

SIMNORAT FINAL CONFERENCE**Planning the Northern European Atlantic Ocean, Brest, France****29/30 JANUARY 2019**

DRAFT MINUTES

(28/02/2019)

OPENING ADDRESSES

Michel Gourtay, Vice president in charge of the economy, Brest metropole, welcomed the participants at the Capucins, a symbolic place belonging to the maritime heritage of Brest. He underlined the European dimension of the event, lead by the Shom, and important actor in the maritime and science community headquartered in Brest, a city considered as the French capital for marine sciences and energy, representing 40% of maritime employment in Brittany. The metropole and its local municipalities are engaged in integrated coastal zone management through an innovative, sustainable and long-term approach, which is essential for the development of marine renewable energies in the area. Brest is open to European cooperation and will be the first French city to host in 2023 the European Maritime Days. He recalled that a strong European cooperation is needed to address maritime related issues such as climate change, sea-level rise, preservation of natural resources.

Forough Salami-Dadkhah, Vice-President in charge of international and European affairs, Brittany Region, welcomed the participants as well and highlighted the participation of the Brittany region in the SIMNORAT project through the participation of the CPMR as partner. Fifteen years ago, the Brittany region launched a truly voluntarist policy for the development of maritime activities at a time when the seafaring field was completely absent from the competence of this institution. Over the years, the region has become more involved. In 2009 it instituted the Regional Sea and Coastal Conference, co-chaired by the President of the Regional Council, the Prefect of the Region and the Maritime Prefect. One of the notable successes of this conference was the possibility to reach a consensus on marine renewable energies planning. She underlined the Brittany region sees very positively the MSP Directive brought by the European Commission as it can reinforce its regional efforts for the development of maritime activities in the respect of the environment. However, the region is claiming two points that must evolve for the successful completion of this exercise: Firstly, the territories must be taken into account. As an example, the facade encompassing Brittany and Pays de la Loire has no coherence, neither administratively, nor human, nor ecosystem-based. Either it is too small or too big. Depending on the activities to be considered in planning, the process cannot be done on the same scales. Secondly, it is the question of the link with the territory and the region. It would be coherent to develop supraregional approaches, especially for activities involving a strong link with the coast. This is a claim from Brittany region, partly acquired today in the planning of marine renewable energies (MRE). The region is asking to be associated with some type of co-management in the planning of coastal activities. This is indeed very relevant as the region assumes competencies in the maritime field, such as management of port authorities, EMFF, support to MRE, nautical and shipbuilding sectors. MSP must imperatively integrate the scales of the issues it claims to take into account, otherwise it will be experienced as an administrative attempt to constrain the development of maritime activities and not to allow development in a conducive environment.

David Sanmiguel, Project Adviser, Executive Agency for SMEs (EASME), European Commission presented the Maritime Spatial Planning Framework Directive which was already adopted 6 years ago. Several resources have been used to develop projects by sea basins to produce tools available to Member States for the implementation of planning. The aim was to do this in a transnational way and to bring together different countries of the same sea basin, as in the case of SIMNORAT, to find the different possibilities to best implement this directive and to consider the different opinions and policies at the same time. From now on, there is a clearer landscape of responsibilities and designated competent authorities in each country that have successfully transposed the Framework Directive into different national laws. In 2021, Member States must submit sea plans, and each Member State must decide how to do it. Today, there is a wider community working on maritime policy and maritime spatial planning in particular, and who can progress together on these issues. After having collected the different contributions of these projects at the end of this 2014-2020 programming period, the European Commission and DG Mare will also be able to see how to contribute to the development and implementation of the various maritime strategic plans. Some plans are still under development and these projects like SIMNORAT came to support them and to give tools in addition to the MSP platform useful to all planners.

Bruno Frachon, Director of Shom, SIMNORAT project leader, emphasized once again Brest's important role in maritime activities, where many of the project partners are based. In French, the MSP should rather be understood as the planning of uses rather than maritime space. The interactions between these uses and activities and the territories justify this need for planning. MSP also must look at the interactions with neighbouring countries. Maritime spatial planning is dynamic and does not stop once the plan is completed. It's not just a background map, it's an environment that can be fragile. We must therefore know the natural processes. The planning process needs to be informed to be robust, based on shared and evidence-based findings among stakeholders. The data is an essential foundation, the directive explains it should be "the best available data", so there is an angle of availability to consider. The studies and methodologies tested in the projects are therefore useful. Knowledge about the marine environment can evolve, the issue of data updates is important as well as data access and traceability. The implementation of INSPIRE for example can also help in this direction. Another issue is also the access to private data. It is very important to emphasize the role of the EU Commission in this sense, which favours the sharing of data, in particular through the EMODnet platform.

SETTING THE ATLANTIC FRAME

Moderated by Corine Lochet, Shom

Angela Schultz-Zehden, EU MSP platform, Project leader, presented the MSP platform, stressing its FAQ, designed to bring practitioners into different types of tools which has already been made in EU. The content is generated via projects and national authorities. The platform does not reinvent the wheel but can analyse in detail what are the sectors issues and provide support to look at what are the solutions in potential MSP issues. Many meetings gathered experts and MSP authorities which brings now to the EU a wider MSP knowledge. However, the methods and the questions are always more or less similar, and it is always almost the same questions, that is why the knowledge exchange is very important. The Atlantic has also its own specifics to be addressed on MSP.

Claude Wohrer, Secretariat General to the Sea, France presented the EU Atlantic Strategy and its Action Plan, priorities and scope for cooperation. The Atlantic Strategy should not be confused with the Atlantic program even though its geographic coverage is almost similar. The Atlantic strategy is an initiative of DG MARE while the Interreg Atlantic program comes from DG REGIO. The links between the two have not always been obvious for many years. The Atlantic strategy has long awaited funding to support projects identified in the context of national hubs and has suffered from poor coordination at both European and national level. Adopted in 2011, an action plan was developed in France as an integral part of the European maritime policy, through a number of stakeholder consultation actions that identified hundreds of actions. As a result, the action plan was found to be excessively generic. A pilot group was set up to coordinate actions and optimize resources through the concerted use of European funds. This group is composed of representatives of various administrative structures of the concerned Member States, the European Commission and regional representatives but it lacked structuring. The link between the different units of the European Commission is not always obvious, especially between the unit responsible for sea basin strategies and the unit in charge of the MSP. The CPMR and its Atlantic Arc Commission represent the regional authorities in the group and support it as well as the Committee of the Regions. The assistance mechanism is also important and can be very useful to support project promoters which can be any public or private actor.

The question of the adequacy of funding for common problems identified between countries is also fundamental. The revision of the action plan is done through seminars in the Member States and should be completed in mid-February 2019 and it will have to take into account the integration of the MSP Directive. The revision is based on the mid-term review of the strategy, which highlighted large funding, however nothing enables to identify projects actually funded by this strategy. Flagship projects will be identified, such as Water Games already organized in Brest. The other idea to be considered is also an MSP project that would become a flagship project.

Like the WESTMed initiative, priorities and funding has been identified, in particular regarding the MSP. This theme can be covered by multiple funds, EMFF, ERDF, and the purpose of these strategies is to ensure the coherence of these funds, to know the projects, and to ensure their complementarity. She recalled that maritime spatial planning must and can be done within the framework of sea basin strategies. The post-Brexit issue is also unresolved regarding the role of the United Kingdom in the planning of the Atlantic maritime area. At the last Interministerial committee on the sea, end of 2018, France decided to give the best guidance to European funding, and maritime strategies can be a very useful framework for achieving coherence and better financing. France will chair the Atlantic Strategy in 2020 and hopes for a revival of this Atlantic strategy.

Damien Périssé, Director in Charge of Maritime Affairs, Conference of Peripheral Maritime Regions (CPMR), underlined the supporting role this organisation can play in a political and technical context of projects such as SIMNORAT, by providing expertise from the regions. At the beginning when the MSP directive was taking shape, there was a strong (and often negative) reaction from the regions, as they feared this directive would interfere in a disconnected way with the concertation already in place with local actors on coastal and maritime areas. It was a fear the directive would create a tension of the political process instead of supporting the necessary fluidity of a good consultation process between stakeholders. Two articles are of high interest for the regions in the directive: The article 6 indicating to Member States the minimum requirements for the implementation of the

directive, including the land-Sea interaction dimension and the article 9 precisating the members states must deliver public consultation with stakeholders. As it was explained by Brittany region and others, regional authorities expressed their wish to be involved in decision-making, notably through a type of co-management of coastal areas. There is the willingness to develop more coherence between the planning at sea, the economic interest of the activities, and the regional strategies. The right intelligence has to be found as well in terms of stakeholders' consultations, such as it was the case in Brittany with the development of marine renewable energies activities in St Brieuc Bay or solving some issues related to the Parc d'Iroise, a marine protected area around Brest. Regional authorities can ease and support the process, enabling to collect citizens' point of views and concerns and build a consensus around a territorial project. Some regions like Brittany or Pays de la Loire have also develop in collaboration with the State, marine and coastal areas strategies to provide a structure for a permanent dialogue related to developing projects in coastal areas or at sea. Nouvelle Aquitaine is also a very active region interested to dynamize consultation processes with stakeholders. The SIMNORAT project has also enabled to highlight the link between national and regional level in Spain regarding the consultation process, as well as in Portugal where Madeira and Azores have more competencies in terms of planning. To conclude, the Atlantic strategy has a key role to play, in order that MSP will not stay an isolated process and it could follow the example of the Charter of Bologna which shows how various and multisectoral stakeholders can cooperate towards achieving a common objective in the Mediterranean basin. There a strong capacity of regional authorities to participate in transnational cooperation initiatives.

In reaction, **Angela Schultz-Zehden**, underlined that even if now MSP is indeed part of a macroregional strategy, in the Baltic it has been a very long process. There are still ongoing discussions on how to really structure the ongoing cooperation in the North Sea, together with the CPMR North Sea commission, the North Sea energy initiative, OSPAR, and other MSP competent authorities. This also includes temporary questions in the view of Brexit and cooperation with other non-EU countries like Norway. In any case, MSP has to be in link with national strategies as well as with sea-basins strategies.

MSP IMPLEMENTATION PROCESSES IN THE ATLANTIC: STATE OF PLAY

Moderated by Damien Périssé, Director, CPMR

Laurent Courgeon, Interregional Directorate for South-Atlantic Sea (DIRM), French Ministry for the Ecological and Inclusive Transition presented the state-of-play of the MSP implementation in France. The governance of maritime spatial planning in France is divided into four facades: East Channel North Sea, North Atlantic Channel West, South Atlantic, and the Mediterranean. The planning is coordinated at local level by coordinating prefects, both terrestrial and maritime prefects. The strategic "plans de façade" concern both the MSFD and the MSP. They include processes that can be contradictory such as the development of maritime activities and the preservation of the marine environment. These strategic plans set out the national strategy for the sea and the coastline, which define social, economic and environmental issues and presents the objectives for 2030. They are based on a state-of-play and a shared diagnosis of maritime space, an analysis of both ecological and socio-economic issues and a map of the vocations of its territories. The validation phase is underway with the finalization of the strategic orientations. A first part of the summary document constitutes the diagnosis and determination of the issues and the vision for the territories and a second part sets the strategic objectives. The whole document presents technical and scientific appendices. The response of the evaluation of the national environmental authority to this document is expected at

the end of February 2019. The objectives, although they may appear to be general, are worked out sector by sector with the concerned stakeholders, including the communities and the regional authorities involved. Improving knowledge as an engine of innovation is also essential, the work in connection with professionals must be strengthened. The objectives are very sectoral and target fishing, aquaculture, renewable energy, water recreation, knowledge, training etc. The environmental objectives are also declined to correspond to all descriptors of the MSFD such as marine biodiversity, the exploitation of commercial species, waste, noise. The evocation map, which is more maritime than terrestrial, does not address cross-border issues. The prefects are in charge of consulting regional and departmental authorities, the local navy commandment, social-economic actors, nautical industry, fishermen, unions, associations. France has the particularity to have the Maritime Council of facade, a body grouping the various actors, who have been associated throughout the process of the Strategic Facade Document (DSF). Regarding cross-border aspects, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is responsible for consulting neighbouring states to ensure consistency with ongoing planning exercises. The SIMNORAT project has indeed demonstrated the interest of sharing planning tools with the cross-border states since the activities and ecosystems know no boundaries. The question of cross-referencing data to the same degree of precision is also necessary to be discussed on the same bases and their provision is a prerequisite while preserving the anonymity, especially when it comes to economic activities with strong stakes such as fishing in South Atlantic. The processes and skill level vary widely between countries and the time factor may also be an element to be considered. An action plan must now be put in place, and the convergence of the exercises regarding this first implementation cycle must also be in connection with a phasing in of the MSFD and the Water Framework Directive. From 2019, a public consultation on the website merlittoral2030.gouv.fr calls for contributions and opinions.

Ana Correa, Spanish Ministry for the Ecological Transition (MITECO) explained Spain has transposed the MSP directive through a Royal Decree that develops the Law 41/2010, which is the law for the protection of the sea that transposes the MSFD as well. It means there is a guarantee that they are going to be coherent with the ecosystem-based approach in both legal frameworks. There is an Interministerial commission from which expands a working group gathering different institutions and administration which have competencies in the sea, designated technicians to work on the implementation of the MSP directive in common. The General Directorate for the sustainability of the coast and the sea is the authority in charge to develop the works around MSP. They already developed 5 marine strategies and now they are working on 5 maritime spatial plans for each designated area. The Interministerial commission of the marine strategy and its working group already met for 3 times and there are 5 committees for the marine strategies that are based in each area. Moreover, sectoral conferences involving stakeholders, as well regional authorities, as they have some competencies in some issues in the sea, are organised. There are legal tools for public consultations. All ministries are involved in the Interministerial commission and they have to coordinate with regional governments that are involved in the same competencies. After collecting their inputs, the competent authority (MITECO) is in charge of developing the 5 plans proposals. After a process of negotiations, stakeholders' involvement, transboundary consultation, strategic environmental assessment have to be processed before the MSP plans are approved by Royal Decree. They have defined, principles and goals through a sectoral questionnaire and have obtained the sectoral objectives and now they are compiling the sectoral objectives views from the regional government. They are planning to do workshops to establish final objectives of the MSP. They have already mapped the biological/ecological areas linked with the marine strategy, and spatial conflicts have been identified and shared with the Interministerial commission via a first map of conflicts, which serves as a basis for the development of the plans, as well as human activities mapping. They

have to be very consistent with the marine strategies and both MSP and strategy fit each other in a constant way.

Ana Paula Simão, Directorate-General for Natural Resources, Safety, and Maritime Services, presented the MSP state-of-play in Portugal. The national Portuguese maritime space, considering the external continental platform, is a very huge area (approx. 4 million sq. KM), from which 1/3 approx. of the North east is Atlantic. The Directorate-General for Natural resources, safety and Maritime services (DGRM) is the national competent authority for maritime spatial planning in Portugal, and the autonomous regions of Azores and Madeira are responsible for their planning in their own EEZ. The challenges are indeed to find the right balance between the current activities in the seas and the development of new and innovative activities such as renewable energies, as well as matching with the good environmental status, and respect good practices when putting in place activities. Both MSFD and MSP directives are handled by the same administrative unit of the Directorate-General for Natural resources, safety and Maritime services. It was a challenge to put in place both directives and to achieve the good environmental status in 2020. They are now in the second cycle. There is an advisory committee, gathering public institutions from the Ministry of the sea, the Portuguese environmental agency, nature conservation institute, representatives of municipalities, autonomous regions of Azores and Madeira and representatives of economic sectors. The advisory committee follows all the process from the beginning and provides its opinion about the maritime spatial plan. Regarding stakeholders' engagement, they settled a website where the public can follow the process, it is providing general and technical information, and the public can download the minutes of the technical working groups. A lot of work was done especially with the fisheries sector and workshops/meetings was organised with fisheries organisation to create "hotspots" mapping with the most important areas for the fishermen, including also tourism and aquaculture. Public sessions and NGOs / tourism sectors organisations meetings were also organised to collect their views. The main activities addressed in the plans are fisheries, aquaculture, renewable energies, submarine cables, multipurpose platform, scientific research, artificial reef, tourism, underwater and cultural heritage. Deep-sea mining or offshore industries must have specific plans, so are not directly addressed by the current developing MSP plans. 4 main areas were designed for aquaculture with specific projects. Specific areas were established for fish farming too in the southern part. 2 areas were designated to develop renewable energies (offshore wind farms and also tidal waves energies). Pilot projects are developed via multipurpose platform where they gather in one single area testing of activities. For submarines cables, areas where activity cannot be done is defined to protect vulnerable marine ecosystems in seamounts. A geoportal has been established where some information shall be soon available in English, where the plans will show activities and natural conservation information, as well as shipping, tourism activity that will be available for public and economic sector stakeholders. Some new possible MPAs were identified. They performed a strategic environmental assessment between the ministry of the sea and the environmental ministry and produced an environmental report after a very intensive work between the competent authorities and the University of Aveiro. They are now in the process of public consultation and enters in its second consultation period until the end of the year. They performed a transboundary consultation with Spain and Morocco. The plans shall be approved in the respected allocated timing in the council of the ministries.

Kirsty Wright, Marine Scotland, UK, explained the state of play of MSP implementation in UK. There is one overarching piece of legislation for the whole country which the marine and coastal access act 2009. In Scotland there are 2 pieces of primary legislation– M&CAA from 12-200nm and Marine (Scotland) Act 2010 (MHWM – 12nm). There are three 'National' Plan approaches and four administrations are carrying out Marine Planning. Marine Scotland is lead organisation for the plan in

Scotland and a Scotland National Marine Plan was released in 2015 and provides single framework for managing Scotland's seas. The National Plan went through its first review process and was presented to Scottish Ministers in March 2018. The National plan is supplemented by 11 Regional Marine Plans prepared by Marine Planning Partnerships. The first review raised the timing issues between the Marine Act (Scotland) 2010 for inshore waters (every 5 years) and the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 for offshore waters (every 3 years). Next review will be done within 3 years (2021) for offshore and 2023 for inshore. The review stressed that a different set of financial circumstances exist now- than at the time of Marine Act (Scotland) adopted - so they need to be prudent about the use of resources. Finally, they wanted to encourage exchange of best practices, especially with Clyde Marine Planning Partnership and Shetland Isles Marine Planning Partnership. There are two marine plans being implemented: East Coast (adopted 2014) and South Coast (adopted 2018), and four marine plans being developed concurrently – NW, NE, SW & SE. East Coast Marine Plans (2014) was reviewed in 2017 and the South Coast plan was adopted in 2018. It is expected that all plans will be published by 31st March 2021. The Stakeholder consultation is going on via online engagement and workshops. Regarding the Irish Sea, it is governed by four pieces of primary legislation, EU Directives and International Conventions. There are four National Plan approaches across the Irish Sea and five administrations are carrying out Marine Planning, which is a real cooperation hotspot and challenges in terms of maritime planning in this complex location, which includes lots of legislation and different stages of marine plan development to consider. In Northern Ireland, the Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs (DAERA) is the lead organisation. Draft Marine Plan for Northern Ireland was published April 2018 and prepared under 2 pieces of legislation. The consultation process closed in June 2018 and is in a consideration stage. However, there is no indication of when plan will be adopted due to absence of a Devolved Government in Northern Ireland. In Wales, the leading organisation is the Welsh Government. The Draft Welsh National Marine Plan (WNMP) was published for public consultation during 2018. Most issues to consider are cross-border related and how to better condense the plan. The plan adoption should occur in spring-summer 2019. To conclude, the main challenges faced in MSP in UK is that there is no pan-UK marine planning approach to marine planning.

Administrations are not working at the same stages and are not all starting from the same policy baseline. As UK had started the process of planning marine resources and activities before the idea of the MSP Directive, they didn't want to start a marine planning process again.

In the debate between the speakers, it was underlined how the transnational dimension was addressed, especially how exchanges are taking place. For the moment, there are some bilateral technical meetings between countries, but it is not mainly dealt at regional level. In France, there is concretely no share of competencies and data, but the foreign affairs ministry will be the one in charge to work on this dimension. There is no specific place for sharing cross-border knowledge on MSP, but some good common work was already established on MSFD between Portuguese, French and Spanish authorities which could be a good basis to transposed to MSP. Platforms like the SIMNORAT project can be very supportive in this sense. The best thing that the project brought was building up capacities but a tool to catalyse the knowledge is missing. Regarding stakeholders' perception on MSP, it depends a lot of the previous experience they have had with the administrations, some see it as opportunities other more negatively. Those type of MSP processes have a political and socio-economic dimension difficult to address in a technical project such as SIMNORAT, which is the limit of the exercise. However, in the frame of the implication of stakeholders, they see it as the potential effect MSP can have on their activities, so they are willing to participate in the cooperation structures. The stakeholder engagement is not an easy process as in

the end some sectors like fisheries, aquaculture vs offshore energy or NGOs have complaints to be considered, but it is an ongoing process with planning constraints that need to be balanced.

SIMNORAT PRESENTATION AND INTRODUCTION TO CASE STUDIES

Dominique Carval, Shom, presented the SIMNORAT project overview, underlining the importance of information sharing and cooperation that occurred between the different partners during the lifetime of the project. They constantly tried to work close to the competent authorities in each country via the steering committees and sometimes via national meetings. The objective of the project was to bring together all actors to support the transborder cooperation between the Member States. A number of studies were produced, addressing topics such as an initial assessment with a focus on the environmental aspect, and on the maritime sectors, the MSP state of play in the countries and the link between the Regions' role, Spatial demands on marine conservation and on maritime sectors, data demands and gaps for MSP, a comparison of tools and methods, and the involvement of stakeholders in each country. A study on the methodologic aspect of MSP process was also produced including some focus on the MSP process links with the OSPAR convention, on how to consider sectoral activities, the land sea interactions, and how to identify the scale of the MSP national plan. Some practical experimentations were done, in particular through workshops at transboundary level between FR/SP and PT/SP. In addition, they were some stakeholders' interviews conducted. A particular case study underlined the pressures on marine mammals and cetaceans in the Bay of Biscay area. Another one stressed the potentialities and barriers to create a joined SP/PT marine protected area between the Galicia bank and Vigo seamount out of the western Iberian coast. Posters are available to present those case studies. The achievements of the project are that partners build up capacities and knowledge, they developed recommendations for public planners and enabled cooperation at technical level and exchanged informally on transboundary issues, which is an opportunity for each country to progress.

LESSONS LEARNT FROM SIMNORAT

Lise Guennal, CPMR, presented the study developed during the SIMNORAT project focusing on the role of the Regions in MSP. The survey, sent to all CPMR members targeted Issues related to the management of coastal and maritime areas (Erosion, Coastal risks, Climate change ...), the actions undertaken by the regions (regulatory powers and other types of powers, the importance of Land-Sea Interactions) and the Regions' proposals for the future of the MSP, MSFD Birds/Habitats directives. This study highlighted the disparities in the involvement of regional authorities in MSP depending on national implementation processes and regulatory powers and competencies. Regions expressed also their willingness to be informed and to be involved in MSP, as well as a need for capacity building and sharing experiences. Regions can act as facilitator, they are a driven-force, and can act as an arena for stakeholder engagement notably to solve issues at local level. Existing examples such as actions developing in the frame of the Bologna Charter in the Mediterranean, demonstrate how regional authorities already interact on topics related to territorial issues such as coastal erosion, sediment movements, impact of climate change which are in link with MSP. Several main recommendations were expressed from the Regions such as more coherence in decision-making and planning, by involving the regions or the adequate funding for monitoring and use of tools to improve scientific knowledge and investment to cover data gaps. Regions are calling for multi-stakeholders and local communities' involvement in policy decision-making and supporting the development of pilot actions to validate management models. In addition, more efforts shall be done

in raising public awareness on MSP, as well as on simplifying reporting mechanisms for small administrations. Finally, projects like SIMNORAT are a good opportunity to encourage cross-border cooperation and more common work shall be better conducted with neighbouring countries.

Julien Dilasser, CEREMA, presented the study on spatial demands and future trends for maritime sectors. Eight sectors were investigated, and three main factors were addressed: the structure of the sectors and channels of expression, an analysis in its environment and the characterization of spatial and prospective demands around future trends. A great diversity of involvement in the claim for spatial demand can be notify (between activities and between countries). Five main trends were detected in spatial demands strategies including: defence strategy for « historically used » space, spatial expansion, maintaining authorized areas, activities not directly influenced by national MSP process and activities in decline due to the decarbonation of European countries. Some interactions between activities and their “environment” (other activities and marine conservation) can be seen as constraints or opportunities for spatial development of a sector, which lead the conclusion to a more nuanced postulate, as interactions are not always seen as incompatibilities and are not necessarily linked with a conflict in terms of space sharing.

Neil Alloncle and Fanny Bliard, AFB, presented the lessons learnt on taking into account marine environment in MSP. Marine conservation is addressed by different policies and regulations and MPAs is one of the ways to address it. The objective was to compile a comprehensive database of MPAs, based on an existing one. They first collect new MAPs and those which were not addressed yet and produced a map of the MPAs network. They sorted out the MAPs by different categories, which don't have the same roles or legal basis, or not governed in the same processes. They also produced a map showing MAPs with conservation objective on benthic habitats or MPAs focusing on other objectives. To come along with database completion, they did a desk analysis in order to answer to several questions, like who is involved in conservation in the three countries. For each category, they tried to specify the general objectives, governance process, stakeholders, and how activities are regulated.

In addition, a Bay of Biscay case study was conducted and enabled to assess exposure risk of marine mammals and seabirds to anthropogenic pressures in in this area. The focus on marine mammals and seabirds is relevant for cross-border analysis. To implement this test they selected, standardized and shared relevant data of marine mammals and seabirds, activities and pressures occurring in the area. It was a challenge as standardisation of data at the international scale is still a major issue. They also shared methodologies for data processing and cumulative effect assessment, and finally, carried out first attempts to assess the anthropogenic pressures occurring in the pelagic domain.

This study allows to identify national producing institutions of marine data and whom to contact to access to these data. It was the first attempts to assess the effect of cumulative pressures on the pelagic component and at the seasonal scale and they had to face a lack of data as most of data concerned national waters and not all the case study area, and data incompatibility due to different methods of acquisition, processing and different units. Efforts must be continued after the project to really build a common, or at least compatible approaches on pressure evaluation.

The last action concerning stakeholders' perception of marine conservation. There is a need and wide consensus for sustainable development from all sectors, however when talking about the implementation it was quite clear that almost all conservation actors underlined that MSP focuses more on activities rather that environmental issues and the sectoral activities representatives

underlined the aim of MSP was too environmentally focused. The way is still long towards a concrete integrated approach and policies.

Ana Lloret, CEDEX, provided some key messages from the Spanish partners (CEDEX, IEO) regarding organising implementation of MSP. They carried out a variety of activities of different nature, focusing in the area of study of the project (OSPAR IV, the north eastern Atlantic). The knowledge and experiences acquired in the SIMNORAT project will have a direct application in the MSP national process, since both partners are involved in the national technical group for its implementation. One of the main tasks was the development of a methodology for transboundary maritime spatial planning which enabled to identify several issues including, the challenge of harmonization when countries are not at the same implementation stages which could be addressed through collaborative cross-borders network, the necessity to develop a practical approach to take into consideration Land-Sea Interactions, and to develop further work towards the definition of using the most adapted scale in MSP. Then, in the task of identifying spatial demands and future trends of human activities and uses at sea, many difficulties have been identified, especially the lack of information. Regarding data, many challenges need to be overcome, in particular concerning the standardisation and validation of the data and making it comparable. Local, regional and national administrations must also participate in an active way in the data flows generated for the MSP. Regarding stakeholder engagement, two different approaches were explored (interviews and workshops) and provided similar and useful outputs which are otherwise very difficult to obtain and enabled to collect their vision of MSP and reflect on how to simplify procedures. The Spanish partners participated in two case studies, a technical one on cumulative effect assessment in the Bay of Biscay and a more governance-oriented case study on Galicia Bank / Vigo and Vasco da Gama seamounts. In the first study, it was a very step in order to guarantee a technical coherence between France and Spain countries and it was the first time France and Spain shared data on fisheries and maritime transport after an agreed resolution in order to avoid confidentiality problems. They are considering maintaining the network of technical people created for this task for further transboundary work. The second case study focused on the creation and management of a transboundary Marine Protected Area between Portugal and Spain. It highlighted the need to create a joint steering committee based on the governance structure of both countries, allowing setting a shared mechanism for planning maritime activities while addressing and reducing environmental pressures. They wish further initiative from the EU Commission like the SIMNORAT project will enable to pursue the collaborative work and ease the MSP process on transboundary issues.

Adriano Quintela, University of Aveiro, presented the project component dedicated to a conceptual methodology for transboundary MSP composed by 5 deliverables, (1) Major steps of conceptual methodologies, (2) The definition and application of MSP by the OSPAR Convention, (3) Coordination of sectorial policies, (4) Land-sea interactions and relationships with integrated coastal zone management and (5) on how to use the most appropriate at national geographical scale for MSP. It enabled, firstly via the analysis of different other MSP projects from different sea-basins, to identify major steps in MSP planning including pre-planning, analysis, planning, implementation, monitoring and three cross-cutting steps evaluation, stakeholder engagement and communication. The second stage was to undertake a swot analysis for each step to identify strength and weakness of the MSP process, which was done in link with the case studies. Guiding principles were also identified related to OSPAR IV convention, which concluded into several considerations and a gap analysis regarding the main characteristics of "MSP in OSPAR" for each SIMNORAT country. Regarding the coordination of sectorial policies, relevant sectorial policy instruments regarding MSP implementation process and common and shared principles about coordination of sectorial policies in EBM MSP in a transboundary context were identified. Several recommendations for the coordination among MSP

process and sectorial policies were elaborated. On the Land-Sea Interaction sub-component, dynamics of land-sea interactions were specified, and a gap analysis of LSI in the MSP implementation was conducted. And finally, a specific part concentrated on how to better identify the appropriate scale for MSP, highlighting preliminary criteria about boundaries, and that there are two types of scale and boundaries depending on management and analysis. For example, to ensure an operational ecosystem-based approach it starts with a bioregional scale in order to understand the ecosystem - It is important because MSP environmental objectives will only be met when MSP addresses environmental effects beyond the planned area. The definition of scale shall also consider the necessity of multi-level governance and hierarchy of scales and that cross-border projects and a network of plans shall be done at a same scale. A gap analysis regarding the most appropriate at national geographical scale for MSP was also produced.

Ronan Jarno, Shom, presented the data needs and gaps component delivered in the frame of the project. The study presented the context and principles of the study, which enabled building up a catalogue of data in the project area, to implement an INSPIRE compliant Spatial Data infrastructure, to test interoperability of data and actions to address the gaps identified in the inventory. Several issues were highlighted on data comparison such as lack of standardisation and harmonisation, the barrier of language regarding understanding including the needs of translation of data and metadata. Finally, the INSPIRE compliancy does not guarantee interoperability. Moreover, existing Web Services protocols are not all INSPIRE compliant. As perspectives, to improve the sharing of MSP data in a transboundary context, solutions can be supported further such as the identification of fundamental data to take into account to deal with transboundary issues, the use of comparable data and to improve interoperability of data and softwares. There is still a remaining work to map the organisation of the data sharing in the different countries although it is on-going through projects like SIMNORAT: countries have not yet all completed to organise MSP data neither decide how and in what measure they share MSP data with the neighbouring countries. In addition, it appears that it is needed to facilitate the publication of MSP relevant data at National, European and International scale by harvesting official data, through a programme or mechanism like EMODnet.

Denis Bailly, UBO, AMURE, explained the component “Improving Stakeholder engagement” particularly developed in the transboundary conditions. They have tested three approaches, firstly a textual analysis through interviews, to capture the views of the stakeholders, their concerns and how they would like to be involved. The analysis gave a good vision of the perception of the stakeholders with the words of the stakeholders. Workshops were also organised, national cross-border workshops were done in the two borders. It was also a good opportunity to introduce MSP as many stakeholders were not people formally involved as sector representatives. It was a peer to peer place for dialogue from each side of the border. It enabled to underlined what are the priorities and key issues to be addressed in a transboundary context viewed from the stakeholders through a “serious” MSP game. A guide for methodologies to engage stakeholders was produced. A leaflet to communicate on MSP in OSPAR IV and on the perception of stakeholders who were engaged was also produced in 4 languages. To conclude there is a need to develop resources to engage stakeholders, and a need to develop skills. A clear objective has to be set up to engage stakeholders. An engagement of stakeholders shall be also separated from a formal political context, and to consider it is first a matter of ethics.

PERSPECTIVES ON MSP

Moderated by Corine Lochet

The session was moderated by Corine Lochet, Shom, who explained the objective of the session gathering different ongoing or past MSP projects in order to explain their experiences and challenges on MSP and their recommendations for the future of the Directive.

Niccolò Bassan, Università Iuav di Venezia, presented the SUPREME project which addressed MSP in a transboundary context in the Adriatic Sea area. One of the main challenges was to involve scientific, academia and institutional actors, and to find a common language. The timing issue was also to be tackled as the project was going faster than the national processes. There was a rusty local institutions engagement due to need for communication efforts in the basin. The case studies had very positive outputs. An initial assessment at the basin scale of the environmental component and uses was undertaken, which created a useful baseline for the MSP implementation. The MSP forum platform was built, and a conceptual methodology as well as the creation of a strong network. The data requirements in terms of homologation of the data and tools and methods were made. It the stakeholder engagement was notably improved and the analysis of LSI and relation with IZCM was undertaken. The outputs of the project were real in the case study implementation. A knowledge catalogue on MSP was built and the LSI methodology was also built as one of the many tools produced in the project. Regarding stakeholders' involvement, different methods were used, with a mixture of larger or smaller meetings with administrative authorities with more focused discussions. MSP in the Mediterranean is still at the early stage and the project boosted up the formal MSP implementation. There is a need of coordination of marine and coastal experts, and tools still need to be tested in order to facilitate the transition between land and sea. It is a learning by doing process which needs time to be addressed properly.

Andrea Barbanti, Research manager, ISMAR CNR, presented the SIMWESTMED project and also delivered some messages from other MSP related projects (ADRIPLAN, MUSES, and other Interreg MED and ADRION projects such as PHAROS4MPAS, or PORTODIMARE respectively). Challenges were encountered in the preparation of the plans. In daily work, at national level there is still an open issue in defining spatial scales and roadmaps to prepare the plans. At basin scale in the Mediterranean, the main challenge is to identify topics and economic sectors were coordinated planning is a priority. Drivers can be conservation needs, development of some sea uses, single and cumulative environmental impacts from sea uses. Linking MSP and MPAs in the middle of the Mediterranean has to be addressed carefully as we are talking about a « Blue Gold Rush » in this area. The main challenge in the implementation and the governance of the plans is the multilevel governance. A lot of valuable contributions to MSP implementation will and have come out of the MSP projects but the most important is the consolidation of the MSP community, to bring together decision-makers, scientists, planners and operators. But how to improve from the informal project to the formal project is still a key issue. Several ways can support the formal implementation in building the process through MSP projects. A common and ongoing effort on data is also essential at national and transnational levels. The connexion between data and tools is important such as the Tools4MSP Geoplatform supporting MSP & Coastal Planning. An ecosystem of tools can allow planners and decision-makers to support them in the MSP process. Regarding stakeholders' engagement, informal ways let more freedom, however there is no one fits all methodology and both formal and informal methods provide useful information.

David Sanmiguel, Project Adviser, Executive Agency for SMEs (EASME), European

Commission, recalled the EU commission launched a number of proposals for Blue careers to promote different domains such as skills in nanotechnologies, aquaculture and asked if in the field of MSP there a lack of skills and expertise. **Niccolò Bassan** replied, that he Erasmus mundus on MSP helped to train maritime spatial planners, but the remaining need is to train planners coming from different backgrounds and to integrate expertise. **Andrea Barbanti** also confirmed that being able to transfer the expertise from the technical and scientific domain to the administration is essential.

Ingela Isaksson, Project Manager, Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management, presented the Pan Baltic Scope project, underlining its challenges which are mostly similar to the other MSP projects moving fast forward. In the Baltic sea area, ten countries are sharing the same sea. In the project 8 authorities are sharing the work, which can be considered as a strength as the project outputs can directly feed the national plans. They are building a macroregional mechanism for cross-border cooperation in maritime spatial planning. They are moving on to the second generation of MSP project. Each country has its own development goals and policy objectives which might change due to the political life every 4/5 years and are not following the same pace in the MSP process and these aspects have to be taken into consideration in the MSP cycle. The project pointed out specific transboundary areas to identify and analyse countries' interests, conflicts, and synergies. They reinforced networking between sectoral representatives from fishing, environmental sector and shipping. Within the ten countries, 4 have non-binding regulations within their plans and other countries like Sweden, Latvia and Finland have non-binding plans. They are constantly working with planning evidence and data and trying to find ways of exchanging data. They also have unsold borders issues but have the advantages that countries are recognising them, planners don't have the mandate to deal with it, but they are looking at the area taking out the borders issues and only looking at the interests and synergies and this is how they proceeded in a delicate way, building up a stepwise approach. In a way, one of the border issues is now solved thanks to the contribution of the projects. They targeted 4 main sectors and addressed with them mainly transboundary issues, trying to reach some consensus in this enclosed area. They produced recommendations which enabled them to go for a 2nd round, within the second project Pan Baltic scope, and to start filling the gaps acknowledged in the 1st round. They are discussing with national authorities on long term issues, and they are following an ecosystem-based approach notably through a check list, and collaboration with regional organisation such as HELCOM, dealing environmental issues and VASAB. They also work on cumulative impact assessment, green infrastructure and social-economic impacts analysis and Land-sea interactions. The involvement of the regional authorities is also a very good path to walk along. When VASAB and HELCOM joined forces 10 years ago, they had a common MSP working group, working on a joined MSP roadmap and develop some frameworks currently in revision within Pan Baltic Scope, to check any possible improvements and share them with national, regional and local administrative levels. Their final conference is planned in Riga, Latvia, in November 2019.

Kirsty Wright, Marine Scotland Science, presented the Interreg NorthSEE project (April 2016- August 2019). Its three main objectives are to improve transnational coordination of national marine plans, to develop an information and planning platform to share MSP knowledge and to develop transnational coherence in shipping routes, energy and environment. North Sea countries are frontrunners in MSP and most of them have MSP already in place (UK, Belgium, the Netherlands, Germany), or an equivalent (Norway). Denmark and Sweden don't have maritime spatial plans in place. This progress mismatch and transnational incoherence are threats to the sustainable management of the North Sea. There is no over-arching body or mechanism for MSP coordination or cooperation in the North Sea which is what the NorthSEE project is trying to achieve. There is limited or ad-hoc transnational consultation during MSP process that should be enhanced. Due to the

different languages spoken in the area there are also terminology barriers to be overcome. Moreover, to better link future trends and spatial policies and harmonize spatial planning criteria should also be considered. The project produced status quo reports on energy (offshore wind energy), shipping presenting future trends and recommendations for MSP also to prevent incompatibilities within transboundary areas. They also produced an infoquarium which is a platform to share information on MSP in the North Sea. An MSP process timeline tool was created in order to help the other countries in the sea basin to understand in which stages were the other countries in the MSP process. An MSP challenge digital game was also conducted with a variety of sectors representative and was very successful to engage stakeholders.

David Sanmiguel, Project Adviser, Executive Agency for SMEs (EASME), European Commission, raised the question on how to better engage the countries from a common sea-basin together in a MSP working group. Ingela Isaksson, replied that they kind of hope that OSPAR could take this responsibility as well and feel quite confident that HELCOM and VASB can continue to work with this issue and support a transboundary MSP working group as it involves all the MSP authorities of the area. **Angela Schultz-Zehden, EU MSP platform,** reacted that in the Baltic sea this is a ten years long process supported by already existing organisations. In other sea-basins, MSP is at a beginner's stage and countries are cooperating within their own MSP processes also supported by DG MARE co-funded MSP projects which has led to the building up of an MSP community. Even if each country has its own process, there is a kind of coherence now in the Baltic Sea MSP and how countries are reacting to each other, but it was a long process.

Gaël Potin, Policy Officer, Université de La Réunion, presented the OCEAN METISS project. The Isle of Reunion is a French outermost region in the Indian Ocean and is the only EU member state related administrative authority in the area, so the only one dealing with the MSP Directive to some extent. However, there is with the Islands countries of the Indian Ocean neighbouring countries the willingness to cooperate and to do MSP, and the Isle of Reunion was chosen to be the testing area (72 million km²) in order to test tools and collect best practices. OCEAN METISS started in February 2018 for a 2 years duration, and aims at developing innovative methodologies for MSP, sharing expertise and competencies and develop capacity building. the consortium is led by Réunion regional authority, together with French prefecture and with technical work delegated to the University of La Réunion. Other Islands countries of the Indian Ocean are technically supporting in some specific topic such as biodiversity, marine renewable energy. One of the main expectations of the project is the building up of a strong MSP related network, and that main outputs will be prescriptive for future research funding in the MSP field. In terms of challenges, the integration of scale is a very complex issue. Engaging stakeholders is an essential aspect and from the scientific technical side, it would be interesting to engage a diversified range of actors in order to engage a real debate. A large part of the project process will be based on the stakeholder's consultation, engaging also the general public and a contextual analysis is performing in order to extract the real issues at stake. They have built a specialised and interoperable database (Geonode) for the project to be shared with specific groups of users on dedicated topics. Based on those data they produce synthesis document which are debated within the public stakeholders' consultation meetings. They work on innovative tools, notably with a Californian laboratory, to explore new possibilities in terms of planning and consulting.

Cathal O'Mahony, EU Grant Co-ordinator, University College Cork, presented the SIMCelt project which aimed to support cooperation between Member States on the implementation of the Maritime Spatial Planning Directive in the Celtic Seas. It informed practical aspects of MSP implementation, with a specific focus on transboundary cooperation within and between Member States and was composed by seven partners from public organisations and national authorities from

France, Ireland and UK. The activities were grouped around sharing best practices - (on technical data management, scientific ecosystem-based management, and through social stakeholder engagement), transboundary cooperation and supporting MSP national implementation. The SimCelt activities were developed in link with the MSP process in order to ensure the project was policy and practices relevant and to let the external stakeholders know the value of the project and how this project was addressing various aspects of the directive. They undertook different case studies in order to understand specific cross-border issues and opportunities, look at stakeholder engagement, how to plan across borders, understanding and applying ecosystem services to MSP North coast and conducting an assessment of cumulative impacts in the Irish Sea and North coast of Brittany. As other projects, they tried to address the problem of interoperability and harmonisation of data, and he emphasized on how to create a common terminology to ease the language barrier and try to ease the shareability of data between countries. SimCelt also conducted stakeholder engagement workshops where participants draw on their own experiences as sailors, fishermen, nature conservation campaigners or members of coastal communities to role-play and plan together for the sustainable use of marine resources and achieve economic and social objectives.

David Sanmiguel, Project Adviser, Executive Agency for SMEs (EASME), European Commission, to conclude, highlighted the EMFF DG Mare co-funded mostly those presented projects and this event was a good way of collecting their experiences.

The MSP challenge board game proved to be an efficient tool in dealing with cross-border MSP issue and stakeholder engagement, order to communicate on MSP and share views from other sectors. The debate concluded that sometimes the process in MSP is complex and it is difficult to exchange data which remains a challenge, not only for MSP, but also for MSFD. All those projects were the first occasion to address this issue of sharing data, and tools like MSP platform, EDMONET remains very important to collect, keep and use available data. The question of interpretation of data is also a key issue, as even if they come from the same source, some data are often not interpreted the same way by each planning authority, which can be problematic in transnational situation.

Following the question asked by Damien Périssé, CPMR, on why the EMFF should pursuing the co-financing of EU MSP projects, it was underlined by **David Sanmiguel, EASME,** that it is the national authorities themselves, and thus through the planning authorities who can pass on the message, to decide in their committee on the priorities and allocation of funds. Each planning national authority can play a role towards defending the importance of MSP and to stress it within their discussion with the EU commission.

It was underlined by the project representatives that the projects were too short to have long lasting effect, and a continuous support shall be provided to build up capacity building in the sea-basin. There is also not only the EMFF to be looked at and strategies (Regional Sea Convention etc.) can play a role in maintaining a strategic view. Within this umbrella made by strategies and initiatives, we have the formal track ongoing, each state developing their plan by March 2021, and they need to be assisted in the process, so projects are very important in order to establish a kind of constant flow of results and processes to capitalise on this community. Those projects helped all countries to look beyond borders in their planning. Sea-basin strategies also helped a lot to contribute and helped the countries to decide what are their needs. Capacity building has also to be funded and supported. And the evolution of plans must also be considered and EU funded mechanisms must recognise that domestic MSP priorities will evolve. The land-sea interaction remains also a crucial element to consider and related to that there is the challenge of involving citizens. Until now in the stakeholder engagement it was mainly focused on sectoral actors and not yet filtered down to the citizen level

which remain a challenge in terms of understanding, communication and perception and they also need to hear the importance of maritime spatial planning in terms of their own well-being.

In terms of funding, this year another call for proposals will be launched which will represent an opportunity to pursue the work done so far on MSP. However, what goes beyond 2020 is still an open question.

The idea of gathering all the MSP projects is well supported, for example a meeting could be organised soon in Brussels, to share experiences, challenges and collect different aspects based on the results, in order for DG MARE to reflect on the follow-up post 2020.

CONCLUDING SESSION

Olivier Laroussinie, Deputy delegate to the Sea and Coastline, French Ministry for the ecological and inclusive transition, had some conclusive words on this one-day conference. SIMNORAT looked like it was the dreamed life of MSP, as in real life, we need to do an integrated management, but it is very difficult to deal with the different entities, compromise and engage all actors in consultation processes, and address the scale issue, or support the sea basin strategies. All the methodologies used since the start are eroding and after ticking all the checklist, the discussion still remains with fishermen and maritime transport. SIMNORAT opened and gave some fresh air to the MSP debate through “serious games”. This type of project is useful for the technical side as planners can exchange and build capacity on the topic, but it is also in a way useful to the political process, as in the end the stakeholders are more aware of the interests and needs of the others and can better understand the necessity of doing maritime spatial planning.

30th January - PARALLEL WORKSHOPS

Workshop 1 (CEREMA / AFB) Ecosystem-based management in MSP, facilitated by Neil Alloncle, French Biodiversity Agency – [download workshop report](#)

Workshop 2 (SHOM) Data needs and information on MSP, facilitated by Dominique Carval, Shom
[Download workshop report](#)

Workshop 3 (UBO AMURE) Stakeholders engagement, facilitated by Dennis Bailly, UBO AMURE

- [Stakeholders' Perceptions on Maritime Spatial Planning](#)
- [« Serious games », new tools to engage stakeholders MSP challenge](#)
- [France-Spain transboundary workshop](#)
- [Outcomes of the Cross-border Stakeholder's Workshop Spain and Portugal](#)

All Presentations are available here: <https://simnorat.eu/index.php/final-conference-presentations-posters-and-other-documents/>

Pictures and final conference article: <https://simnorat.eu/index.php/2019/02/22/simnorat-final-conference/#more-929>