

D43 (D2.23)
Report of Technical
Workshops
V workshop

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The work described in this report was supported by the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund of the European Union- through the Grant Agreement number 887390 - MSPMED-EMFF-MSP-2019, corresponding to the Call for proposal Call EMFF-MSP-2019 (Maritime Spatial Planning) Topic: EMFF-MSP-2019 Type of action: EMFF-AG for Projects on Maritime Spatial Planning (MSP).

DISCLAIMER

The content of this report represents the views of the author only and is his/her sole responsibility; it cannot be considered to reflect the views of the European Commission and/or the Executive Agency for Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (EASME) or any other body of the European Union. The European Commission and the Agency do not accept any responsibility for use that may be made of the information it contains.

Project Full Title	Towards the operational implementation of MSP in our common Mediterranean Sea
Project Acronym	MSP-MED
Gant Agreement Nr.	887390
Project Website	www.mspmed.eu

Deliverable Nr.	D25 (D2.22)
Status (Final/Draft/Revised)	Draft
Work Package	WP2 – Setting-up Maritime Spatial Plans
Task Number	2.7 – Sharing experiences among countries
Responsible Institute	CORILA
Author/s	Hadi El Hage, Folco Soffietti, Martina Bocci, Camille Assali
Infographics	Folco Soffietti
Recommended Citation	
Dissemination Level (Public/Partnership)	Partnership

Document History			
Version	Date	Modification Introduced	
		Modification Reason	Modified by
1	09/11/2021	Creation	CORILA
2	24/11/2021	Revision	All partners

INDEX

Introduction	6
Programme	14
Participants	15
Introduction and Greetings	16
Presentations by Guest Institutions	18
Mediterranean Approaches - Competent Authorities	24
Roundtable Discussion	45
Conclusions and Debriefing	48
Essential References	50

MSP-MED | 5th Technical Workshop

8th November 2021 (9:30-13:00 CET)

Stakeholder Engagement in MSP

Introduction

MSP relies on the correct allocation of activities in space and time and, therefore the relationship between planners and competent authorities, with different stakeholders is a cornerstone of the planning process. Active engagement can increase the efficiency of the plans, both by highlighting points of need and by ensuring participation and sense of belonging.

Stakeholder engagement has a broad spectrum of participation beyond information sharing and consultation. It involves understanding needs and interests of stakeholders, collaboratively defining targets, seeking consensus and agreements, and jointly implementing initiatives and monitoring progress over time (Susskind et al. 1999).

Why is it important to tackle this topic?

Engaging key stakeholders in the development of plans is essential for several reasons that encompass from issue identification, evidence gathering, consensus building up to monitoring and evaluation. In fact, MSP aims to reach outcomes affecting different sectors of society (social, economic and ecological) and should therefore reflect major expectations, synergies or conflicts occurring in the MSP area.

Stakeholder engagement in MSP is a complex asset of the plans because of the great number and diversity of maritime stakeholders in different levels (horizontal and vertically). Furthermore, MSP is a relatively recent process and, as such, many actors are still unfamiliar with it. Also, the identification of relevant stakeholders is not always a simple task. Eventually the transboundary dimension can represent an additional challenge to the engagement.

The MSP Directive expresses engagement as a necessary asset to consider when preparing maritime spatial plans. In fact, the EU Directive 2014/89/EU makes several references to this use of stakeholder engagement:

Art 9, *Public participation* states that:

- 1. Member States shall establish means of public participation by informing all interested parties and by consulting the relevant stakeholders and authorities, and the public concerned, at an early stage in the development of maritime spatial plans, in accordance with relevant provisions established in Union legislation.
- 2. Member States shall also ensure that the relevant stakeholders and authorities, and the public concerned, have access to the plans once they are finalised.

The UNESCO's guide *Marine Spatial Planning A Step by Step Approach toward Ecosystem-Based Management* has a dedicated chapter on the issue and key expected results of stakeholder engagement are listed:

- To encourage 'ownership' of the spatial planning process and final plan, engender trust among stakeholders and decision-makers, and encourage voluntary compliance with rules and regulations;
- To gain a better understanding of the complexity (spatial, temporal, and other) of the marine management area;
- To gain a better understanding of the human influences on the marine management area;
- To deepen mutual and shared understanding about the problems and challenges in the marine management area;
- To gain a better understanding of underlying (often sector-oriented) desires, perceptions and interests that stimulate and/or prohibit integration of policies in the marine management area;
- To examine existing and potential compatibility and/or conflicts of multiple use objectives of the marine management area;
- To generate new options and solutions that may not have been identified in single-sector planning;

- To expand and diversify the capacity of the marine planning team, in particular through the inclusion of secondary and tertiary information, for example, local knowledge and traditions.

Stakeholders involvement may take different forms, degrees of participation and influence on the process, depending on desired goals that range from general and strategic MSP issues to the preparation of concrete maritime spatial plans.




Figure 1. Different types of stakeholders participation (Adapted from Bouamrane M. (2006) in IOC-UNESCO, 2009)

In recent years the employment of online platforms and social media has improved the possibility of reaching wider audiences. The effect of this communication trend on MSP is expected to better plans and plan adaptation.

Stakeholders engagement ensures that the plan design is aligned with real needs proposed by real actors (bottom-up approach) and allows endorsement of the plan's measures and indications (top-down approach).

What were the objectives of this fifth MSP-MED technical workshop?

This workshop, built on past Mediterranean and European experiences (PartiSEApate, Adriplan, etc.) and was an opportunity to share among the partners the national approaches to stakeholder engagement, especially with regard to stakeholder consultations that are part of the creation and delivery of national plans towards the 2021 deadline.

The main goals of this workshop were to explore how stakeholders were identified, to review different activities undertaken to actively engage stakeholders (workshops, webinars, surveys, interviews, informal contacts, etc.) and to share different techniques and technologies employed in the process, for instance national portals and 'purpose built game based applications.

What was addressed during this fifth technical workshop?

Giving the multiple aspects of stakeholder engagement that could be addressed, the event was subdivided as follow: (1) greetings, (2) presentation from guest institutions on best practices for engagement; (3) national sessions and following debate, aimed at sharing and discussing more in detail the national strategies. Possible topics of discussion:

Identification of Stakeholders and engagement strategy

Cross- Sectoral engagement:

Institutional Stakeholders/ Private sector Stakeholders/ NGOs / research institutions / Foundations / Universities

Public consultation online using national portals.

Public consultation in Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs)

Stakeholder Engagement in the transboundary dimension (transboundary consultations)

ATTENTION:

The event was conducted with interactive sessions via Slido, code: #900322

Link <https://app.sli.do/event/jsjoetc7>

1) Guest institutional overview

WWF Italy

Scalability: Stakeholders engagement through EB-MSP approach in Southern Italy

Defining new No-Take Zones in the MPA of Torre Guaceto and in the SAC Torre Guaceto Macchia San Giovanni requires engagement of fishers and other relevant stakeholders as well as science-based approaches through a conservation planning decision-support tool. Those strategies can be applied at different scales to enable national plans. The case study proposed by WWF Italy offer practical assets that can be applied in other contexts and at different scales.

Finland:

Finland's national draft Maritime Spatial Plan 2030, covering its territorial waters and exclusive economic zone, was completed on 18 May, 2020 in keeping with the Land Use and Building Act (132/1999).

The draft Maritime Spatial Plan and its key preparatory materials were on display online at

merialuesuunnitelma.fi between 18 May and 17 June, 2020. The materials were available in Finnish and Swedish and, in essential respects, in English.

The draft Maritime Spatial Plan was only provided in a digital format, but the draft plan map, the draft plan's zones and markings, a report entitled Impact assessment of the Finnish Maritime Spatial Plan and many background reports were also available as printable PDF versions. (Finnish MSP Cooperation, 2020).

A large-scale, interactive engagement process that also proposed visions and scenarios in addition to the draft plan, the results can be of real interest for countries now entering the consultation phase or finalizing it and reviewing received inputs.

Questions for guest institutions:

WWF Italy:

- Please introduce the general context and strategies employed in mapping and engaging fishers and relevant stakeholders.
- Which were the main gaps and limitations encountered in the stakeholder's engagement process and ways to overcome them?
- Please report on how inputs from stakeholders were paired with data tools in supporting design of protected areas and no-take zones.

Finland, Finnish MSP Cooperation:

- Please introduce the platform-survey method, contents and design employed for public consultation.
- Which were the main gaps and limitations encountered in their stakeholder engagement processes and ways to overcome them?
- Please identify the different levels and types of stakeholders that were engaged (i.e. national/regional/local – institutional/sectorial/general public) and in which phases of the process.

2) Mediterranean approaches

Presentations from Competent Authorities

These series of presentations from Mediterranean Competent Authorities (10'-15' per country) were aimed to explain their stakeholder's engagement approaches in the different

steps of the MSP planning processes, and which inputs from stakeholder contributions have been implemented in the plan.

Each of the presentation to be followed by 5' of Q&A

Proposed question for national authorities/partners on national approaches:

- Which methodology did you use to conduct a proper stakeholders' consultation in different levels (i.e. questionnaires, meetings, interviews, workshops, etc.)?
- For what steps of the MSP process did you conduct stakeholder consultations? How did you proceed? Before decision making: initial assessment, stakes evaluation (environmental, economic and social),
When elaborating plans: scenarios building, zoning/measure elaboration,
For the mandatory consultation on drafted plans (before adoption).
- Is the information obtained from public consultation used in the same way in the MSP national process, regardless the type of stakeholder consulted (i.e. NGOs, administrative bodies, private sectors)?
- Feedback from national experiences: were stakeholder categories more involved than others? Did you face difficulties (stakeholder understanding, stakeholder availability,...).
- How to deal with difficult topics/decisions (when there are conflicts of interest for example...).
- Is there any protocol to identify and engage stakeholders in a formal way?
- Is there any other stakeholder engagement process in your country which could be useful for the MSP process (i.e. approval of management plans of Natura 2000 sites)?
- After the mandatory process of consultation (for the approval of MSP Plans and SEA), what are the next steps to continue with stakeholders' participation in the National MSP process?
- In a transboundary consultation with third countries, are there any protocols for formal or technical participation?

- Considering that, in general, transboundary consultations are developed just institutionally, have non-institutional levels the chance to participate in a consultation for MSP (i.e. fishing sector from other country)?

-

Q&A Sessions:

Participants will be given the opportunity to ask questions to presenters via Slido.

3) Round Table

Further questions to help comparison of Stakeholder Engagement Processes

Participants were given the possibility to elect the most relevant questions via Slido: #900322

Each panellist was asked to share his/her reflexion in maximum 3' answer for each of the 3 topics.

1/ Dealing with multiple stakeholder categories:

MSP processes should involve a broad range of stakeholders' categories, from economic sectors to the general public, not having the same organisational level, appropriation skills or time to dedicate to the multiple consultations. How to deal with this variety and engage the whole range of stakeholders? Are there key stakeholder categories to be engaged?

Guiding questions:

- Which stakeholders were more responsive? Are some stakeholders' categories more difficult to involve?
- What were the key sectors engagement-wise?
Did engagement processes foster exchanges (and maybe cooperation) between different stakeholders' categories?
- What solutions can be found to involve non-institutionalized or represented communities that may wish to express their views (e.g. recreational seafarers)?
- Would a specific program or section of a platform be useful to be implemented in the official/legal process? How and where would it be better to advertise it?

- Was the general public aware and engaged?

2/ Ensuring stakeholders' understanding of MSP plans and promoting their ownership.

MSP aims to be holistic, integrating lots of interlinked topics and issues. As a result, released maritime plans often end up being complex and very large and therefore, difficult to be understood and appropriated by stakeholders. How to address this ownership challenge?

Guiding questions:

- Were there stakeholders that found the plan too strategic? or others that would only be engaged with specific issues?
- How can the plan be opened up (communicated and explained) to stakeholders, so that the plan is felt as owned by everyone and fully endorsed to achieve ambitious goals?

3/ Further perspectives to enhance engagement in the future MSP processes.

Now that the first MSP plans are adopted, next steps are effective implementation and then, evaluation and revision. How to build on the experience of the first plans elaboration to improve engagement processes for the future steps?

Guiding questions:

- Should stakeholders' engagement for MSP be refined/ further declined compared to other plan engagement processes?
- Would you like to share successful examples of practical engagement strategies? Any failure example to be avoided?

Programme

Program	
09:30	<p>Introduction and greetings (5 min each):</p> <p>MSPMED: <i>Pierpaolo Campostrini</i> (CORILA)</p> <p>Warm-up session (wordcloud)</p> <p>WS Facilitator: Hadi El Hage</p>
09:50	<p>Presentations by guest institutions (15 min each)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WWF Italy (Andrea Zanella) - Finland, Finnish MSP Cooperation (Pohja-Mykrä Mari) <p>Proposed Rapporteur: Martina Bocci</p>
10:30	Virtual Coffee Break
10:40	<p>Mediterranean approaches: Presentations from Competent Authorities (20 min each, 5 of which in Q&A sessions)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Spain - France - Italy - Greece - Slovenia - Malta <p>Proposed Rapporteur: Camille Assali</p> <p>Round Table (1h15)</p> <p>Proposed Rapporteur: Folco Soffietti</p>
13:00	Debriefing and conclusions

Participants

MSP-MED Partners	
CORILA -IUAV-CNR	<i>Pierpaolo Campostrini, Andrea Barbanti, Daniele Brigolin, Federico Fabbri, Fabio Carella, Folco Soffietti, Hadi El Hage, Alessandro Sarretta, Amedeo Fadini, Martina Bocci</i>
PA	<i>Michelle Borg, Alexia Vella</i>
Shom	<i>Armelle Sommier, Adeline Souf</i>
OFB	<i>Camille Assali</i>
RRC Koper	<i>Slavko Mezek, Lenča Humerca Šolar</i>
UTH	<i>Harry Coccossis</i>
YPEN	<i>Efi Stefani, Elena Lalou, Evgenia Lagiou, Anna Spyropoulou</i>
IEO	<i>Cristina Cervera Núñez, Mónica Campillos Llanos, Elena Gutiérrez Ruiz</i>
MSP Competent Authorities	
Ministry of Transports and Infrastructures (Italy)	-
Ministry for the Sea (France)	-
MSP Technical Committee (Malta)	-
Ministry of Environment and Energy (Greece)	<i>Efi Stefani, Evgenia Lagiou, Anna Spyropoulou Elena Lalou</i>
Ministry for the Ecological Transition and the Demographic Challenge – DG for the coasts and the sea (Spain)	<i>Aurora Mesa Fraile, Sagrario Arrieta Algarra</i>
Other Institutions	
Finnish MSP Cooperation	<i>Pohja-Mykrä Mari</i>
WWF Italy	<i>Andrea Zanella</i>

Introduction and Greetings

GREETINGS AND INTRODUCTION

PIERPAOLO CAMPOSTRINI
(CORILA-MSPMED COORDINATOR)

STAKEHOLDERS ENGAGEMENT IS A EUROPEAN MINIMUM REQUIREMENT FOR MSP BUT IS ALSO IMPORTANT TO ENSURE PARTICIPATION AND OWNERSHIP OF THE PLAN FROM THE CITIZENS.

AS INDICATED BY THE UNESCO GUIDE TO MSP IT IS THE NECESSARY TOOL TO MEET REAL NEEDS PROPOSED BY REAL ACTORS (BOTTOM-UP APPROACH) AND AT THE SAME TIME IT ALLOWS ENDORSEMENT OF THE PLAN'S MEASURES AND INDICATIONS (TOP-DOWN APPROACH).



IT IS ALSO AN INSTRUMENT OF COOPERATION AMONG MEMBER STATES (USING TRANSBOUNDARY SEAS)!

GENERAL FACILITATOR
HADI EL HAGE

WARM-UP SESSION
A WORD CLOUD:
"NAME AN IMPORTANT TOOL TO ENGAGE STAKEHOLDERS"



THE MAIN GOALS OF THIS WORKSHOP ARE TO EXPLORE:

IDENTIFICATION OF STAKEHOLDERS AND ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY

CROSS-SECTORAL ENGAGEMENT: INSTITUTIONAL STAKEHOLDERS/PRIVATE SECTOR STAKEHOLDERS/NGOs/RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS/FOUNDATIONS/UNIVERSITIES

PUBLIC CONSULTATION ONLINE USING NATIONAL PORTALS

PUBLIC CONSULTATION IN STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS (SEAs)

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT IN THE TRANSBOUNDARY DIMENSION (TRANSBOUNDARY CONSULTATIONS)

The meeting was attended by an average of 30 people, and facilitated by Hadi El Hage (IUAV) who introduced the meeting schedule.

Official greetings and introduction were offered by Dr. Pierpaolo Campostri (CORILA), the Project Coordinator of MSPMED, that reminded the importance of stakeholders engagement and expressed the importance of the transboundary consultation with EU countries and third countries.

Dr Campostrini explained the EU requirements by mentioning the Directive 2014/89/EU. The MSP Directive clearly indicates Stakeholder Engagement as a minimum requirement for MSP Plans. Furthermore, it ensures public participation in the process.

The pairing of Bottom-up and Top-down approaches is considered as beneficial because Stakeholder engagement ensures that the plan design is aligned with real needs proposed by real actors (bottom-up approach) and at the same time it allows endorsement of the plan's measures and indications (top-down approach).

The workshop objectives were briefly presented with the aim that the discussion will shed more insight on tools used to explore how stakeholders were identified, what different activities were undertaken to actively engage stakeholders (workshops, webinars, surveys, interviews, informal contacts, etc.) and which different techniques and technologies were employed in the process.

A "word cloud" warm up exercise was done to serve as an useful tool to engage with the audience. The statement was: *"Name an important tool to engage in stakeholders"* Some of the main and recurrent answers were: workshops, effective communication, online tools, public consultation, etc.





Guest institutions

Andrea Zanella (WWF) presented the **Scalability: Stakeholders Engagement through EB-MSP approach in Southern Italy**

ANDREA ZANELLA – WWF ITALY

WWF IS SUPPORTING THE SCALING-UP OF CO-MANAGED, FINANCIALLY SUSTAINABLE NO-TAKE ZONES AND MPAS TO IMPROVE THEIR MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT CREATION OF NEW NTZs IN THE MED.

IN TORRE GUACETO, AN MPA IS ALREADY ESTABLISHED, OF 2200 HA, WITH 6 FISHING BOATS STILL ALLOWED TO ENTER.

THE NEW MPA IS EXPECTED TO BE LARGER, 6200 HA AND 33 KM OF COASTLINE. THERE IS TO DEAL WITH MANY STAKEHOLDERS.

NEXT ACTIVITIES:

MAPPING OF SOCIOECONOMIC ACTIVITIES IN THE NEW AREA.
MARXAN ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES TO PROPOSE ALTERNATIVE SCENARIOS.

A WRITTEN AGREEMENT BETWEEN ALL THE STAKEHOLDERS.

DONE:

MANY MEETINGS WITH FISHERS TOOK PLACE, TRYING TO FIGURE OUT THEIR POINT OF VIEW, THE PROBLEMS OF LACK OF SURVEILLANCE AND ILLEGAL FISHING.

MEETINGS WITH RECREATIONAL FISHERS TO AVOID CONFLICTS AND ALSO:
LEGHE NAVALI
FIRAS
TOURISTIC SECTOR.

MONITORING OF ACTIVITIES AND OF BIOMASS DISTRIBUTION.

DEVELOPMENT OF A NETWORK FOR IMPROVED SURVEILLANCE.

SAME APPROACH WILL BE USED IN MOLAT MPA, CROATIA.

Zanella started by sharing experience from the case study of the Torre Guaceto MPA which was implemented within the framework of a MAVA Foundation project with the goal to improve conservation in the coastal area, management of small-scale fishery and management of the MPA. In the MPA only a very limited number of fishing boats is allowed. The WWF representative mentioned that the lack of surveillance and illegal fishing are the main challenges in this MPA.

There is a plan to extend the MPA from the current 2200 ha to 6200 ha. This would lead to an increase in management challenges, given the fact that a larger area would be even more difficult to be surveyed.

Stakeholders engagement through EB-MSP approach in Southern Italy

▷ The case study of Torre Guaceto MPA

Current MPA

- 2200 ha (185 ha core area)
- 6 fishing boats allowed to fish inside the MPA

New MPA

- The MPA asked to extend its boundaries to the marine SAC
- About 6200 ha & 33km of coastline

Challenges:

Many more stakeholders and interests involved



Co-funded by the European
Maritime and Fisheries Fund

The following actions of stakeholder engagement were undertaken:

- Meetings with local fishers – fishing both inside and outside the area – were organized to understand their problems and try to find shared solutions pointing out that a main problem is lack of surveillance, illegal fishing and conflict with recreational fishers.
- Recreational fishing sector was engaged with the aim to find a common agreement for the creation of a no-take zone in the extended MPA area. Monitoring of recreational fishing was also started with land and sea-side observatories.
- In parallel, workshops were also organised, at national level, with MPA managers, judges, port authorities and finance police to understand the challenges in surveillance of MPA and identify common solutions.

The next steps in the process are to map socio-economic activities in the extended areas and apply the Marxan tool to propose a series of different scenarios considering the MPA boundaries extension.

As a result of the whole process, a written agreement will be prepared with all stakeholders as the basis for a new management plan of the MPA. The support of the local community is essential, particularly in a context of lack of surveillance.

The same approach is going to be applied also in another site of the MAVA project in the Adriatic sea: the Molat MPA in Croatia. The main key messages discussed were:


- Stakeholder engagement is used to understand real needs, challenges of maritime sectors, the conflicts they suffer and build trust
- Planning process (in this case planning of new environmental protection measures) is put in place to find solution to the challenges, manage the conflicts and improve marine conservation
- For effective marine environmental protection participation and empowerment of local stakeholders and community is key

Mari Pohja-Mykra - Finnish Maritime Spatial Planning Cooperation

MARI POHJA-MYKRÄ-FINNISH MSP COOPERATION


MARITIME SPATIAL PLAN 2030 FOR FINLAND CONSISTS OF THREE MARITIME SPATIAL PLANS IN THREE AREAS, IT IS A STRATEGIC PLAN.

EIGHT COASTAL REGIONAL COUNCILS TOGETHER WITH CIVIL SERVANTS FROM THE MINISTRY OF THE ENVIRONMENT FORMED THE MSP COORDINATION GROUP. PLUS EXPERTISE GROUPS. THE MSP COOPERATION COORDINATES.



STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT STARTED VERY EARLY IN THE PROCESS AND INFORMED ALL THE PLANNING PHASES.

FORMAL CONSULTATIONS WERE ALSO DONE IN BOTH SPRING 2019 AND IN SPRING 2020, TACKLING ALL TECHNICAL CONTENTS OF THE PLANS. BECAUSE OF THE STRATEGIC NATURE OF THE PLAN, ESA WAS UNDERTAKEN AT NATIONAL LEVEL ONLY.



INTERNET PAGE FOR THE MSP PROCESS
WWW.METZIALUUESUUNNITTELU.FI/EN

PLATFORM FOR DISCUSSION AND PUBLIC CONSULTATION.

INTERACTIVE MAP (ARCGIS ONLINE)

INPUT AND OUTPUT DATA CAN BE ACCESSED.
INTERACTIVE MAP (ARCGIS ONLINE)

SPECIAL ATTENTION TO INFORM.

MEETS EMODNET AND BASEMAPS STANDARDS

VISION 2030 VIDEOS
MSP NEWSPAPER (IN PRINT)



MSP FOR FINLAND 2030



Mari Pohja-Mykra explained that the Finnish MSP is strategic by nature. Three maritime spatial plans have been developed. The coastal regional councils (not the national authorities) are responsible for these plans (coastal waters and territorial waters).

The plans start from the shoreline and consider territorial waters and the EEZ. Given the huge national coastline (up to 50000 km including islands), the land-sea interactions are key aspects to be considered. Finnish waters are characterized by extended shallow water areas with low salinity and very changeable environmental conditions across the year. As a consequence, fishing and maritime logistics are also very changeable.

For the plans' preparation process, discussion and stakeholder engagement were undertaken at both, the national and the local level within the national MSP cooperation group and the MSP cooperation network respectively. The latter was open to anyone, including the residents.

MSP Cooperation structure

▷ The core group of MSP

The **Maritime Spatial Plan 2030 for Finland** consists of three maritime spatial plans in three planning areas.

Eight coastal regional councils together with civil servants from the Ministry of the Environment formed the **MSP Coordination Group**. Lots of small internal expertise groups such as GIS group, Communication group, and steering groups covering multiple MSP projects. The Coordinator of the MSP Cooperation keeps all the threads in her hands.

Together with civil servants from the ministries and agencies, regional and national maritime stakeholders, and experts.

16 maritime spatial planners
5 GIS-experts
8 professional PR-persons
Consultants
Researchers, MSP related projects
National-level MSP cooperation group – ministries, agencies
MSP Cooperation Network open to anyone with 400 participants
Coordinator of the MSP Cooperation

The nature, structure and elements of the Finnish MSP were defined in a collaboration process. Vision for our marine areas was built by stakeholders. Even the Plan map is defined and drafted together with stakeholders



Stakeholder engagement started very early in the process and stakeholders were informed during all the planning phases. The planning process was completely stakeholder driven: input from stakeholders was considered to shape the plan step by step and the role of coastal municipalities was particularly important. Internal and external interaction plans were set in order to coordinate activities of stakeholder engagement.

Formal consultations were also done in spring 2019 and in spring 2020, tackling all technical contents of the plans, including impact assessment. Due to the strategic nature of the plan, the Environmental Strategic Assessment (ESA) was undertaken at a national level only. Some transboundary dialogue exchanges were organized but not in a format of formal transboundary consultation.

77 workshops and thematic meetings were organized and surprisingly participation in later phases was higher than in early ones. Stakeholders were engaged in a scenario making for both, their sector and the community at large. A shared GIS tool was used to collect information from all the sectors. A platform for public discussion was also launched and story maps were shared with the public.

The strengths of the collaborative Process included:

- Bridging social capital,
- Shared understanding of socio-ecological systems,
- Shared vision for marine areas up to 2030 and 2050,

- Practical way of adopting Ecosystem-Based Approach in MSP,
- Practical way of taking Land-Sea Interactions into account and plan from the shoreline,
- Essential in order to have coherent planning among coastal regional councils and to meet regional maritime stakeholders' needs,
- Natural resource conflict mitigation.

Among the challenges encountered, there is the fact that the planners were not professional facilitators. In addition, some sectors are particularly difficult to interact with, for example fishers. Here is the full list of challenges faced:

- Maritime Spatial Planners are not professional collaborators or facilitators. There is a need for training.
- Because of the long coastline and eight regional councils there, occur different development visions for maritime sectors and sea use.
- Political decision-making. Maritime spatial plans were approved by 8 coastal regional councils – that is, local-level politicians. It is necessary to increase political pressure in the future.
- Compromises are essential. Despite the collaboration and shared vision, not all maritime sectors were satisfied with the final Plan.
- Collaboration with fishers. New stakeholder group for spatial planning. The impact assessment shows that the Plan does not support the development vision of the fishing sector.
- It is a real challenge to look up in the future.
- There is a need to reach more locals during our next planning round starting in January, 2022.


Here are some final key messages, as discussed by Dr. Pohia-Mykra:

- Main objective of stakeholder's engagement is to build trust among participants on the planning process and the related choices.
- Institutional trust is the backbone for the success of the planning process. Trust is the keyword.
- Motivation of stakeholders is a key: people should be motivated to spend their time and share their knowledge in the process.
- Stakeholders' motivation comes from the perception that their opinion matters and they have the power to influence plan choices. Therefore, there has to be real room for negotiation.

- Equal treatment of maritime sectors is a basic requirement.
- Local knowledge has to be valued.
- A lot of time and resources have to be dedicated to stakeholders engagement.

Mediterranean Approaches - Competent Authorities Presentations

Spain - Aurora Victoria Mesa Fraile



Aurora Victoria Mesa Fraile began her presentation by sharing a quick recap of the MSP national plans of Spain. She explained that there are five maritime spatial plans (one for each marine demarcation); with a structure of 5 different sections (context and scope; guiding principles and objectives; diagnosis; MSP; application/assessment and monitoring of the plan).

Next steps: Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) study and plans on public consultation lasted until September while the analysis will last until December. Aurora underlined that 2022-2027 is the first cycle of the plans.

Chronogram:

- **July – September 2021:** public consultations for the Strategic Environmental Assessment Study and the five MSP Plans drafts.
- **October – December 2021:** analysis and integration of the allegations received and to draft the final version of the plans and the Strategic Environmental Assessment Study.
- **First quarter of 2022:** SEA statement and MSP plans approval by Royal Decree.
- **March-April 2022:** submission to the EC.
- **2022 – 2027:** implementation of measures, monitoring, annual reports, etc.
- **December 2027 at the latest:** review and update.

The stakeholders' identification started through the MSFD strategy; SIMNORAT and SIMWESTMED projects that led to the increase in the proper stakeholder database.

3 main tools used in the stakeholder identification: meetings, workshops and mandatory public consultations.

Meetings:

The first meeting was held in person in March 2019, where many different sectors (representatives of companies, associations, fishing federations, etc.) were present. This provided further information about the process and future ways of participation. Collection of first suggestions (e. g. application of the EBA).

In March, 2020, the second stakeholders meeting took place with marine renewable energy representatives. The results were the collection of main suggestions and questions; and information (e.g. how to choose best location for offshore wind farms).

Workshops:

5 in-person workshops related to the stakeholder's engagement activities were foreseen, then moved online due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

A national workshop was conducted on December 14th, 2020 in an online format with a general public among other representatives. Some of the objectives of this workshop were to provide information on MSP to sectors and to the general public, provide information on InfoMAR (the cartographic viewer) and to provide information on the future of the public consultations and ways to participate.

The second workshop was carried out on the 8th of July, 2021 focusing on the interaction between fisheries and floating wind farms. The main objectives were to explain the

methodology and zoning definition criteria for the Priority Use Area (PUA) and High Potential Areas (HPA) for floating wind farms and to ask for information about the small-scale fishing.

Stakeholder engagement activities

Workshops

5 in-person workshops,
one for each marine
subdivision, were
planned

COVID-19

	National workshop	Workshop on the interaction between fisheries and floating wind farms
Date	14th December 2020	8th July 2021
For what step of the MSP process	when elaborating plans	public consultation
Format	On-line	On-line
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ To provide information on MSP to sectors and general public. ✓ To provide information of main advances in MSP process and future schedule (new drafts of the strategic environmental assessment study and the five MSP plans; methodology used; first attempt of zoning, criteria and measures). ✓ To provide further information on future public consultations and ways to participate. ✓ To provide information on InfoMAR (cartographic viewer). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ To explain the methodology and zoning definition criteria for the PUA and HPA for floating wind farms. ✓ To ask for information about small-scale fishing (below 15m in length, without AIS or VMS data).
Assistants	> 260 representatives from companies, associations, universities, fishing federations, NGOs, public R&D bodies and other ministerial departments, autonomous communities representatives, etc.	> 50 representatives from national and regional governments and from fisheries sector. 
Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Assistants were informed. ✓ Q&A session took place. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Assistants were informed. ✓ Q&A session took place. ✓ Main impressions and suggestions were gathered (uncertainty associate to the unknown impacts of floating wind farms, main spatial issues that fishermen face, foreseen impacts derived for the establishment of floating wind farms in fishing activities, etc.).

Public consultation:



The first public consultation: scoping process was from January to June, 2020 discussing the Initial Strategic Environmental Assessment Document and the first draft of the Spanish MSP plan.

The second public consultation was held in June, 2021 about the "Public Audience" and discussed the draft of the Royal Decree adopting the maritime spatial plans and the draft of the five maritime spatial plans.

The third public consultation about the strategic environmental assessment took place from July to September, 2021 and discussed the Strategic Environmental Assessment Study, the draft of the Royal Decree adopting the five maritime spatial plans and their drafts.

Stakeholder engagement activities

Administrative stakeholders



Administrative stakeholders were very important, especially from regional governments. The inter-administrative coordination has been and is still essential. GT-OEM specific working group for MSP issues (on the national level) had 10 meetings with autonomous communities. Communications took place by e-mail for the identification of key-topics, leading to ad-hoc working groups.

Difficulties faced during this period were clearly due to the COVID19 pandemic, where the involvement of stakeholders has been limited. This led to take specific measures:

- Five in-person workshops, one for each marine subdivision were planned, but couldn't be performed. national workshop + monographic workshop on renewable energies (RE) and fisheries were held online.
- Measure OEM7: Development of a Strategy for the participation and involvement of stakeholders.
- Measure OEM5: Creation of working groups to tackle planning matters with appropriate detail and scale.
- Monitoring: N° of coordination meetings, N° of participatory events, workshops, etc., N° of participants, etc.

The main conflicts identified were the potential impacts of the floating wind farms on the other uses, specially fisheries and biodiversity conservation. It was important then to find a procedure to ensure the minimization of the potential negative impacts. There were also difficulties in making stakeholders understand that MSP plans do not replace other legal requirements (authorization process, environmental assessment, etc.).


Portal hosting the plans information: <http://infomar.cedex.es/>

Q/A session:

Q: How do you concretely work with the regional committees? Is it about consultation or is there some kind of subsidiarity in decision making?

A: The five committees (created for the MSFD implementation) were used to as to access representative contacts (meetings; e-mails were extensively used). There are not protocols established to make decisions but they could be created in the framework of these committees.


France - Neil Alloncle



Neil Alloncle presented the feedback from Sea Basin Strategic Documents:

The elaboration of sea basin strategies has been conducted in two phases (2 consultations processes as well):

1. Strategic objectives, spatialization work to end up with MSPlans (used to assess implement both MSFD and MSP directives)
2. Operational phase: currently under public consultation (to set the action plan and monitoring plan).



There are two ways to engage stakeholders:

1. Formal consultation: upstream (before plan elaboration) - identification of stakes and issues, challenges, willingness from stakeholders. The downstream is formal consultation on drafter plans. This consultation was targeting citizens/general public and a specific consultation process with "Instances" (listed in the environmental code and representing local governments, citizen organisations, public bodies related with MSP), under the supervision of the National Commission of Public Debate.
2. Consultation Co-construction: co-elaboration through permanent consultations bodies called "sea basin council" (one by sea bassin), grouping the five kinds of stakeholders (state, local governments, economic stakeholder organisation; employee organisation (syndicates), NGOs and citizen organisations). Not a formal consultation; but lead to proposals for objectives, actions, zoning, etc.

Methods/ tools for both consultations:

- Concerning the formal consultation, the consultation platform www.meretlittoral2030.gouv.fr was used to deliver the drafted plans and related documents (synthesis + detailed sources) and the collection of public opinion through a forum (any user can see all contributions).
- This formal consultation was not that “massive” relatively to the potential concerned public and the number of answers was not high- events were organized so as to advertise better the consultation process. Ex: citizen workshops organized all along the French coast (upstream consultation), and webinars (downstream; 2021).

Examples:

- 6 territorial workshops in the Mediterranean coast (world café format) took place in the end of 2019, grouping 140 participants in total; in order to present draft actions about recreational activities, emerging uses, fishing and aquaculture, seashore management, to be discussed and prioritized. A lot of topics were addressing fishing activities (knowledge about stocks; licensing), and other associated topics.
- Synthesis workshop at sea basin scale gathered 117 participants in October 2020; with the objective of discussing and prioritizing actions. The objective was the discussion and the prioritisation about actions specified since 2019. The management of fishing stocks appeared as a priority for instance, other topic such as biodiversity, fishing and aquaculture, port/maritime industry, tourism and coastline management were also mentioned.
- Another example of offshore wind farm planning: dedicated consultation with a specific commission of the Sea Basin Council was organised. Public consultation is conducted to choose the most suitable areas within 4 macro-zones (comment about advantages, potential risks; recommendations to make wind farms settlement compatible with their activities)
- An experimental approach was the example given about the stakeholders' engagement: board game “*opération océan*” used to raise awareness of citizen about MSP challenges
- A web application has been developed thanks to the SIMAtlantic EU project: The objective was to Disseminate Maritime management plans through interactive webpages (SIMATLANTIC) which present the dynamic links between elements stakes, objectives and action, the mapping module to display the adequate data and the popularised content..


Co-elaboration with the Sea basin council

Example of the action plan elaboration

6 territorial workshops with local stakeholders
(end 2019)



- Draft actions about recreational activities, emerging uses, fishing and aquaculture, seashore management
- To be discussed and prioritised
- World cafe format



Q/A session:

Q: Were you satisfied about stakeholders' response to the game and web application? "Is it worth it?"

A: The game was played two times (la mer XXL 2019 and IUCN congress 2021) – it is a good tool to explain the issues and challenges linked to MSP, but the main challenge is to have it played everywhere (multiply events in order to reach different public). The very recent web application receives good first feedback; this dynamic interface explains better the management plans and shows clearly the links between stakes and planning.

Q: Was there a particular communication strategy? Or was there a direct contact with stakeholders?

A: Formal consultation/communication was done through newspapers; involvement of "instances": authorities are directly contacted to give their feedbacks. For the co-construction phase, it's an advantage to have an official body to gather stakeholders already identified and mobilized (like Sea basin councils).

Italy - Fabio Carella

NATIONAL PRESENTATIONS ON ENGAGEMENT


ITALY
FABIO CARELLA (UNAV)

THE NATIONAL MSP GUIDELINES STATE THAT CONSULTATION IS NEEDED.

THE CONSULTATION CAN BE DEVELOPED IN PARALLEL TO THE SEA PROCEDURE.

END OF THE COGNITIVE FRAMEWORK CONSOLIDATION, WITH MANY ADMINISTRATIONS, NOW IS TIME TO START A SPECIFIC ACTION FOR ENLARGING THE STAKEHOLDER'S PARTICIPATION.

UNTIL NOW A TOP-DOWN APPROACH: NATIONAL ADMINISTRATIONS, THE REGIONAL ADMINISTRATIONS, SUPERINTENDENCE OF THE MINISTRY OF CULTURE, AND MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATIONS (COASTAL METROPOLITAN CITIES).



TO PROMOTE PARTICIPATION THE ITALIAN GOVERNMENT HAS, IN THE PAST, USED ONLINE PLATFORMS SUCH AS PARTECIPA.

ANOTHER POSSIBILITY FOR ENGAGEMENT IS THE INTEGRATION OF A SURVEY METHOD WITHIN THE SID, THE ITALIAN INTERACTIVE PORTAL WHERE THE PLANS ARE STORED (BUT NOT OPEN TO THE PUBLIC YET).



REGIONAL ADMINISTRATION LEVEL, 15 COASTAL REGIONS WERE INVOLVED IN THE MSP PROCESS

WITH BILATERAL MEETINGS TO SET VISIONS, SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES AND DRAWING MEASURES + CREATING SYNERGIES

RESULT: A HOMOGENEOUS AND UNIFORM MARITIME MANAGEMENT PLAN. THROUGH BILATERAL MEETINGS (REGION, TECHNICAL COMMITTEE)

TRILATERAL MEETINGS (REGION, SUPERINTENDENCIES, TECHNICAL COMMITTEE) FOR EACH SUB-AREA HAVE BEEN PERFORMED, TO DISCUSS ON THE ENHANCEMENT AND PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE



MSP CHALLENGE SIMULATION PLATFORM ADRIATIC EDITION: A DEDICATED VERSION OF THE SIMULATION GAME WAS EMPLOYED DURING WORKSHOP WITH ADRIATIC REGIONAL ADMINISTRATION.

Fabio Carella presented the Stakeholder Engagement and focused on the legal framework and the ongoing strategy.

Framework consultation: the article about public participation highlighted that competent authority (MIMS) is in charge of carrying out the consultation and ensure active participation of the public.

Framework consultation

▷ From EU to Italy

EU Directive 2014/89/EU

Art.6 - Minimum requirements for maritime spatial planning
(d) ensure the involvement of stakeholders

Art.9 - Public participation
Member States shall establish public participation by informing all interested parties and by consulting the relevant stakeholders and authorities

Legislative Decree 201/2016

Art.9 - Public Participation and Access

The competent authority (MIMS) is in charge of carrying out the consultations and ensure active participation of the public in the procedures for the development and review of proposals for management plans



Istituto Nazionale di Studi e Ricerche
Università Iuav di Venezia



CNR ISMAR
Istituto Nazionale di Studi e Ricerche
Università Iuav di Venezia



Co-funded by the European
Maritime and Fisheries Fund

The National Consultation guidelines includes: how it is “fundamental to develop a maritime spatial management plan that is socially and politically accepted and shared by the various authorities and stakeholders involved”. Also, the consultation can be developed in parallel of SEA procedure. And thirdly, at the end of the cognitive framework consolidation, in which many administrations (national and local) have been already involved, it is opportunity to start a specific action for enlarging the stakeholders’ participation, same for the private sector and the general public.

Carella explained the approach that is until now a top-down approach, as all the administration levels have been involved in order to enlarge stakeholders’ participation. These are the national administrations, the regional administrations, superintendence of the ministry of culture, and municipal administrations (coastal metropolitan cities).

This is in addition to the public and private organizations as the main national service providers that could be involved for instance (ENI, RAM, etc.). Main national service providers (e.g. ENI, RAM, etc.), the main category associations (Assonautica, Assomarinas, FEDERPESCA, LEGAPESCA, etc.), the civil society organizations (CSOs), research institutes and universities, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) as well as the main public.

At a regional administration level, 15 coastal regions were involved in the MSP process where bilateral meetings were conducted to set visions, specific objectives and drawing measures + creating synergies between all the identified conflicts.

The consistency and coordination with other regions to achieve a homogeneous and uniform maritime management plan. Through bilateral meetings (Region, Technical



Committee) visions, specific objectives, planning units and measures (ongoing process) have been identified.

Carella also indicated innovative engagement tools employed, such as the MSP challenge simulation platform Adriatic Edition: a dedicated version of the simulation game was employed during workshop with Adriatic Regional administration. All regions involved in this occasion to five continuity/homogeneity at the border of all areas (enforce coordination/cooperation plan).



Trilateral meetings (Region, Superintendencies, Technical committee) for each sub-area have been performed, to discuss on the enhancement and protection of Landscape and Cultural Heritage (terrestrial and submerged), within the specific objectives and Planning Units already agreed (gaps of data, coherence of specific regional needs, etc.).

He then shared an example of results from a trilateral meeting: a spatializing of needs concerning uses, prioritization of an area in respect with the cultural heritage and tourism.

Administration level

Trilateral meetings

Example of results from the cooperation between Region, Superintendencies and Technical committee



Co-funded by the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund

The Public and Private Organizations:

The SEA procedure has not started yet and parallel engagement processes are under evaluation. To promote the participation of public and private organizations, citizens and improve the quality of public decisions, the Italian Government has, in the past, used online platforms such as ParteciPA, which is an open source platform promoted by the Public Function Department and the Department for Institutional Reforms. Another possibility for engagement is the integration of a survey method within the SID, the Italian interactive portal where the plans are stored (but not open to the public yet). These strategies are



under evaluation by the Competent Authority (Ministry of Infrastructures and Sustainable Mobility).

Q/A session:

Q: About the work with the regions, are you expecting that actions carried out by regions contribute to plan implementation. Or is it to identify regional needs?

A: Yes, an important example is Tuscany, which has expressed a strong interest in implementing the plan regionally. When the national process will be mostly ready, (include SEA) they would like to promote and establish a regional msp law. Implementation of the MSP at the regional scale is key. Amedeo Fadini (CNR-ISMAR) added that inside some of the Regions it is probable that there have been also stakeholders' consultation at a local level.

Q: What was the response to the MSP Challenge game? Did the regions' representatives find it interesting? Were they very participative? What about the logistics?

A: Amedeo Fadini replied by saying: the challenge was to set up MSP game platform with real data. We are still in an early stage in planning, so in stakeholders' point of view, participation could be better facilitated later in future events or workshops. It allowed to draw plans at the local levels; online workshops (due to COVID-19) were limiting the collective work and the interactions between people, even with a digital game.


Q: When is it expected to start the engagement process in Italy? When would the WWF be involved in the process?

A: The precise date is not available yet from the Ministry. This month, they are going to start with the SEA procedure, so it is expected to be right after or in parallel. WWF will be contacted to be involved and to find common ways to reach broadly people, through WWF tools/skills.

Q: Regarding the MSP process and offshore floating wind farm sector: do you have a strategy to choose their location? How to combine protection areas and the development of this technology? As many projects are coming out, how do you deal with that increasing need/challenge of space use?

A: A case in Sardinia: the park is over the 12 miles which means that are in off-shore water, not regional, the stakeholders consulted about renewable farms / Adriatic have different perceptions of future renewable development along with ministries. They are trying to reach a common point of view in order to protect the landscape and the view behind the landscape along with the wind farm project. This is a co-planning process: region and ministries have to find a common point of view; then information will be shared to public stakeholders + additional meetings where all people can express themselves.

Greece - Elena Lalou



Governance framework for MSP consists of a vertical and horizontal consultation framework.

In accordance to the provisions of the 2018 Law for MSP, that transposed the EU Directive into the Greek legislation, MSP will be subject to consultation with three main bodies: Public authorities, civil society, and stakeholders.

The first draft of the National Spatial Planning Strategy for Maritime Space (NSPSMS) has been completed and the Ministry of Environment and Energy is in collaboration with the co-competent ministries for further elaboration. The next step will be the public consultation and public participation process. The NSPSMS will be open to public consultation online, using the national portal www.opengov.gr, where citizens and organizations can post their comments and suggestions, article-by-article.

Next step in the consultation process is having the opinion of the National council of Spatial Planning, which is a consultation body of social dialogue in Greece with stakeholders. The regular members of the council are representatives of:

- Regional and Local Authorities


- Economic stakeholder organisations
- Professional Chambers
- Employee organisations
- Environmental NGOs
- relative associations and scientists

Specifically, for the MSP consultation, representatives of other public authorities and bodies, as well as professional and scientific bodies, may participate in the National Council for Spatial Planning, at the invitation of its President, in order to develop their views at Council meetings. In this context, representatives of sectoral productive activities related to the sea, scientists and research institutions related to marine environment will be invited.

Greece: Governance and Public Consultation

► Process of Establishing National Maritime Spatial Planning Strategy

National Maritime Spatial Planning Strategy



Public consultation
online, using
national portals

www.opengov.gr

Similarly, in the process of Establishing a Maritime Spatial Framework for a Marine Area of interregional/ regional /sub-regional level, the opinion of the National Council of Spatial Planning is required. In this case, additionally relevant representatives for the specific Marine Area will be invited to participate. The public consultation and public participation process, for the Maritime Spatial Frameworks will be also online, using national portals. In parallel, the consultation for the Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Maritime Spatial Framework will take place.

Alongside with the legally prescribed processes, other informal steps are taken to involve the everyday users of the marine space, in the processes of drafting and implementing the MSP and to widen the public participation and the stakeholder consultation, such as:

1. Consultation procedures, workshops, information days and other events with the participation of the social partners, the competent bodies of the central administration and the corresponding services of the local authorities.

Workshops and information days are planned to be held at national and regional level, in the context of the MSPMED and the THALCHOR2 projects.

2. Participatory mapping platforms.

An online interactive MSP platform (<http://msp-greece.eu/>), with environmental, social, and economic data, is being developed by University of Thessaly, in the context of MSPMED to engage marine stakeholders to experiment with zoning, scenarios and visualize the predicted output.

3. Other actions considered for informing in a targeted way about relevant aspects of the MSP process, are:

a) Publications in the press on issues of general interest that arise in the context of the drafting and implementation of the MSP.

b) Scientific conferences that invite members of the scientific community to an open dialogue on issues related to MSP.

c) Publications in scientific journals concerning issues of maritime space management.

Slovenia - Lenca Humerca-Solar

NATIONAL PRESENTATIONS ON ENGAGEMENT

SLOVENIA
LENCA HUMERCA-SOLAR (MINISTRY OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND SPATIAL PLANNING, CONSTRUCTION AND HOUSING DIRECTORATE)

A PUBLIC DEBATE ON THE DRAFT MSP AND ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT WAS CARRIED OUT IN JANUARY AND FEBRUARY 2021.

STAKEHOLDERS PRESENTED COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

MINISTRIES AND STATE PUBLIC SERVICES PROVIDED THEIR OPINIONS REGARDING COMPLIANCE WITH REGULATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT DOCUMENTS.

During this time, a transboundary consultation procedure with Croatia and Italy was carried out.

FOLLOWING THE DEBATE, THE MINISTRY EXAMINED THE COMMENTS AND PREPARED ANSWERS.

THE PROCESS WAS DESIGNED IN AN INCLUSIVE WAY SO AS TO INVOLVE STAKEHOLDERS AT SEVERAL LEVELS. 5 BIG MEETINGS ORGANIZED WITH OTHER 12 MAJOR MEETINGS AND 20 WORKING MEETINGS).

MSP IS DESIGNED TO SERVE LOCAL COMMUNITIES AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF ACTIVITIES; WHILE PRESERVING THE AREA NATURAL AND CULTURAL VALUE.

KEY STAKEHOLDERS AT THE NATIONAL AND LOCAL LEVEL WERE INVOLVED:

- MINISTRIES AND STATE PUBLIC SERVICES
- MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC
- VARIOUS ASSOCIATIONS
- UNIONS
- THE UNIVERSITY OF PRIMORSKA
- ENTERPRISES OPERATING IN THE AREA
- CIVIL INITIATIVES
- ISTRIAN MUNICIPALITIES

DEVELOPMENT VISION:

- ◆ FURTHER PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF NATURE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE
- ◆ FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF MARITIME TRAFFIC AND PORT ACTIVITIES
- ◆ PLANNING/SETTING OF ALL TRADITIONAL SEA AND ICZM ZONE DEPENDENT ACTIVITIES

Lenca Humerca-Solar, from the competent authority for the MSP (the Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning, Construction and Housing Directorate) explained about the legal basis and the national legal framework for the Slovenian MSP. Slovenia has adopted its first MSP in July 2021. Portal hosting the plan documents: <https://dokumenti-pis.mop.gov.si/javno/veljavni/PPP2192/index.html>

Activities and uses, relevant for Slovenia 's MSP (blue technologies, although it is still at a nascent stage, nature protection, cultural heritage protection, short sea shipping, deep-sea shipping, coastal tourism, cruise tourism, marine aquaculture, military activities). Some

evident multiuses which need a special attention within the MSP process (aquaculture / port and berth area; aquaculture / fishing reserve; fishing zone / international waterway; works with explosives / international waterway; bathing waters / international waterway; ...).

The process of preparing the MSP was designed in a progressive, inclusive way, which fosters open discussion, mutual confrontation and recognition of different points of view in terms of content and interests, which resulted in a harmonized document, accepted and supported by all relevant participants. (organized 5 presentations, 12 major meetings and over 20 working meetings with individual stakeholders).

All key stakeholders at the national and local level were involved. Key stakeholders: Ministries and state public services, responsible for maritime affairs, Members of the public and various associations, unions, the University of Primorska, Enterprises operating in the area, Civil initiatives and Istrian municipalities

Vision and scenarios (according to SUPREME project results) - main result: synthesis scenario with vision, goals and priorities as a basis for MSP development elements, regimes, land uses and implementation measures. The source document / starting point for the preparation of sectoral legislation and development documents, and for the issuing of all permits, rights and concessions.

The role of Slovenia's MSP:

- common (spatial) development strategy for the sea and the coastal zone,
- intersectoral and cross border reconciled sea use plan with a criteria framework for future projects, tackling also land spatial development.

Preparation of the first draft MSP + the baseline of the Environmental Report

- intensive communication with stakeholders,
- public presentation to key stakeholders and Istrian municipalities in July 2020.

A public debate on the draft MSP and Environmental Report was carried out in January and February 2021. Stakeholders participated in the debate by presenting their comments and suggestions. Ministries and state public services provided their opinions regarding compliance with regulations and development documents within their respective competences and professional bases. During this time, the Ministry also carried out a cross-border consultation procedure with Croatia and Italy: Italy submitted its comments (which, however, had no significant impact on the content of the MSP). Following the public debate, the Ministry examined the comments and suggestions and prepared answers.

Development vision:


- further preservation and protection of nature and cultural heritage,
- further development of maritime traffic and port activities,
- planning/setting of all traditional sea and ICZM zone dependent activities.



The process was designed in a progressive/inclusive way so as to involve stakeholders at several levels. 5 big meetings organized with other 12 major meetings and 20 working meetings). Different planning institutions were involved in this process.

MSP is prepared in the way it serves the local communities and the development of activities; while preserving this very fragile area. On one hand, prepared in accordance with European and sea basin rules; and on the other hand, with respect to local communities.

Malta - Michelle Borg



Michelle Borg started her presentation by doing a comparison between the approach taken for the current and the process being planned of the revision of the plan.

In the current plan: consultation were undertaken on the strategic objectives (formal consultation with government entities; and dedicated online consultations on webpage). Dedicated meetings with NGOs and representative bodies were held. At the time groups were already well organized and they knew how to get involved/participate however, since it is a plan covering both land and sea, the emphasis on the marine waters was overshadowed by the main interest on land use. Formal consultation on the Draft plan and draft SEA has been done online. And a publication of the feedback from public consultation has been done.

Engagement during implementation:

The implementation of the MSP plan is carried out through the preparation of subsidiary plans and policies, and the processing of development permits. The provisions in the Development Planning Act of 2016 prescribe the consultation process to be carried out in both instances:


- Subsidiary plans/policies: consultations on objectives; draft policies; revised policy and respective SEA if required. The draft policy is subject to the scrutiny of a Parliamentary sub-Committee on Environment and Planning which is also open to the public
- Use of additional methods (media/facebook/workshops) depends on the nature of the plan.
- Development permitting: Public is informed of a development application through notification in government gazette, local news paper and onsite notice (or onshore) and online on the PA website; anyone has right to register as objector and thus can be involved in decision stage; list of statutory consultees to provide feedback; when EIA is required, public consultation is undertaken.

SIMWESTMED project presented an opportunity to create a portal to enhance stakeholders engagement. Through the MSPMED project findings, there was the opportunity to get an idea of public perception on the use of marine space, with the scope that such the information can inform the consultation/engagement process of the revised plan. A public survey was carried out to discover what the public thinks about MSP, their own use of the sea, and whether they would be interested to participate in the plan making process.. One of the results was that from 500 interviewed people the majority did not wish to be involved in the process. As a follow up to this survey, there will be an effort to have more media coverage to raise awareness about the importance of MSP in day-to-day life (TV, online).

Q: Was there any difficulty in engaging stakeholders - any idea/suggestion to tackle this for better engagement?

A: For the current plan, the process is already established so outreach efforts was organised. The difficulty arose from the fact that many marine users work with their sectoral regulator and did not identify the planning entity as also responsible/able to influence their activity, so the amount of feedback was not as desired. Since then we have had an EU SRS funded project to assist us on techniques to use to raise awareness on MSP and ICZM. With the MSPMED project we have taken the opportunity to engage in a public survey to help us gauge the situation which will guide us on how to engage on the maritime part of the revised plan. However we are also experiencing a situation that public engagement may not be sufficient due to a decrease in public trust in institutions – with increased dissatisfaction on the process on the land side this creates an additional challenge for MSP.

Roundtable Discussions



The roundtable discussion was facilitated by Hadi El Hage (IUAV) and using the online tool Slido to ask and vote for questions to be tackled by each of the competent authorities. The answers were followed in order starting by Spain, France, Italy, Greece, Slovenia, and Malta.

- The guiding question was “dealing with multiple stakeholder categories”: MSP processes should involve a broad range of stakeholder categories, from economic sectors to the general public, not having the same organisational level, appropriation skills or time to dedicate to the multiple consultations. How to deal with this variety and engage the whole range of stakeholders? Are there key stakeholder categories to be engaged?

Winning question chosen by the audience:

What solutions can be found to involve non-institutionalized or under-represented communities that may wish to express their views? Would a specific program or section of a platform be useful to implement it in the official/legal process?

- Spain: The Spanish CA and planners want to study this aspect, but there is no answer yet.
- France: A permanent body could be a crucial asset to establish engagement - in France, this is the Sea Basin Council. The articulation with regional bodies can also be key, because regions are more and more involved. There are different scales of stakeholders' discussions and to work on these different levels and categories in a harmonized way could help to achieve engagement and commitment. Ambassadors from sectors are also important, especially for underrepresented categories. In France, it could be interesting to have a framework for ambassadors.
- Italy: An answer is not possible yet but a hierarchical programme could help to cascade the information, as well as other tools, not only platforms, as the board games. Different ways need to be found, and of course, communication itself to communicate the goals of the plans. Regional contact points work as a sort of semi-permanent framework but not formally and linked to individuals.
- Greece: On the online portals, individuals, unions and groups can make comments and suggestions, which will be taken into account.
- Slovenia: In Slovenia the plan is a strategic document, the groups of stakeholders who are more involved are the ones closer to sea activities. The ones that should be included are already foreseen by the law. It is clearly stated who are the stakeholders to be involved. Other important stakeholders: Regional and local development players. Local communities and administrative units are really important because they will need to implement the plans. Having institutions on board is also important, also NGOs are keys to represent protective aims. Finally, individuals are important but they don't engage much.
- Malta: Malta has online portals but it takes time and resources to analyse the comments and inputs. It requires constant work, and also stakeholders may have difficulties in giving feedback on all the released plans. The idea of developing a stakeholders' forum is being considered to allow for more constant exchanges. External administrative processes linked to general elections may influence the timing for implementation of such an idea since new governments are likely to lead to administrative changes, and may affect the momentum on MSP work gained between different institutions.

ROUNDTABLE

A MOMENT TO COMPARE AND DISCUSS

THE SECOND ROUND OF QUESTIONS:


WERE THERE STAKEHOLDERS THAT FOUND THE PLAN TOO STRATEGIC? OR OTHERS THAT WOULD ONLY ENGAGE WITH SPECIFIC ISSUES?

• **SPAIN:** SOME SECTORS WANTED LESS REGULATIONS AND MORE SPACE, TO BE LEFT OUT OF SEA WHILE OTHERS (E.G. NGOs) WANTED MORE PROTECTION AND PRESERVATION.

• **ITALY:** SOME REGIONS WERE ABLE TO GIVE MORE INFORMATION WHEREAS OTHER WERE LACKING DATA AND SPATIAL DATA.

• **MALTA:** WHETHER THE PLAN IS STRATEGIC OR NOT, IT IS DIFFICULT FOR SOME PEOPLE TO ENGAGE – ESPECIALLY IF THEY FEEL IS TOO STRATEGIC. LAND-SEA IS A USEFUL OPTION TO KEEP THEM ENGAGED.

• **FRANCE:** AVOIDING HAVING AN “ADMINISTRATIVE” WAY TO PROCEED EX: BY TOPICS OR SECTORS, WITH SEGMENTED PLANS. THIS IS BECAUSE IT LOSES SENSE FOR MOST OF THE PUBLIC. WEB TOOLS ARE VERY USEFUL TO DESCRIBE AND EXPLAIN THE DIFFERENT TOPICS/ISSUES/STAKES IN A MORE LEGIBLE WAY: BOTH VISUAL AND INTERACTIVE.



• **GREECE:** THE PLAN DOCUMENT WORKS AT STRATEGIC LEVEL AND IT INCLUDES MEDIUM AND LONG-TERM GOALS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT FOR THE NATIONAL AND REGIONAL LEVEL.



• **SLOVENIA:** IT IS IMPORTANT TO UNDERSTAND THE AIM OF THE PROCESS, THE GOVERNMENT PUBLISHED THE REQUIRED INFORMATION ONLINE. INCLUSION OF STAKEHOLDERS FROM THE BEGINNING TO TRIGGER CO-OWNERSHIP AND EXPRESSIONS. STRAIGHTFORWARD COMMUNICATION WAS IMPORTANT.

The second round of questions of the Roundtable discussion revolved around ensuring stakeholders' understanding of MSP plans and promoting their ownership. How can the plan be opened up (communicated and explained) to stakeholders so that the plan is felt as owned by everyone and fully endorsed to achieve ambitious goals?

Winning question: Were there stakeholders that found the plan too strategic? or others that would only engage with specific issues?

- **Spain:** Some sectors wanted less regulations and more space, to be left out of SEA while other (e.g. NGOs) wanted more protection and preservation. Normally each stakeholder consulted in their own area of action, apart from shared issues. In future consultations, efforts will be made to open up the consultation.
- **France:** To try to avoid as much as possible to have an “administrative” way to proceed (ex: by topics or sectors, with dedicated parts of the plan that are very

segmented. This is because it misses sense for most of the public. The plan has to be presented in an integrative way to be more meaningful to the stakeholders and be well understood. The web tool solution (presented) is very useful to describe and explain the different topics/issues/stakes in a more legible way that is both visual and interactive.

- Italy: Concerning regions: some of them were able to give more information whereas other were lacking data and spatial data more specifically. The Technical committee tries to create an equilibrium and not to be too specific or too general. One major issue is that the Plan is strategic and tried actually to deliver a methodology work with examples to express the intention of each step.
- Greece: The National Spatial Planning Strategy for Maritime Space, that will be open to public consultation by the end of the year, is a text of policy principles and strategic guidelines, for the development and planning of maritime space of strategic level. The participation at the public consultation process is expected to be substantial (key stakeholders, social partners, non-governmental organizations, regional and local authorities and organised civic society) .
- Slovenia: It is important to understand the aim of the process; the government published the required information online and explained what should be achieved by MSP. Then inclusion of stakeholders from the beginning was useful so that they felt they co-owned the plan and expressed their interests. Straightforward communication was important for successful results and the importance of trusting the institution.
- Malta: Whether the plan is strategic or not, it is difficult for some people to engage - especially if they feel is too strategic and therefore cannot tangibly see how it relates to their day to day life. But land-sea interactions may be a useful option to keep them engaged as the land and inshore areas are the main areas used by a large diversity of stakeholders and public.

Conclusions and Debriefing:

A small brief was done by Folco Soffietti and Martina Bocci summarizing all the keys takings from the 4th Technical workshop:

The guest institutions presentations offered interesting examples of practical engagement techniques, science-based and respectful of bottom-up needs. Of course, when scaling to large areas or national level the process is more complicated, compromises are essential as

well as knowledge of local culture. Build trust, acknowledging importance of opinions and ensuring equal treatment of all sectors can be a useful strategy.

The Mediterranean setting on the topic is diverse: some countries have completed their processes (Slovenia) or are closing them (Spain, France) employing workshops and online platforms or other tools (board games, communicative campaigns, etc.), Italy has consulted at a different level of governance but the wider engagement process is still under evaluation even though tools could be available; Greece is in a similar position of design of the process.

Hadi El Hage wrapped the workshop and made the closing greetings.

A summary table done by Camille Assali (OFB) has been very useful for the comparison between the 6 Member States regarding the stakeholder engagement process, regarding the methodology used, and the feedback about the difficulties and different perspectives (Table 1).

	MEMBER STATE ->	Spain	France	Italy	Greece	Slovenia	Malta
THEMATICS	QUESTIONS/TOPICS						
STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT	Protocol		Formal consultation : upstream and downstream; and co-construction process				consultation on strategic objectives (formal consultation with government entities; and dedicated online consultations on webpage.)
	Different involvement between stakeholders categories ?	engagement of administration at different levels has been crucial					
	Other stakeholder engagement process that could be useful for MSP	MSFD, and SIMNORAT and SIMWESTMED project allowed stakeholders identification	MSFD, Sea councils				
METHODOLOGY	MEMBER STATE ->	Spain	France	Italy	Greece	Slovenia	Malta
	For what steps of the MSP process did you conduct stakeholder consultations?	3 consultation phases				intensive communication was conducted in the preparation phase of MSPlan.	Formal consultation on the Draft plan and draft SEA
	Consultation tool (e.g. questionnaires, meetings, interviews, workshops, ...)	meetings with representatives of different sectors; workshops with the general public	consultation online platform; web application (SIMATLANTIC); world cafés; ...	bilateral meetings within 15 coastal regions; MSP challenge game	national portals; participatory mapping platform	national portal, meetings, scenario building through european projects	dedicated online consultations on webpage
	How was processed/used information obtained from different stakeholders ?			ex: spatialization of needs concerning uses prioritization in an area in regards with the cultural heritage			
FEEDBACK ABOUT DIFFICULTIES / PERSPECTIVES	MEMBER STATE ->	Spain	France	Italy	Greece	Slovenia	Malta
	Limitations : stakeholder understanding, stakeholder availability ...						
	Dealing with difficult topics	main conflict : potential impacts of offshore windfarms on fisheries and biodiversity	Achieve the target territory (regional scale)			Important to start dialogue/discussion in the first stage of the process in order to avoid conflicts at the very end	
	Perspectives	COVID - public consultation in presence has been clearly limited		COVID - limitation for the game			

Table 1. Comparison between Member States stakeholder engagement processes in MSP

Essential references

[Directive 2014/89/EU establishing a framework for maritime spatial planning](#)
[Marine Spatial Planning \(MSP\) Toolkit \(Chapter 4\)](#)
[Marine Spatial Planning A Step by Step Approach toward Ecosystem-Based Management \(Chapter 4\)](#)
[PartiSEApate Handbook on multi-level consultations in MSP](#)
[Stakeholder Participation in Environmental Policy Toolkit \(Chapter 3, 4 and 5\)](#)
[Stakeholder Mapping Guide For Conservation International Country Programs & Partners](#)
[The consensus building handbook: a comprehensive guide to reaching agreement \(1999\)](#)
<https://www.havochvatten.se/en/eu-and-international/marine-spatial-planning/consultation.html>
<https://www.msp-platform.eu/faq/stakeholder-involvement>
[\[Finland\] Feedback on Maritime Spatial Plan and its considerations](#)