





EUROPEAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Capacity4MSP

CROSS-SECTORAL DIALOGUES

Summaries and Key Messages

Editors:

Magdalena Matczak, Jakub Turski, Joanna Witkowska Maritime Institute of the Gdynia Maritime University

Based on the reports prepared by workshops organisers

March 2022

The CROSS-SECTORAL DIALOGUES, Summaries and Key Messages was developed by the consortium of the Capacity4MSP project.

Editors:

Magdalena Matczak, Jakub Turski, Joanna Witkowska Maritime Institute of the Gdynia Maritime University;

Disclaimer:

The contents and conclusions in this policy brief, including tables, were developed from the views of the consortium of the Capacity4MSP project with the participating of related experts with the best available knowledge at the time. They do not necessarily reflect the respective national governments' positions and are therefore not binding.

The Interreg BSR programme is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information this report contains.



Table of content

Int	troc	luction	4
W	ork	shop summaries	6
	1.	Data workshop: Exploring BASEMAPS	6
	2.	Offshore Energy and Maritime Spatial Planning	9
	3.	Tackling Land-Sea Interactions Towards Blue Growth in the BSR	. 12
	4.	WP 2 Synthesis Report	. 15
:	5.	Vision and Strategies for Coherent MSP Framework	. 17
	6.	Cumulative Impacts of Maritime Activities	. 21
	7. mul	"Mission Ocean: What is the role of MSP in increasing low-trophic aquaculture and ti-use in the Baltic Sea?"	. 23

Introduction

The dialogue with sectors and stakeholders was always in the very heart of the maritime spatial planning, especially in the Baltic Sea Region with its reach history of EU projects of transboundary nature. Within the last 10 years a lot has been done to build the cooperation networks between the MSP practitioners, decision- and policy makers (EC, HELCOM-VASAB MSP WG, national institutions responsible for MSP) and stakeholders. The knowledge exchange become a part of a regional working routine. The Capticty4MSP project supported the continuation of such a regional collaboration platform for exchange and intensified dialogue, with the additional added value of bringing the experience from different Baltic projects in one place.

A regular dialogue with stakeholders was meant as a crucial part of the Capacity4MSP project. By collecting and discussing lessons learned in previous MSP projects and national MSP processes, project tried to ensure efficient and value-added knowledge-transfer within and outside the Region and across various sectors and governance levels.

On its first meeting in Riga (November 2019) the first discussion on the potential seminars' topics was performed. We have screened the so far completed projects and discussed the main challenges for the future MSP to define the most important fields of discussion. At least 6 cross-thematic and transnational workshops were planned in order to deepen and bring forward the gained knowledge from various MSP projects and project platform activities among various project's target groups. Another aim of this activity was to strengthen the elaboration of the Capacity4MSP Synthesis Report and its Policy Brief. The workshops themes were supposed to be connected with main fields of Synthesis Report.

In 2019, the initial discussions defined such topics:

- Renewable energy development, focusing on:
 - OWF as elements of green infrastructure?
 - o OWF energy connection and impact on benthic habitats
- BlueBioEconomy in MSP
- Cumulative Impact Assessment (new tools)
- Land Sea Interactions
- MultiUse (eg.: MCH+Nature+Tourism+Military)
- Marine foresight: new technologies and new marine uses in 2030
- Promotion of the use of the semi-decentralized MSP data infrastructure (or as an input to all the workshops)
- Intersectoral workshops and expert discussions on Russian MSP Roadmap
- Shipping MSP and IMO
- Radical potential of MSP in practice

The November 2019 meeting in Riga was the first and the last real meeting of the project – due to the pandemic situation. In such a difficult situation, the dialogue activity was first postponed (with the hope that the pandemic will end quickly) and then – had to be reconsidered and adjusted to new, online reality.

Finally, such cross-sectoral dialogues were organized by project partners:

- **6 September 2020** Data workshop: Exploring BASEMAPS.
- **22 September 2020** Offshore Energy and Maritime Spatial Planning.
- **23 September 2020** Thematic Workshop for the Development of the Russian MSP Roadmap.
- **3 March 2021** Tackling Land-Sea Interactions Towards Blue Growth in the BSR.
- 25 March 2021
- Data workshop: Exploring BASEMAPS second edition.
- 30 June 2021

The Synthesis Report and the tools needed to implement the topics which require public support.

• 2 December 2021

Vision and Strategies for Coherent MSP Framework.

• 6-7 December 2021

Cumulative impacts of maritime activities.

• 25 February 2022

"Topicalities for coastal planning and development: project activities, results and tools" for Latvian MSP stakeholders.

• 30 March 2022

"Mission Ocean: What is the role of MSP in increasing low-trophic aquaculture and multi-use in the Baltic Sea?".

As planned, the results of the workshops were included in the parallel work on the Synthesis Report.

This report brings the most important insights from most of the dialogues in one place.

Feel free to explore them!

Workshop summaries

1. Data workshop: Exploring BASEMAPS

Held online on 16 September 2020 (09:00 - 11:30 CET), organised by HELCOM Secretariat

Aim of the workshop:

To **support** the participants of the BSR MSP Data ESG to add relevant MSP input data services (WMS and WFS) that are available from national data providers in Basemaps.

This workshop supported the participants for adding **more available input data services** in Basemaps and to **identify** the further development needs of the admin panel. This information is important to **increase** the **user-friendliness** of Basemaps and to make sure that it contains updated content.

Participants: a total of 16 participants from 7 HELCOM Contracting Parties as well as from HELCOM and VASAB Secretariats attended the workshop.



The introductory session discussed where are we with Basemaps now.

A presentation from the HELCOM Secretariat served as a reminder of the aim and the current status of <u>Basemaps</u>. The participants were reminded that an animation to explain and promote Basemaps is available on <u>Youtube</u>. Thanks to the Capacity4MSP Project Platform, detailed instructions are now publicly available:

- Instructions for users ;
- Instructions for the admin panel.

Session on adding WMS and WFS

The core of the workshop was to have an online «help desk» session during which the participants could add WMS and WFS to Basemaps using the admin panel. It was requested prior to the workshop to prepare such available services. Participants from Denmark, Germany and Sweden took part in this exercise with the help of the HELCOM Secretariat.

Main takeaways from the workshop:

- The exercise of adding WMS and WFS went smoothly.
- The participants discussed that it would be relevant to have an «automatic map content refresh» of Basemaps after adding a new service. For now, the refresh has to be done manually by reloading the page. An automatic map content refresh would be more user friendly.
- The participants highlighted that the subdivisions of the layer list on Basemaps could be simplified. For example, it is not necessary to have a section for each country. We could have the layer name and the name of the country (or its abbreviation) between brackets.
- The participants also highlighted that the current structure of the input data does not necessarily match with the data available from the countries. Layers categories structure should be revised to check if current data fit in it. Structure could be possibly changed to better fit national data. One proposition was also to have a category as « unsorted data » for the layers that do not fit in the current structure.
- Layer or service metadata does not describe the layer enough. The participants wished to have layer description section in the metadata box. Data provider, when adding the layer, could manually add information about how does this layer fit into Basemaps category.
- Finland informed that more services will be available next year.
- Even though the workshop was not focusing on output data, some feedback were received on this topic :
 - It would be more user-friendly that restricted and forbidden sea use categories would not be enabled by default when displaying the «Planned Sea Uses»

As a general outcome, it seems that the participants found relevant the «help desk» session and expressed the need to repeat the exercise before each Meeting of the BSR MSP Data ESG. Consequently, the **second workshop** on Basemaps was performed on 25th March 2021, also in online format, during the 15th Baltic Sea Region Maritme Spatial Planning Data Expert Sub-group (BSR MSP Data ESG).

Main takeaways from the second workshop:

Input data

• The participants discussed on the possibility to harvest WMS/WFS from the INSPIRE geoportal and recognized that it is already a long-term tasks already planned for Basemaps. The Meeting highlighted that the aim of BASEMAPs is to collect and make available MSP relevant data directly from the countries so the approach is a bit different than the INSPIRE geoportal.

- The participants discussed the issue of the categories on Basemaps that are not identical at the national levels. Another issue was also about how to display or make available for download a layer that is mixed with others in a service.
- The Meeting agreed that having a "comment" field as free text when adding a service would be great to inform the user on more information on the service. This field could also be available for downloadable resources.
- The participants noted that a field about the date when the resources where added or updated would be a nice feature to Basemaps (i.e. timestamp).
- The participants agreed that the HELCOM data could be removed for the section on administrative borders since most of the data from the CPs is available. This change was implemented during the meeting by the HELCOM Secretariat.
- The participants discussed that the availability of WFS / WMS is still an issue: not much services are currently available to be added to Basemaps.

Output data

- The participants took note that the output data for Åland, Finland and Lithuania were added to Basemaps. The participants noted that the Guidelines on transboundary MSP output data structure in the Baltic Sea mentioned PlanID with a capital P, but Basemaps model required planID without the capital letter. It was agreed to edit the Guidelines and to publish the new version on HELCOM and VASAB websites to avoid further issue with this attribute.
- The participants discussed on having available a WMS of the output data from the HELCOM Secretariat. WMS would help the CPs to display this dataset in their national portal if needed.

Important information:

Helsinki Commission - https://helcom.fi/

Basemaps - https://basemaps.helcom.fi/

- Instructions for users
- Instructions for the admin panel

Baltic Sea Region Maritime Spatial Planning Data Expert Sub-group - <u>https://vasab.org/theme-posts/maritimespatial-planning/bsr-msp-data-esg/</u>

2. Offshore Energy and Maritime Spatial Planning

Held online on 30 October 2020 (09:00 – 11:30 CET), organised by SUBMARINER Network for Blue Growth EEIG

Aim of the workshop

To provide a platform to discuss what the role of MSP is in ensuring that the future offshore wind energy targets are met and to clarify what approaches may be suitable in which circumstances. Given that **the Baltic Sea countries are at different stages of MSP and offshore wind development and are taking different planning approaches**, the workshop was also an opportunity to highlight some key lessons learned for countries that are just starting to plan their offshore wind energy (OWE), as well as to highlight some of the key industry needs.

Participants

A total of 60 participants took part in the exchange between the public authorities responsible for maritime spatial planning, offshore wind energy authorities, environmental NGOs and the offshore wind industry.



The seminar was divided into four distinctive sessions provided an opportunity for discussion and the exchange of insights on the topics that were identified as relevant by public authorities and industry:

- 1. Maritime spatial planning (MSP) addressing the national renewable energy targets
- 2. Spatial planning criteria for offshore cables interactions with other sectors, with land interconnectors and across borders
- 3. Co-location & multi-use of space between the offshore wind farms and other uses the need for a collaborative approach to policymaking
- 4. Offshore wind environmental impacts (positive and negative).

The first session was moderated by Mr Colin Brown, Business Development Manager at Vattenfall and Chair of WindEurope's Baltic Task Force.

Main takeaways from the first session:

• Importance of official long-term renewable energy commitments, as well as the need for alignment of maritime spatial plans with these commitments. In practice this means that the

ongoing MSP processes and revisions need to address the national renewable energy targets, by:

- Ensuring that enough space for offshore wind will be timely allocated;
- Considering the land-sea interactions including the timely planning of the electricity connection to land and the electricity grid capacities to accommodate these additional volumes.
- Transnational and cross-border cooperation is crucial, especially in relation to grid development and environmental impact assessment;
- All sectors need to work together, and sometimes compromise, to sustainably manage and develop the ocean resources, to protect important factors and tackle climate change.

The second session was moderated by Mr Mattia Cecchinato from WindEurope, who emphasised that when siting offshore wind farms, the MSP process needs to also early on consider the need to bring the electricity from OWE to shore as well as consider what the necessary volumes are in light of European targets to reach carbon neutrality.

Main takeaways from the second session (general recommendations for MSP):

- Planning needs to be undertaken at different scales, including at international (including with the third-party, non-EU Member States, when required), regional, national and local levels. Cross-border planning should be done at least at sea basin scale.
- Planning needs to ensure cross-sector cooperation, including consideration of combined zoning arrangements with other marine uses, with consideration given on minimising cumulative environmental impacts and supporting biodiversity recovery.
- The identification of landing points for offshore grid connection is also a very important part of the planning process and must be tackled at an early stage. This will allow identifying potential onshore grid constraints, and thus reinforcements needed, and minimise environmental impacts.
- Government support is needed for developing real demonstrations of multi-purpose interconnectors in the coming decade, following the Kriegers Flak example. This also requires common planning between TSOs on how to plan the future networks as well as agreement on a clear governing framework for multinational projects.

The third workshop session was moderated by Ms Ivana Lukic from the SUBMARINER Network for Blue Growth EEIG.

Main takeaways from the third session:

- Governments need to drive pragmatic solutions and early dialogue to identify suitable multiuse solutions that bring benefits to society;
- Examples show that the co-location between offshore wind farms and fisheries are possible but dialogues with fishers need to commence early. Questions of defining the legal base; implementation of safety regulations; delineation of minimum requirements for fishing vessels such as capacities, quotas, technical equipment; implementation of a licensing process; and

scoping for financial subsidies to set up a business, require close involvement of government, in many cases multiple agencies, and systemic changes going beyond a single project;

• Co-existence and multi-use go beyond compensation, but the latter can be useful in a transition period.

The fourth and final session of the workshop was an opportunity to exchange good practices and present new guidelines that are meant to support the environmentally sound development of OWE. **Main takeaways from the final session**:

- Early discussions with stakeholders about possible impacts of offshore wind farms on the environment, facilitated through an MSP and SEA processes, and making data on impacts available, could reduce the burden on developers during the permitting process.
- Collaboration across borders is needed in order to ensure that migration corridors are properly taken into consideration, but also with regard to making the environmental impact procedures compatible and sharing the information.

Important information:

Seminar documentation - <u>https://vasab.org/event/online-workshop-maritime-spatial-planning-and-offshore-wind-energy/</u>

SUBMARINER Network for Blue Growth EEI - <u>https://submariner-network.eu/</u>

3. Tackling Land-Sea Interactions Towards Blue Growth in the BSR

Held online on 03 March 2021 (09:00 – 11:30 CET), organised by the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development of the Republic of Latvia

Aim of the workshop

To discuss the complexity of land-sea interactions (LSI), the development and measurement of blue economy and good practices of consideration of land-sea interactions and challenges ahead.

The **participants** were maritime spatial planning experts, practitioners and planning specialists from various governance levels.

This workshop was also an example of how synergies can be created between two Interreg BSR projects (Capcity4MSP and Land-Sea Act) and how productive discussions on challenging issues like land-sea interactions can be facilitated.

The seminar was held in separate sessions, exploring the different dimensions of the LSI.

The first Part – on complexity of the land-sea interactions, included panel discussion and presentations on multi-level governance, blue economy, and well-being of coastal communities in relation to land-sea interactions and marine spatial planning.

Main takeaways from the first Part:

- The reliable MSP needs land-sea interactions.
- Stakeholder engagement is the key for success of multi-level governance, as the process is as good as its participants are prepared.
- There is room for improvement in measuring the Blue economy sector development and comparable national/local data should be taken into account when measuring Blue economy.
- The coastal area (land-sea interconnecting space) is of vital importance also for Blue economy business development.
- Landscapes and wellbeing should be considered as important concepts that might be useful for planners in coastal planning. Landscapes should be able to satisfy at least some of human needs, e.g. to promote mental wellbeing.
- According to participants opinions, the Blue economy sectors which will demand additional space in the land-sea interface are marine renewable energy and coastal tourism, from new sectors, the blue bioeconomy an biotechnology was also mentioned.

The second Part on **getting to know good practices of consideration of land-sea interactions and challenges ahead** was divided into three short sessions with presentations and panel discussions on:

- 1. Offshore wind parks & coastal communities,
- 2. Coastal tourism & coastal environment,
- 3. Marine/coastal cultural heritage and identities of coastal communities

The first session demonstrated e.g.: an example of offshore wind farm (Middelgrunden) which was developed as an early energy community with more than 8500 shareholders and where energy production and tourism sector go hand in hand.

Main takeaways from the first session (second Part):

- the new strategy on offshore renewable energy shows that we will need more space, still various sectors can have synergetic development while using same marine space. Examples of the offshore energy industry and tourism also being an opportunity,
- measurable criteria (like distance from coast etc.) for the placement of offshore wind parks are not enough, involvement of local people and profit sharing is important too.

The second session was devoted to coastal tourism and coastal environment and shared the knowledge and experience gained by research held on Latvian and German coasts devoted to the assessment of the pressures from the tourist flows.

Main takeaways from the second session (second Part):

- it is important to have systematic visitor assessment to have the necessary knowledge, furthermore, when coastal tourism is one of biggest contributors to Blue growth, coastal visitor monitoring can become a common interest for all of the BSR,
- in coastal places balanced measures need to be found to limit the capacity while retaining public access at the same time,
- key challenge with monitoring coastal tourism and recreation might be in linking different planning and management systems.

The third session was devoted to marine/coastal cultural heritage and identities of coastal communities, challenges in integrating tangible and intangible cultural heritage in MSPs and how to overcome the still limited knowledge on maritime cultural heritage in the Baltic Sea Region.

Main takeaways from the third session (second Part):

- It is important to involve the local community and to get data, information from the community (e.g., bottom-up/citizen science data showing bathing and important places).
- When culturally important and/or heritage places are mapped, it is crucial to know how to treat this information as background or as instrumental for creating regulation/restrictions it is important to develop methods for including important cultural places/objects in plans.
- Many questions might arise from work with intangible coastal/maritime values and traditions, however, it also might be an advantage in the involvement work with the local community.

During the whole workshop experts also expressed that:

- integrated planning for land and sea or "one space perspective" is possible, but there are shortcomings we all need to address,
- large scale spatial plans with ambitious measures and priorities for coastal areas could help dealing with LSI issues,
- there is a strong need for more education on the land-sea interaction issues,
- the power games are very important in small (local) communities where community leaders have a great role in moving things forward,
- within Blue economy all value chains should be explored comprehensively.

Important information:

Documentation from the workshop - <u>https://vasab.org/event/workshop-land-sea-interactions-towards-blue-growth-in-the-bsr/</u>

Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development of the Republic of Latvia - <u>https://www.varam.gov.lv/en</u>

Land Sea Act project - https://land-sea.eu/

4. WP 2 Synthesis Report

Held online on 30th June 2021, organised by Gdynia Maritime University – Maritime Institute,

Aim of the workshop

The Capacity4MSP project has elaborated the Synthesis report aiming at addressing the policymakers. It emphasizes what topics require public support for their development at the current stage of MSP in the BSR. The final part of the report contains supporting tools for practitioners enhancing the aforesaid development. The BSR planners have identified top priorities in terms of the future of BSR MSP, therefore for those priorities there is a need to elaborate tools. The workshop on 30th of June served this purpose.

Participants – there were 21 participants from the Baltic Sea countries, representing the institutions experienced in maritime spatial planning.

The discussion during the workshop was devoted strictly to the tools.

Main takeaways from the workshop:

• Tools on the interactions related to the social sustainability (how allocation of the sea space benefits various social groups on land) (moderator Kira Gee)

Kira Gee presented the Social sustainability model including representation of communities, stakeholders, cultures in MSP; recognition of legitimate interests, values and connections to the sea and distribution of goods and bads resulting from MSP policies.

The main outcome of this group was that social sustainability should be a more explicit objective for MSP. The group agreed that it not supposed to be about measuring benefits, but who benefits. Territorial impact assessment/sustainability appraisals should be expanded to include different relationships.

• Tools on monitoring governance of MSP processes (coherence of MSP), MSP results and monitoring/assessing impact of MSP on other policies (moderator Riku Varjopuro)

Riku Varjopuro presented existing tools regarding monitoring governance, like EU MSP Platform Handbook on MSP Indicators Development, BaltSpace indicator system and the Baltic SCOPE / Pan Baltic Scope reports on monitoring and evaluation. The group described characteristics of good tools, which have to include: easiness to apply, used consistently over time, overall picture (one indicator positive, other negative) and easiness to communicate the results.

Group concluded: "Develop a framework to assess which tools work in which contexts and why. Then make a catalogue of validated tools that countries can select from."

• Tools helping MSP adaptation to the climate change (moderator Inga Jekabsone)

Inga Jekabsone mentioned studies, which indicated that in the Baltic Sea region in the next 100 years, the most probable changes will be related to the increase of sea surface temperature, increase number of weather extreme events, and decrease of ice cover. She presentenced existing tools, like Symphony, Baltic Sea Impact Index Tool and PlanWise4Blue.

The group concluded that knowledge base has to improve and that these 3 tools are very silimar, they are about resiliance and mitigation. These tools are very helpful, but do not give new

information. Therefore, there is a need for a models showing changes in ecosystem to look forward if areas are climated proofed.

• Spatial oriented tools telling MSP planners what will be the socio-economic consequences (primary, secondary and tertiary i.e. through the multiplier effect) of allocating a given amount of sea space to the given sea use (moderator Jacek Zaucha)

Jacek Zaucha presented existing tools, which are: German S=spatial economic benefit analysis tool, Polish maritime spatial rent, public policy for MSP, maritime spatial development and estimating economic impacts linked to Marine Spatial Planning with input-output techniques.

The group concluded that these tools seem promising – e.g. they have a lot of potential to determine the value for maritime space. However, they are lacking a broader perspective of how one entity has an impact on another. There is a need for a bigger picture of trade-offs. Moreover, it was concluded that national statistic offices have to improve their marine orientation.

• Tools on combining blue growth and carrying capacity of the environment (moderator Anda Ikauniece and Magda Matczak)

Anda Ikauniece and Magda Matczak informed that, sectoral tools do not cover all aspects of ecosystem carrying capacity and that cumulative impact assessment tools should be used more widely – and should be improved.

The group concluded that there is place for improvement for: temporal aspect of the impact – how long is it lasting; heritage and other tourism features to be included; additional information on noise, sand extraction, marine litter impacts on carrying capacity; comparison of impacts on land vs. in the sea (nutrient concentrations, energy), balance of impacts; to include positive impacts of nature based solutions not only the negative ones and data quality for relevant assessments.

• Tools supporting Multi-Use in MSP including energy sites (moderator Ivana Lukic)

Ivana Lukic informed about the existing tools, which are: MUSES DABI approach, MULTI-FRAME Assessment Approach, SOMOS risk Assessment Framework, Community of Practice and UNITED – pilot tests as a proof of concept.

The group found key gaps, like planning system and legislation - who decides on MU and how is that decided, is it voluntary or mandatory, the problem of overlapping permits, the way of MU implementation to MSP, technical challenges – e.g. what fishing gear, question of quotas, the engagement forms/tools needed to facilitate the 'creation' of MU, communication tools for communicating MU benefits.

Important information

The results of the discussion was incorporated into the Policy Briefs, published at project website: <u>Policy Briefs</u>

Maritime Institute of the Gdynia Maritime University - https://im.umg.edu.pl/eng/

5. Vision and Strategies for Coherent MSP Framework

Held online on 2nd December 2021, organised by Gdynia Maritime University - Maritime Institute

Aim of the workshop

To present VASAB work towards coherent MSP framework in the Baltic Sea and share existing practices in visioning processes in MSP, identified by Capacity4MSP project platform and applied practice around the Baltic Sea Region countries. Also – to present and discuss the update of the VASAB Long-Term Perspective. Going through the four metaphors of the vision, i.e., the *pearls*, the *strings*, the *patches* and the *system*, each representing a different territorial element, participants were welcomed to share their views how these are related to MSP and what should be addressed by VASAB Vision 2040.

The workshop was attended by 23 **participants** from the Baltic Sea Region countries as well as from the North Sea and the European Commission.

The workshop was divided into two parts to discuss what has been done so far (Part 1) and how could the future look like (Part 2).

During Part One - the Baltic history of MSP was presented by Elīna Veidemane from VASAB Secretariat, starting from the Wismar declaration of 2001 and the Gdańsk VASAB Ministerial Conference of 2005 *Policy Document Connecting Potentials* in which MSP was upgraded to the key VASAB tasks the first time. In 2009 - the VASAB Long Term Perspective was adopted and the Joint HELCOM-VASAB Working Group on MSP was established, that made BSR a forerunner in the MSP vis a vis other EU Sea Basins.

Jacek Zaucha (GMU-IM) presented the <u>main conclusions steaming from the analyses of Capacity4MSP</u> <u>with regards to visions focusing</u> on the outcomes of transnational projects such as BaltSeaPlan, EU MSP Platform, Plan Bothnia, Baltic Integrid, BalticLINes screened by the Capacity4MSP project. Out of these visions at least two influenced the MSP national processes: BaltSeaPlan and BalticLINes. The key policy observations on visioning in the BSR might be summarized as:

- The good practices related to visions are available.
- Despite their great potential to influence the planning process and outcomes they have not been frequently used.
- Probably the reason is in lack of trust into vision practical power in changing reality or concentration on concrete planning topics as suggested by VASAB-HELCOM WG
- Several countries have been reluctant due to the lack of long-term policies and targets of sectors.
- However, visions are important for stakeholder engagement, adding social sustainability to the economic and environmental ones and for discussing on a long term development goals.
- At least in the BSR a more complex cross-sectoral vision (integrating sectors) prepared by different authorities have not been sufficiently developed (such as BSR Integrated Coastal Management (ICM) vision as proposed by students at the BSR Young Planners' Contest initiated and organised by VASAB).
- For pursuing visions political commitment is necessary (also for mesh grid).
- Young people clearly see the need of MSP visioning (see the outcomes of the Young Planners contest organised by VASAB).

The experience on including visions is national MSP processes was shared by participants.

- In Poland the MSP process did not included visioning. The BaltSeaPlan *VISION 2030* somehow bridged this gap and played important role in Polish MSP, guiding thinking of planners, as well as Helcom-VASAB guidelines.
- In Latvia, vision was important for making connections with stakeholders the national MSP process was started from encouraging stakeholders to present their thinking how the LV sea space will look like in 2030. It helped also in structuring the MSP strategic objectives. Vision was also important in scenario building seeing different ways of exploring the future opportunities, examining different alternatives.
- In Sweden, the six pages vision was prepared (based on existing national policies), but it was
 criticised for being weak. That was mainly due to the stakeholders being unprepared for
 making prediction. The planning objectives are more concrete and they explain vision. But this
 six pages vision was a useful experience that can be used in the future in a better way.
- In the Netherlands, the process of scenario building (30 years' time horizon) was based on territorial dialogue with stakeholder focused on MSP drivers in global scale such as energy or food transition or the climate change. They will have four scenarios evenly feasible.
- In Estonia visioning was important part of the MSP. It helped to add to the environmental side (having strong legislation) also the economic, social and cultural side that have less support from legal acts. The vision helps to find a balance in MSP.
- In Finland, the scenarios and visions are very popular in land-use planning. This is e.g. a very good tool for inclusion of Marine Cultural Heritage (MCH) into the planning process. The MSP process also included the scenario building. There is a need for more data and information on culture and MCH to include culture to the MSP.
- In Bulgaria, the MSP is still at the beginning. But visioning and identification of strategic goals were done both in Bulgaria and Romania. Black Sea MSP vision is aligned towards the sustainable blue economy with some focus on EU Green Deal. Long term vision of the EU part of the Black Sea is in discrepancy with the processes done under regional conventions more inclined towards ICZM. So the long term vision for MSP in the Black Sea is important for involvement of non-EU member states in the region. Such a vision would need a political commitment.

The links to another "visioning" project was also shared (Plan4Blue): <u>https://www.syke.fi/projects/plan4blue</u> and link via participating organisations SYKE and Univ. of Tartu is <u>https://www.msp-platform.eu/projects/plan4blue-maritime-spatial-planning-sustainable-blue-economies</u>

In the Second Part, the emerging trends/phenomena in the Baltic Sea were discussed, their spatial consequences, potential conflicts and how could the visioning help in solving these. These were e.g.: climate change, offshore energy expansion and grid development, high quality tourism including MCH, new and powerful mega political processes (e.g. Green Deal) combined with new transnational MSP guidelines, tangible and intangible cultural heritage (culture as social aspect) as horizontal issue, fishery transformation, blue growth combined with multi-use, growth of bio-blue economy/marine bio-economy, land-sea interactions, Co2 capture and ecosystem restoration, human mobility patterns over time, behavioural changes.

The territorial scenarios for the Baltic Sea Region prepared by ESPON were also mentioned: <u>https://www.espon.eu/BT%202050</u>.

Finally, the concept of the updating of the VASAB LTP (VASAB Vision 2040) was presented and discussed widely.

As far as the pearls are concerned, the main takeaways are:

- The "coastal pearls" should be distinguished as separate "group" to support Land Sea Integration.
- Thematic networks and place based connections are important for the costal pearls interacting both in terms of information, collaboration, exchange of goods and services and people maybe a coastal pearl necklace, they should reflect real situation of coastal towns.
- Maritime clusters (such as in Västra Götaland) should be examined.
- Cross-border multi theme connector might be also effected, an example: Svinesund Committee between Sweden and Norway.
- The VASAB vision should emphasize importance of small and medium size coastal towns. According to the existing proposal, Riga is dominant for Latvia. Do we want that for future?
- VASAB and national visions on coastal cities and towns should be aligned.
- Sea to fork thinking should be addressed in development of the coastal towns.
- Transformation from fishery to energy and tourism should be addressed in development of the coastal towns.
- Multi-level governance should be addressed in development of the coastal towns.

As far as the strings are concerned, the main takeaways are:

- Multi-modality including marine transport is a key part for strings for BSR.
- Around the clock transport (sleep while you travel), connecting rail and shipping better for passengers, schedules resilient to disturbances and improving coordination across borders. The highly competitive character of the present transport market has disturbed connectivity.
- Connections between different modes of transport at coastal areas should be better reflected.
- Transport in coastal areas should be driven by public concerns not only economic needs (e.g. in order not to spoil marine landscapes).
- More focus should be given to cables and pipelines under VASAB strings which is important for connecting energy market of BSR and is a key part of marine strings.
- Electrification and digitalization of Maritime Transport is a key issue.
- Ecological, nature corridors mobility of fish, birds, mammals should be part of strings.
- Better interlinkages between different issues are necessary i.e. hydrogen is important for maritime transport so off-shore energy is connected with development of strings.
- Important issue is reducing vulnerability and increase redundancy and resilience in systems e.g. mesh grid.
- One needs to be agile. But this is not always easy. Big investments will be needed in the energy and transport infrastructure. And we do not know yet what the main parts will be on the energy use of the future. Will we transfer to a hydrogen economy or will solar and wind energy be the key technology. We should think how one should address this strategically in a vision?
- We need both the big systems and the decentralised this is the key to resilience!
- Military strings should be addressed ,

- Land sea integration should be addressed in development of the strings.
- Cross-border and transboundary coherence should be addressed in development of the strings.
- Integration between strings and patches should be addressed in development of the strings.

As far as the patches are concerned, the main takeaways are:

- Sea basins may be quite local/regional in their characteristics and this is valuable. Important is coexistence and openness to new activities. Sea areas are extremely patchy and multi-layered in themselves (add the summer/winter dimension!). One should consider using the term of "mosaics" (used in ecology) to illustrate interconnected local and regional social-ecological sub- patches with many different aspects.
- "Marine energy patches" should be taken into consideration.
- Vision on patches does not take into consideration the specificity of marine patches. Sea is
 extremely productive. The ecosystem services are related both to biodiversity but also to
 enhancement of businesses in local disadvantages coastal communities. Sea produces
 important elements of quality of life. So we need to put more consideration to this issue. And
 we need to link better all metaphors. E.g. sea is important for climate change in pearls because
 sea is providing important climate related ecosystem services (e.g. absorption of Co2).
- Multidimension of sea patches must be better addressed. So we have challenge in interpreting the map. Map on patches conveys simplified messages.
- Maps should not cover sea areas outside BSR. Open space is a better metaphor than patches since we can combine here environment and local development. Sea is a linking element for all four metaphors used in LTP update.
- Man is missing from all the images and explanations (except Patches in 2040 > people), we are talking about species, ecosystems, but man is absent with cultures and intangible values under patches, this should be changed.
- A special seminar discussing the map and text with marine planners should be organised as a part of LTP update.
- The carrying capacity of the sea basin is a very important parameter which sets boundaries for other uses. This fuels the big (political) discussion. At least this is the case in the North Sea.

As far as the system is concerned, the main takeaways are:

• The Baltic marine spatial vision would be useful (and necessary) to complement the Baltic Sea REGION more general vision.

Important information:

VASAB LTP - https://vasab.org/ltp-update-2021-2022/

BaltSeaPlan Vision 2030 - <u>https://maritime-spatial-planning.ec.europa.eu/practices/baltseaplan-vision-2030</u>

The territorial scenarios for the Baltic Sea Region (ESPON) - <u>https://www.espon.eu/BT%202050</u>.

Plan4Blue project - <u>https://www.syke.fi/projects/plan4blue</u>

6. Cumulative Impacts of Maritime Activities

Held in Copenhagen, at the Alborg University campus on 6-7th December 2021

Aim of the workshop

The aim of the workshop was **to discuss the cumulative impact assessment**, its principles and approaches, as well as the topics of multi-use, synergies, and conflicts in maritime spatial planning.

The discussion was based **on testing the MYTILUS toolbox** - a general-purpose tool for cumulative impact assessment (CIA) and the spatial scope spans from local sea areas over regional seas like the Baltic Sea to global level. The toolbox was originally developed as a research tool within the INTERREG North Sea project NorthSEE and the BONUS BASMATI project. The software has been used in PhD courses and currently efforts are directed towards a broader application of MYTILUS as a decision support tool in real-world MSP processes.

Participants

Due to the pandemic situation, the workshop had been postponed several times in order to be able to perform it as a physical event making room for direct interaction and dialog with MSP planners. Still in December 2021, only a few participants were able to travel and take part in the workshop. Though, despite the limited number of participants, the workshop contributed to the ongoing dialog on how to include cumulative impact assessments in the MSP planning processes. The workshop was attended by planners from the Maritime Institute, Gdynia Maritime University (Poland).



Fig: Workshop participants concentrating on the exercises

The workshop was organised as mixture of presentations, hands-on exercises and discussions covering the following topics:

• Cumulative impact assessments – introduction to principles and approaches

- Cumulative Impact Assessments introduction to the MYTILUS Toolbox suite followed by hands on exercises
- Multi-use, synergies, and conflicts introduction to principles and approaches
- Hands on exercises using the MYTILUS Toolbox suite
- Hands on exercises using the MYTILUS Toolbox suite
- Wrap up and future perspectives

The material and experiences from the Capacity4MSP workshop will be further developed to serve the needs of MSP planners and has already been utilised for a PhD course in the Knowledge Flows for MSP project. A movie introducing the cumulative impact assessments as part of MSP and a user guide introducing the MYTILUS tool will be ready when the project ends.

Important information

Alborg University, Dept. of Planning - <u>https://www.en.plan.aau.dk/</u>

Mytilus Toolbox - <u>https://maritime-spatial-planning.ec.europa.eu/practices/toolset-estimate-effects-</u> human-activities-maritime-spatial-planning

7. "Mission Ocean: What is the role of MSP in increasing low-trophic aquaculture and multi-use in the Baltic Sea?"

Held online on 30th March 2022, organised by SUBMARINER Network for Blue Growth EEIG

Aim of the workshop

To inform stakeholders about the EU Mission "Restore our Ocean and Waters by 2030" and about the concept of the BluBioSites project.

There were 45 persons participating in the seminar mainly from the Baltic Sea Region as well as from France and Romania.

The workshop introduced one of the five EU Missions, which main goal is to restore the Oceans and Waters by 2030. The main actions were described:

- The Horizon Europe Programme, the European Maritime Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund, Invest EU and other EU programmes will provide around 500 million Euro in seed funding during the period 2021-23.
- Create a network of lighthouses at sea and river basin scale to implement the mission and expand the networks of marine protected areas.
- Establish an EU-wide "Blue Parks" initiative to provide new restoration and conservation opportunities.
- Support effective water management through a digital knowledge system with a Digital Twin Ocean and improved environmental monitoring of ocean health.

The objective of the Baltic-North sea lighthouse is making the blue economy carbon-neutral and circular, and among the targets we can find "develop zero-carbon and low-impact aquaculture and promote circular, low-carbon multi-purpose use of marine and water space".

In order to implement the Mission, in early 2022, the first calls for proposals under Horizon Europe will make available 114 million Euro to support the rolling out of the Mission. Throughout its lifetime, the Mission will move from piloting to demonstration, deployment and market entry of innovative solutions to restore our oceans and waters.

In the second part of the seminar, the concept of the new project was presented: *the BlueBioSites* – *Data, information and tools to identify and monitor optimal sites for the Blue Bioeconomy in the Baltic Sea*. Overall objective of the project is to identify optimal sites for the respective BlueBioEconomy uses in the Baltic Sea Region and to establish the necessary standards for continuous monitoring of these sites Improve knowledge base, methods, technologies, tools and resulting analyses necessary to identify and monitor Blue Bioeconomy sites.

The project has been submitted for the Interreg funding.

Important information

UE Missions in Horizon Europe - <u>https://ec.europa.eu/info/research-and-innovation/funding/funding-opportunities/funding-programmes-and-open-calls/horizon-europe/eu-missions-horizon-europe_en</u>







EUROPEAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT FUND



www.capacity4msp.eu

The Interreg BSR programme's co-financed project platform Capacity4MSP aims to strengthen the capacity of maritime spatial planning stakeholders, policy- and decision-makers through intensified dialogue activities and amplifying gained knowledge in maritime spatial planning. Capacity4MSP builds on the results of the current and recently completed MSP projects and ongoing MSP processes in the Baltic Sea Region.

Since June 2020 project platform is granted with a flagship status of the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region under the policy area Spatial Planning.

1 August 2019 – 30 March 2022	Duration:
€ 1,089,272.50	Total project budget:
€ 909,950.00	European Regional Development Fund:
€ 179,322.50	The European Neighbourhood Instrument and Russia budget:
€ 192,695.88	Own contribution:

Lead Partner

VASAB VISION & STRATEGIES AROUND THE BALTIC SEA

Project Partners



Swedish Agency r Marine and Water Management





À



Praca naukowa finansowana ze środków finansowych na naukę w latach 2018-2020 przyznanych na realizację projektu międzynarodowego współfinansowanego/ Research work funded by 2018-2020 science funding allocated to an international project co-funded.