section presents the overview of responses.

The questions 1, 3, and 4 as well as the additional comments relate to the contents or the overall goal of the next roadmap. The figure below gives an overview of the themes and topics raised in the survey.

Implementation	Multi-lateral governance / impact of MSP solutions	Environmental objectives / EBA	Data & tools	Intergovernmental cooperation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share the best practices • Transboundary coherence • Monitoring & Evaluation • Review of plans <p>THEMES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • multi-use concept • social-economic impacts • social sustainability • Climate change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • collaboration / alignment with sectors • Sector policies & MSP’s role in steering sectoral decision making • land-sea interactions • studies on the relationship between sectoral planning and MSP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BSAP • CBDs 30% MPA • EBA • Green infrastructure • Ecosystem services • cumulative environmental impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • collect & exchange data what & how • technological development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Call for joint vision of the Baltic Sea / towards visionary MSP in BSR • BSR’s MSP in global context • EUSBSR & HA Spatial Planning • update of H-V guidelines & principles • regular follow-up of Roadmap • best practices & learning (also - education)

1) What will be different and/or important for the time period after 2021 in relation to the current MSP Roadmap and the time when it was written?

The responses pointed out to the new situation after 2021 when all EU countries have at least their first round MSP plans in place and approved. Then **implementation of the MSP plans** is topical. The **BSR countries can learn a lot from each other** on the practices of MSP implementation – and of the experiences of the recent MSP planning round. It was also pointed out that cross-border coherence in implementation of the plans is important.

Themes	How many mentions?*
Focus on implementation	6
Share best practices in implementation	4
Coherence in implementation	5

* It should be noted that the number of how many times certain topics is partly based on an interpretation of the responses as we aim to summarise the responses into broader categories. Topics are taken from the responses and most the responses were unambiguous.

Another topic mentioned regularly is **monitoring of impacts and implementation** of the plans. There is also a need to **evaluate the plans** with the view on the next planning rounds.

Themes	How many mentions?
Monitoring & Evaluation	7

Many inputs commented MSP in relation to the broader context of implementation. For instance, **MSP's relationship to broader developments** (sector policies, climate change, EU Green Deal, BSAP, EUSBSR, CBD's 30% MPA targets) should be followed in the next rounds of MSP planning. It was also mentioned that **MSP's role in steering sectoral decision-making should be strengthened**. MSP's role in **achieving environmental objectives** (GES, EBA) and checking for environmental impacts and unintended consequences was also remarked.

Themes	How many mentions?
Follow broader developments	3
MSP's contribution to GES, env. impacts	4
MSP to stronger guide sectors	2

New **MSP data practices** and especially rapid **development of information technological** was mentioned as a development to be considered in the coming years.

Themes	How many mentions?
MSP data and technol. development	2

Two of the respondents called for development of the **joint BSR level MSP vision**. One input mentioned **land-sea interaction** as a topic for the next period.

Themes	How many mentions?
BSR level MSP vision	2
Land-Sea interaction	1

Overall it seems that respondents did not focus only on possible future developments that should be taken into account as an operational environment for the next period of MSP Roadmap. Quite many of the respondents considered rather directly the relevant contents for the next roadmap.

Thematic clustering of the responses to the question 1:

Implementation	Broader developments	Environmental objectives	Data & tools	Call for joint vision of the Baltic Sea
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Share the best practices •Coherence •Monitoring & Evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Sector policies & MSP's role in steering sectoral decision making •Climate change •EU Green Deal •EUSBSR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •BSAP •CBDs 30% MPA •Environmental impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •collect & exchange data what & how 	

2) What type (format) of new Roadmap would be needed and what would be its role?

The question asked whether the next roadmap should be strategic document or should it present concrete actions? Most of the responders were of an opinion that the new roadmap should, in fact, cover both aspects. The document should have clear strategic objectives, but it should also present concrete actions that would guide the work of the HELCOM-VASAB MSP WG. Concrete actions could be presented as best practice, too. It was mentioned also that the concrete actions could be in the working group's work plan. Three responses were in favour of a strategic document

Themes	How many mentions?
Strategic with concrete actions	6
Strategic	3

3) What should be the main focuses of the overall goal in the new Roadmap?

The third question asked which aspects should be included in **the overall goal** of the new roadmap. We did not yet ask to give suggestions for phrasing of the goal, only topics and focuses. However, some of the responses were written in a way that included almost suggestions for the elements of the new goal. Below were summarise the main topics referred to and give also some examples of the texts.

Common topics mentioned were **monitoring** and **evaluation of effects and impacts**. A related topic of **revision or reviews of the exiting plans** were mentioned also. Development of **data, including monitoring data**, was brought out by three respondents. The **ecosystem-based approach** was suggested as a topic for the next MSP Roadmap's goal often.

Themes	How many mentions?
Monitoring and evaluation	7
Ecosystem-based approach	5
Review of the plans	4
Data development (monitoring)	3

Other types of topics to be included in the overall goal were **improvement of cross-border coherence** and **improved collaboration with sectors**. Land-Sea interaction was mentioned once.

Themes	How many mentions?
Improve coherence	3
Collaboration with sectors	3
Land-Sea interaction	1

Here are some examples from the responses

DK: *MSP's should be implemented and monitored, and the coherence of the plans should continuously be developed.*

FI: *Continue developing the coherence of the plans (including data) and to improve the connections to MSFD and applying ecosystem approach.*

LV: *Establishment of closer cooperation not only between planning authorities, but also between planning authorities and main sectorial stakeholders.*

PL: *The overall goal should be coherent spatial governance of the Baltic Sea, as well as to monitor, evaluate regional plans and draw conclusions for future plans (in international context). So, we should focus on aligning several sectors to work coherently. We should also focus on minimum coherence among spatial solutions between countries.*

SE: *...development of interlinked national MSP-systems (including implementation, follow-up, revision and management) supported by a common BSR MSP-framework. Including methods for strengthening a BSR-perspectives in national MSP... "Ecosystem based MSP in the BSR contributing to sustainable use, development of sustainable Blue Economy and harmonised (environmental) management"*

Cluster of proposals for the new overall goal:

Implementation	Multi-lateral governance / impact of MSP solutions	Ecosystem approach	Development of data
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Monitoring of implementation and impacts (effectiveness) •Actions towards reviews of existing plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •collaboration / alignment with sectors •land-sea interactions •studies on the relationship between sectoral planning and MSP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •connections to MSFD •tools & methods •data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •share & exchange what and how •data for monitoring •data for coherence

4) What should be the KEY elements for the “new Roadmap”?

The question on key elements of the new roadmap gained very diverse responses. They are mostly very well in line to responses to questions 1 and 3. These responses need to be compared to the seven themes in the current roadmap to check what is new.

Common topics that were brought up were **monitoring and evaluation** and related **review of plans**. Collaboration in **MSP data** considering technological development was found important, as well. The **ecosystem-based approach** was suggested several times. Some of these responses related green infrastructure (GI) methodology and ecosystem services (ESS) to the EBA. **Land-Sea interaction** was also one of the top proposals. This is possibly the only remarkable difference to the responses to questions 1 and 3, in which land-sea interaction was mentioned, but not as commonly.

Themes	How many mentions?
Monitoring & evaluation	7
MSP data	6
Ecosystem-based approach (incl. GI, ESS)	5
Land-Sea interaction	5
Review of plans	2
Education for MSP	1

Cross-border coherence was mentioned by three responders.

Several topics mentioned only once or twice. Two times were mentioned: **climate change, update of the existing guidelines, best practices and learning, cumulative environmental impacts and socio-economic impacts**. Only one time were mentioned: **multi-use, social sustainability and BSR's MSP in global context**. **Education of MSP** was also mentioned. The topic of **stakeholders** was mentioned twice, but in opposite meanings. One response listed stakeholder as one of the main themes, while another maintained that "We do not need public participation theme as we are not actively planning any more and the guidelines for that is already in place." (possibly as a response to the previous?)

Cluster of proposals, integrating also responses from Q.1, Q.3 and general comments that all deal with the content of the roadmap or its goal.

Implementation	Multi-lateral governance / impact of MSP solutions	Environmental objectives / EBA	Data & tools	Intergovernmental cooperation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share the best practices • Transboundary coherence • Monitoring & Evaluation • Review of plans <p>THEMES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • multi-use concept • social-economic impacts • social sustainability • Climate change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • collaboration / alignment with sectors • Sector policies & MSP's role in steering sectoral decision making • land-sea interactions • studies on the relationship between sectoral planning and MSP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BSAP • CBDs 30% MPA • EBA • Green infrastructure • Ecosystem services • cumulative environmental impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • collect & exchange data what & how • technological development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Call for joint vision of the Baltic Sea / towards visionary MSP in BSR • BSR's MSP in global context • EUSBSR & HA Spatial Planning • update of H-V guidelines & principles • regular follow-up of Roadmap • best practices & learning (also - education)

5) What would be the time period for the next roadmap?

A common suggestion for the time period to be covered by the new roadmap is seven or approximately seven years, similar to the current roadmap. The new period according to these responses would be 2021-2027. Three responses suggested 10 years, although it was mentioned that there should be a 5-year mid-term review. One suggested approximately 5 years.

Themes	How many mentions?
Approx. 2021-2027	5
10 years	3
5 years	1

Comments on the period suggested also comparison of **different BSR countries MSP plan review cycles** as well as to taking into account emerging policy areas and topics before agreeing on the definite period. Consideration of the **MSFD review cycles** were also mentioned. The **update of BSAP** and its new period as well as the **VASAB long-term perspective** were also mentioned as important processes to follow while deciding on the period. Finally, it was brought up that the mandate given to the HELCOM-VASAP MSP working group is an important factor when considering the new roadmap

6) Other comments

The questionnaire allowed also giving comments other than the ones asked about. One of the comments was about **education** as being an important topic. It was, however, mentioned that education is included in the current roadmap, but it has been a particularly complicated topic to implement.

Another comment pointed out that there is a need to discuss on **which level the new roadmap should be adopted or decided**.

The third comment was that the update of the MSP Roadmap is an opportunity to move forward with a **visionary MSP for the BSR**.