



Report on Implementation and M&E mechanisms for MSPs in the Baltic Sea Region

Activity Leader: Angela Schultz-Zehden
SUBMARINER Network for Blue Growth EEIG





EU MSP Directive: *“MSP should cover the full cycle of problem and opportunity identification, information collection, planning, decision-making, implementation, revision or updating, and monitoring of implementation”*

Article 6: Member States to review their MSPs at least every ten years

Article 9: Relevant stakeholders and authorities, and the public concerned, have access to the plans once they are finalised ...

New BSR MSP Roadmap:

Joint actions to support implementation and follow-up of the MSP plans in relation to the regional MSP framework:

- ➔ Develop / share a concise and descriptive overview on national plans' implementation (what does implementation mean in different countries; where/when do they impact on decisions on certain projects, etc.)
- ➔ Develop a guiding framework to support harmonized evaluation of MSPs, including a set of definitions
- ➔ Develop a regional follow up system on MSP, including monitoring of implementation at the Baltic Sea level
- ➔ Facilitate exchange of information on best practices of MSP implementation, monitoring & evaluation across the BSR and other sea basins
- ➔ Analyse and support spatial efficiency by comparing approaches and solutions with regard to spatial use (e.g. exclusive vs multi-use)



CAPACITY4MSP



Aim: Identify mechanisms for Implementation and Monitoring & Evaluation of maritime spatial plans after their adoption ... and how to support them

“Implementation has to be shown much more clearly and consequences for other agencies/ministries assessed and monitored.”



CAPACITY4MSP

Almost no guidelines

*Much about MSP
development*

*Very little about
implementation*

Output: A report providing an overview of (foreseen) mechanisms across the BSR coupled with benchmarks from outside the BSR

- Types of MSPs; their provisions; responsibilities
- Ways of communication and governance structures
- Involvement of MSP authority in implementation decisions
- Adaptability of plans before a formal revision
- Foreseen structures for Monitoring & Evaluation

But hardly any guidelines ...

IOC MSP ,step-by-step‘ 2009, ,evaluation‘ 2014*

Definition: IMPLEMENTATION

is the process of converting MSPs into action or operating programs.

Most States will designate a ‘lead’ agency to coordinate and oversee the MSP implementation process: Single-sector management institutions will carry out most actions toward implementation of the marine plan. They can use the MSP as guides for permitting and other actions for which they are responsible.

Definition: ENFORCEMENT

actions that governments take to achieve compliance with regulations of human activities.

Enforcement usually includes:

- **Inspections;**
- **Negotiations**
- **Legal action**

Definition: COMPLIANCE

is the conformance to the requirements of the specific management actions of MSPs by relevant ocean users.

Definition: PERFORMANCE

MSP plans should be evaluated, not only by their outcomes, but for how they improve the understanding of decision makers and stakeholders about present / future problems and opportunities that planning presents to deal with problems in the present to avoid them in the future.

a) Conformance Evaluation:

- MSP as a Blue Print for how things should evolve
- Compare actual, observable development of the objectives of the plan.
- *Success = conformity to the plan*

b) Performance Evaluation:

- MSP a decision framework that gives guidance
- MSP raises important topics for regional and sectoral development
- *Success = If deviations can be justified and plan is used in decision-making process*



**BSR again
frontrunner ?**

What is regulated by whom?

Which sectors ?

MSP Authority or others responsible?

Various terms for **operational mechanisms**:

- Designations
 - Positive / Negative
 - All use zones
- Rules
- Regulations
- Measures
- Conditions
- Guidelines
- Guidance
- Conditions...

**Do the same words
mean the same?**



CAPACITY4MSP



Following MSP adoption, how are **plan mechanisms communicated?**

Communication Plans

- Large emphasis on development - hardly any country explicit communication plan for implementation
- Press; official gazettes; messages to those involved in MSP development
- Finland: MSP network (open to everyone)
- Sweden: Communication Plan under development



CAPACITY4MSP

Web-based Communication

Move from static pdf versions to inter-active web-portals

- Finland: Inter-active web-portal with more detail behind => to be developed into input platform (Eng)
- Denmark: digital plan (Eng)
- Estonia: aims to develop digital platform
- Sweden/Polish plans: web-portals (SE / PL)
- Germany: GeoSeaPortal

MMO/UK:

Large scale MSP roadshow

‘Explore marine plans’

- More user friendly
- Focused
- Functional
- Used for monitoring

Implementation / 'Action' Plans

Latvia: Actions in addition to MSP provisions

| SO1: Balanced use of the marine space, preventing inter-sectoral conflicts and preserving free space for future needs and opportunities | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------------|-----------|
| Measure | Result indicator | Who? | When? |
| 1.1. Update data on fishing intensity in the Baltic Sea | updated information | BIOR | Regularly |
| 1.2. Carry out research regarding the suitability of environmental conditions for the cultivation of different aquaculture species in the sea, assessing potential environmental risks and developing environmentally friendly technology suitable for Latvia's conditions. | N° of scientific studies | MoA with BIOR, MoEPRD with LIAE | Regularly |
| 1.4. Support public infrastructure development for growth of marine tourism in significant places in Latvias' territorial sea and coast, | Investment program for coast prepared. | MoEPRD, MoE, KPR, | 2024 |
| 1.5. Identify the underwater and marine cultural heritage assets of Latvia and develop guidelines for the management thereof. | Research carried out, guidelines developed | NCHB | 2030 |
| 1.6. Support renewable energy demonstration projects in the sea by raising eligible funds (foreign financial aid or State) | N° of energy facilities installed | MoE, MoF | 2030 |
| SO2: The marine ecosystem and its ability to regenerate is preserved, ensuring protection of biological diversity and averting excessive pressure from economic activities | | | |
| 2.1. Update information regarding ecologically significant areas and distribution and condition of biotopes/species | Report; potential MPAs identified. | MoEPRD, LHEI, DAP | 2030 |
| 2.2. Assess the distribution and supply of marine ecosystem services according to internationally approved methods. | Assessment prepared | LHEI | 2024 |
| SO3: ... promote development of maritime related businesses and required infrastructure | | | |
| 3.3. Develop a network of marinas and jetties ... | Increased N° of yachts served in ports | MoEPRD, MoT, KPR | 2030 |
| 3.3. Create model to determine impact of economic activities on sediment flow, assess process of coastal erosion and accumulation. | Study performed and model created | MoEPRD | 2030 |
| 3.4. Develop spatial measures to minimize erosion effects, incl. sites suitable for sand extraction for beach nourishment, places that require beach nourishment ... | Spatial measures developed in places with the highest risk | MoEPRD | 2030 |





How are MSP Authorities involved in implementation?

Legally Binding Plans

MSP have to be taken into account for subsequent plans / permits

- **Germany MV, Estonia, Denmark:** MSP Authorities have to approve
- **Latvia:** MSP Authority involved as part of Min Env role – large area specified as ‘area of further investigations’
- **Germany EEZ:** MSP Authority also in charge of OWF licenses & cables* / pipelines*: for other sectors more ‘stakeholder’

Strategic Plans

MSP strategic information and guidance documents

- **Finland:** Implementation with Regional Councils
- **Sweden:** MSP Authority part of process, but no veto right



MSP Coordination Groups

Countries with no coordination group

- Poland, Lithuania

Countries with coordination groups:

- **Denmark: Inter-Ministerial WG**
- **Latvia: MSP working group** from development phase (ministries, sectoral agencies, associations of local governments, trade organizations as well as various NGOs)
- **Estonia:** aims for **MSP Executive Board** (not established yet)
- **Germany: Informal Working Group of MSP authorities ...** but not related to specific planning, not inter-sectoral
- **Sweden:** plans to establish **MSP council** (national agencies, county administrative boards, municipalities, academia)'
- **Finland:** coordination group of **regional council MSP planners**



CAPACITY4MSP

Timeline for revision of given MSPs

| Country | MSP adopted | MSP revision | Remarks |
|------------|-------------|--------------------|---|
| Germany MV | 2016 | 2026 | No specific timeline; but generally 10 years horizon for cross-check |
| German EEZ | 2021 | | Revision of plans at least every 10 years; medium-term perspective with approx. 10 – 15 years |
| Poland | 2021 | | Plan to be assessed at least every 10 years |
| Lithuania | 2021 | | |
| Latvia | 2019 | 2026 – 2029 | In line with timeline of Sustainable Development Strategy of Latvia 2030; however, review planned together with MSFD reporting. |
| Estonia | 2021 | 2026 | Check for possible renewal starts after 5 years |
| Finland | 2021 | At the latest 2030 | Revision planned at time of MFSD update, that is by 2027 |
| Sweden | 2021 | 2029 | New plans, if needed; at least every 8 years |
| Denmark | 2021 | 2031 | 10 year horizon |



Adaptability of MSPs

When the context changes and new information becomes available...

- Can the plan be **adapted** within the set validity period?
- What **triggers plan changes** within the validity period?
- **Who is responsible** for making plan changes due to external factors?
- How are changes **made and communicated**?



CAPACITY4MSP

Adaptability of given MSPs

Countries, where possible:

- **Germany MV:** MSP authority may allow for 'justified non-compliance' (*activities forbidden in the plan or *new activities not foreseen) => try exception first; process for amendment of plan similar to plan development
- **Germany EEZ:** Deviations possible, if in line with objectives => sample: OWF higher if still not seen from coast
- **Latvia:** 1) Adaptations of factual information 2) Changes in strategic direction or zones: complex process => MSP working group / government approval
- **Denmark:** adaptation possible, but process not defined yet
- **Poland:** If necessary, Maritime Administration can change; also smaller plans can be prepared replacing partially existing and adopted plans (i.e. Gdansk Gulf)
- **Finland:** adaptation theoretically possible; but to be avoided as very complex

Countries, where not possible:

- **Sweden:** Planning evidence can be adapted; but no 'hanging parts' or updates of specific geographic areas => possible to revise only ONE out of the THREE MSPs
- **Estonia:** Only Action Plan can be adapted; but guidelines 'soft' so that open for interpretation
- **Lithuania:** ??



CAPACITY4MSP

To be cross-checked!

Monitoring & Evaluation Provisions



CAPACITY4MSP

| Country | Conformance | Performance | Remarks |
|------------|--|---|---|
| Germany MV | Past M&E | Future M&E | Complicated evaluation framework for 1 st MSP did not lead to useful information |
| German EEZ | For MSP goals & objectives | Decision-making, permissions by other sectors | Predominantly qualitative assessment of achievement of planning goals and impacts as part of background report for revision process. For MSP 2021 a comprehensive framework will be developed; but is not ready yet |
| Poland | YES | YES | No formal M&E Framework; reports by Maritime Offices to Minister for Maritime affairs at least every 10 years |
| Latvia | MSP goals & objectives MSP Action Plan Developments in designated zone | Designation of uses (licenses & permissions) | Action Plan can be cross-checked as well as further investigations in specific designated zone; developments at sea also possible in other than designated areas; if in accordance to strategic objectives |
| Estonia | Plan | Action Plan | With Action Plan try to check whether conditions will be developed to achieve MSP goals & objectives |
| Finland | YES | YES | Cross check influence of MSP on land-use planning, licenses, permissions; and resulting from this, whether MSP objectives met |
| Sweden | National MSP goals & objectives | YES | County Administrative Boards to 'check' whether municipal plans aligned with national MSP |
| Denmark | | Indicators | No framework yet; but M&E will also include performance check of MSP process |

Who is responsible & involved in M&E ?



CAPACITY4MSP

| Country | M&E Group | Stakeholder Involvement | Timing | Remarks |
|-------------------|--|---|------------------|--|
| Germany MV | No group: government process | Not planned | Not defined | Possibly involve external experts to do stocktake for collecting data for M&E as well as future MSP preparation |
| German EEZ | Scientific Advisory Council | | | Framework not yet developed / Scientific Advisory Council will be consulted in developing the M&E framework |
| Poland | No | Maritime Conference planned every two years | Yearly | No formal M&E Framework; reports by Maritime Offices to Minister for Maritime affairs |
| Latvia | MSP Working Group + | At least one bigger event planned per year | Upon need | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action Plan to be cross-checked once a year; • surveys planned; • align MSP M&E with MSFD report (2022-23) |
| Estonia | Option A: Executive Board Option B: Ask different ministries directly | Not planned | Not defined | M&E Framework not yet decided; but plan to engage different ministries to ask for input and review |
| Finland | MSP Planners Groups of Regional Councils | Planned to involve Open MSP Network | Yearly | Detailed M&E will be done via the MSP Coordination Group facilitated by a consultant |
| Sweden | M&E WG with 3 county admin boards | Planned – but not defined | Yearly follow up | SwAM currently develops M&E framework together with 3 county administrative boards and research experts as well as reference group from national agencies |
| Denmark | Inter-Ministerial working Group | Virtual Stakeholder Meetings | | No framework yet; but focus on involving stakeholders, municipalities, NGOs and relevant business |

Use of Indicators

Not possible to collect specific indicators yet ...

- **Latvia:** interim evaluation of plan implementation based on indicators and inviting stakeholders to provide comments on the mid-term reports
- **Sweden:** M&E Framework under development; focus on continuous collection of new input for possible renewal
- **Denmark:** Systematic data collection foreseen
- **Finland:** M&E Model based on EU MSP Platform Indicator ,checklists‘
 - Excel table with some 330 (!) indicators to match around 440 objectives.
 - Indicators will be shared with the stakeholder community as to get their opinion, which of these indicators may be most relevant for their plan and who may have the information to measure them.
 - In a further step these indicators shall also be used as to get feedback and collect information from stakeholders within the MSP Digital Platform

Germany MV: Rather negative experience in 1st MSP M&E

- now more based on performance, but not indicators



CAPACITY4MSP

*Do not go crazy
with indicators !*



CAPACITY4MSP

How is information collected?

- 1) **In countries where MSP authorities involved in decision-making; direct knowledge on licenses, etc.**
- 2) **Public Events**
- 3) **Surveys**
 - currently only planned in Latvia
 - web-based feedback planned in Finland

Benchmark from MMO/UK for use of surveys

- For regular M&E reports every three years
- Takes one hour to be filled.
- In reality also for survey not large number of stakeholders; e.g. East Marine Plan survey send to 25 (2014), 5 (2016), 10 (2018); 27 (2019)
- Answers often: 'do not know'
- Surveys followed up by interviews: get consistent stakeholder group
- Monitoring & Evaluation: more on basis of policy / licenses



How is information collected?

- 1) In countries where MSP authorities involved in decision-making; direct knowledge on licenses, etc.
- 2) Public Events
- 3) Surveys
 - currently only planned in Latvia



CAPACITY4MSP

Message from Finland, Latvia, Sweden:

Align MSP related data sourcing with MFSD reports

- in reality also for survey not large number of stakeholders, e.g. East Marine Plan survey send to 25 (2014), 5 (2016), 10 (2018); 27 (2019)
- Answers often: 'do not know'
- Surveys followed up by interviews: get consistent stakeholder group
- Monitoring & Evaluation: more on basis of policy / licenses



Beyond national processes – cross-border cooperation

- How should other countries be informed about plan implementation?
- How should they be informed when changes may impact them?



CAPACITY4MSP

- No formal obligation so far
- Change reporting formats within HELCOM-VASAB MSP Working Group => How to achieve meaningful implementation reports?
As implementation takes longer – once a year sufficient?
- Maintain Planners Forum to keep each other informed (informally) => as shown: justified as all MSP planners informed about implementation
- Regionally coherent monitoring and evaluation framework => ex-post AND ex-ante
 - Minimum set of joint questions to stakeholders?
 - Minimum set of joint ex-ante external data collection?



THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION!

Follow-up: asz@submariner-network.eu



Swedish Agency
for Marine and
Water Management

