

Thematically grouped recommendations of the workshop on strengthening EBA in MSP.

General recommendation on the application of EBA in MSP

What kind of improvements to the international EBA framework would be of the highest priority?

- Guidance on planetary boundaries. (This point meant that there is now a lot of discussion about planetary boundaries and it could help in finding practical solutions for the EBA in MSP. But to use the concept and analyses that apply it for MSP planning needs still more thinking and methodological development. An international guidance.)
- Establishing transboundary governance mechanisms that ensure the defining of common goals in countries sharing the same regional sea. (Here the HELCOM-VASAB WG was mentioned as a good model. Such a mechanism can also be a driver for countries to do their MSPs.)
- **Land- sea interactions (and integrated legal framework)**
- **WFD can be an instrument to link land- sea uses,**
- Better knowledge and representation of regional ecosystem processes
- Better knowledge from local to broadly distribution of pressures and their effects
- "Real promotion" of regional plans more than Plans under national jurisdiction (promotion of international collaboration)
- Better knowledge on relational understanding, interconnectivity of systems
- Progress on assessing the different values that users and societies give to the benefits derived from ecosystem services besides the monetary approach. This is, explore relational and intrinsic values apart from instrumental.
- Include restoration and ecosystem services.
- Define carrying capacity in calculable way and define ecological ceilings.
- GES harmonization across borders.
- Adaptive management
- Use RSC to harmonize the implementation of the EU MSPD. Provide legal test cases involving EBA, SEA and GES.
- Identify the role of RSCs as a coordinator of information and data produced by different systems.

- Harmonize timeline for various EU directives.
- Sustainability appraisal.
- Harmonize the definition of ecosystem approach (e.g. ecosystem-based approach vs ecosystem management).
- Develop tools (criteria) to balance local interests vs national ones; private vs public.

What can MSP do to increase climate change resilience (adaptation and mitigation)?

- Include climate change considerations in all MSP scenarios to facilitate analysis of trade-offs and really plan for the future. (the point was really to strengthen future-orientation in MSP and then one has to consider CC)
- MSP should go in line with spatial planning on land, so that e.g. flood risk is mitigated. (I asked an explanation for this, but got none)
- **MSP can collect information on the sectors and the environment (M&E) how they are affected by CC and plan to mitigate.**
- Future scenarios definition – modelling approaches to predict ecosystem processes changes (includes spatial and temporal distribution of species for conservation and of commercial interest).
- To leave as much space for nature (no human activity) as possible
- Marine Plans can be used to identify/signpost coastal management policy in land planning that can be accounted for in marine projects e.g. ORE cable landfall. This enhances and better integrates accounting adaptation/resilience.
- Marine planning might be a useful tool to look at the marine contribution to mitigation overall. This might allow more informed decisions and certainty on options / plan focus e.g. a marine plan that maximises CC mitigation. For example, is it possible to set out the contribution of ORE in reducing carbon from electricity production alongside the contribution of maintaining (and separately improving) habitats in carbon sequestration?
- Considering appropriate modelling of CC effects, future scenarios "due to CC" should be considered when allocating spatially and temporally maritime activities.
- Adaptive management – “extra” precautions.
- Include the role of nature (ecosystem services) in climate resilience; nature-based solutions.
- Mapping cumulative pressures to reduce impact (impact of CC?).
- Land-sea interactions for two-front support.
- Climate refuge spots; bright spots.
- Long-term prediction scenarios (2030-2040-2050-2100). Integrative science scenarios.

- MSP can enhance the protection of biodiversity to increase the ecosystem resilience by incorporating refuge areas.
- Regulate activities related extraction from the sea floor (hydrocarbons, sand, etc).
- Regulate recreational activities which cause pressure.
- Optimise sea traffic.
- Prevent habitats fragmentation.
- Climate change is a global process while MSP is local or regional. MSP is a tool to communicate the need to allocate space, including MPAs, from global perspective with local stakeholders.

What are the mechanisms to ensure that results of SEA and EIA are incorporated in the plans (goals and content)?

- Ensuring that the development of the EB-MSP goes hand-in-hand with the implementation of the MSFD and the other relevant EU Directives and establishing common goals (An explanation on this actually focused on the use of common pool of data in environmental assessment; use monitoring data collected for MSFD and other policies in assessments related to MSP)
- SEA: Add a step in the process to ensure that the identified concerns are addressed and somehow incorporated in the plan before its adoption. (In the explanation there was a concern that the conducted SEAs do not have impact on the planning after all. This needs to be clearly organized and included in the MSP planning process)
- EIA: More complicated as this is at project level. But information from EIA should be incorporated in MSP databases to ensure they are used for monitoring and revision of the plan. (here the discussions within the UN Global Compact's MSP work and the UN Ocean Decade data work were brought in. There have been proposals to make the data that companies collect for EIA publicly available. Quite often, if anything is made public, it is final reports and maps, not the data itself. This should be changed by changing regulation)
- **If MSP and SEA are created by the same institution, there are synergy effects and a greater chance of integration.**
- **EIA is a project- level assessment. One of the main challenges in using information from these processes is scale and variation in terms of approach and project types etc. Often applicants use different methods, data resolutions etc. in their applications This makes comparison difficult. Also, consenting systems and make it hard to collate and analyse data e.g. applications in .pdf format. Improving applications systems to allow easier comparison and collation of data so it can be used at national MSP and sea basin scale would be useful.**

- Should Appropriate Assessment (Birds and Habitats Directives assessment) be considered here or is it assumed that this is part of SEA?
- For SEA, this is an assessment of the plan so it is important to begin this assessment at the start of the MSP plan development process then enable iterative development during drafting to inform the final plan.
- Structure of MSP content including SEA as an attachment to the plan.
- Cross-disciplinary with broad representation of different fields of interests.
- Harmonization of parameters and structures.
- Include information on decision making based on EIA and SEA within MSP; also include information on carrying capacity of the ecosystem.
- Include all user's life cycle perspectives.
- National MSP science boards and active dialog between these boards.
- Standardize and ensure high quality of SEA and EIA.
- Integrate SEA and EIA into planning process from the very beginning. The SEA and EIA are to be a part of the planning throughout the whole process.
- Include the evaluation of cumulative impact.
- Raise public awareness about the impact of plans.
- Develop a guideline integrating recommendations, methods and tools to integrate SEA and EIA in the planning process.

How does the reference data list strengthen EBA in MSP?

- A common data list can facilitate transboundary assessment, thus contributing to the identification of regional goals. Regulations can be a barrier for collaboration.
- **This list might be helpful in providing a baseline for countries around a sea basin regarding the types of data to be used in MSP on a non-binding basis.**
- The reference list can help strengthening coherence in the approaches.
- Common quality standards for data structure, processing, organization.
- Harmonization of applied terminology – a reference list.
- Data becomes useful when translated into applicable knowledge.
- Translation to policy needs.
- Streamline with other information to speak the same language.
- Structuring for SEA needs with an opportunity for regional scaling.
- Efficient data sharing is important.
- Harmonize data to improve usefulness and understanding for different countries.
- It strengthens transparency.
- Data does not make sense if it's not translated for planners.
- Use maps but with the analysis to complement them.

- Use RSCs as a platform to harmonize align and share data.
- Proper visualization of data has significant impact on stakeholders.

The role of MSP in overall progress towards GES: opportunities and limits.

MSP as a tool to achieve GES.

- MPA's and spatial protection measures beyond them (buffer areas for underwater noise)
- Restoration areas (e.g. areas allocated for oyster restoration)
- OECM's (other effective area based conservation measures)
- New MPA based on MSP assessment (Example from Poland)
- Refugia
- Corridors between MPAs
- Small Natura 2000 areas for particular consideration of high nature values (Sweden)
- Spatio-temporal measures in a MSP to reduce pressures
- Bycatch: Spatio-temporal measures fishery measures in areas (MPA's)
- Securing L-S corridors for migratory fish species (Example in Polish MSP)
- Changing the shipping lines (routes)
- Adaptive development, go or no-go moments
- Quality indicators
- Step-by-step development
- Planning provisions can limit pressures to contribute to GES
- Setting planning provisions to take into account multiple pressures in larger areas
- MSP steering & encouraging to plan for:
 - ecosystem services restoration
 - ecosystem services enhancement
 - use of best available technology (BAT)
- Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) for MSP have been done using Cumulative Impact assessment methods, but those are not yet cases with quantified effect on GES by MSP. Examples:
 - Portuguese Azores case
 - Environmental assessment for offshore wind farms (Denmark)
 - Fisheries closure areas (Estonian MSP)
- Communicate to terrestrial sources of eutrophication and hazardous substances to reduce their pollution (main impact)

- MSP designations limiting certain uses in time or space to support species (e.g. Germany: temporary seasonal reservation area for harbour porpoise)
- Where MSPs are statutory, MSFD- related plan policies / objectives can be used to inform / enhance the marine management decision making framework so that MSFD matters can be readily considered in processes such as consenting.
- MSP approaches in Scotland so far are not looking at the ecosystem in the ground. Natural capital accounting or net gain may help with future iterations
- National marine plans are an example (but not a good one at present) where the mechanism for mitigation is too weak to get to GES. They tend to be all things to all people – allowing more development whilst mentioning wider environmental goals
- In Spain, Marine Strategies include by law planning as a tool (law for the protection of the sea). With this purpose, MSP directive was transposed into policy by an extension of this law that regulates MSFD in Spain. So, both processes are linked. In practice an interministerial commission involving also the representatives from regions
- Side comment: in the IOC- UNESCO survey about the status of MSP, we have a question regarding 'articulation between MSP and marine protected areas'. Reviewing the answers from Europe, we can see that some countries mention the MSFD, such as Ireland.

Balance between Blue Economy development and achieving GES

- Look at cumulative effects, not just new activities
- Innovation needed – sustainable activities
- Holistic view and sensible roll-out of sustainable activities – for old and new
- Data from monitoring in public domain (Belgium as an example)
 - + translate into evidence
- Nature sets the framework
- Assure balance between transitions
- Increase energy density of wind farms
- Nature positive wind parks + mariculture (Maripark, multi-use wind + solar)
- Nature strengthening activities
- BAT and BEP always applied
- Life Cycle Analysis consideration
- Sustainable tourism and other sustainable blue economy sectors
- Restore ecosystems
- Need for monitoring (baseline data and long-term monitoring)
- Adaptive blue economy – replacing existing technology with new forms of energy

- Whole-society approach of divesting from harmful activities and investing in protection / sustainable use
- The problem of continued economic growth
- MSP informs, reduces conflict and steers in space. MSP also provides a vision for GES/SBE, but the question how to measure balance remains.
- Creating political will and awareness
- Combining activities that compensate for each other
- GES certificates for energy producers etc. or labels
- Monitor the effects during the whole life cycle
- Responsibility for those damaging the environment
- Force the companies to share the data
- Analyse benefit of fishery exclusion in OWF
- Blue Economy outcomes are still being thought about in silos
- Integrate MSP in the European Green Deal objectives
- Engage private sector in the achievement of environmental goals such as those related to restoration
- Equitable stakeholder involvement to ensure consideration is given to all aspects of Blue Economy and how to balance this with GES
- Guidance for maritime sectors about how to become more sustainable
 - Achieving GES can be easier if companies care for Corporate Social Responsibility

Potential strategies for improving the integration of GES into MSP

- Integrate MSFD & MSP in one process
- Changing MSP directive accordingly
- Ecosystems as a basis for activities
- Natural capital = Showing socio-economic benefits of the ecosystem and integration in MSP
- Including MPAs as an integrated part of MSP
- Bring MSFD & MSP together
- No silos!
- Faster common decision-making process
- Using MSFD environmental status in MSP
- MSP evaluation to inform on impacts and potential gaps
- Cross-scientific collaboration (economy, biology, society)
- One international strategic plan, then adapted on national level (“Pan-Baltic Scope”)
- Creating political will and awareness

- Combining activities that compensate for each other
- GES certificates for energy producers etc. or labels
- Monitor the effects during the whole life cycle
- Responsibility for those damaging the environment
- Force the companies to share the data
- Perspective: Balanced/neutral, listening, understand
- Ideal training: interdisciplinary environment, geogprahy, planning, cultural heritage
- Cross-border and sea basin wide thinking + cross calibration
- Using similar seabed int.: data /thersholds, analytical, methods + tools
- Shared training of planners + environmental experts -> knowledge / tools
- National / subnational level integration of MSP + MSFD planning + data + management
- Model Finland: Coordination, steergin by national requirements, many meetings
- Further development of ecosystem-based approach
- Using natural capital aspects or the concept of net gain in MSP
- Provide EBA and policy guidelines to standardise MSP to achieve GES
- Include in trade-off analysis what is the potential environmental status of each alternative scenario
- Utilise more ecological data and continue to scope and understand environmental carrying capacity of the marine environment, which GES indicators will support
- Set clear objectives regarding exact GES, that are hoped to be achieved
- Use the Natural Capital approach in the Sustainability Appraisal for the Marine planning to give a wider consideration of the natural environment
 - However, how can we value the easily monetized natural capital without undermining the value of those ecological components that cannot be monetized?

Main challenges in achieving GES through MSP

- Lack of balance between transitions (energy, food, nature)
- Applying the precautionary principle properly
- Political win
- How to determine if the effect is because of MSP or not?
- Stakeholder opinions
- Contrasting interests of stakeholders
- Solid monitoring for adaptive management
 - 6 year cycle too long?
 - How to create a feedback system?

- Lack of spatial data
- Political will to put measures in place
- Slow MSFD / processes implementation
- MSFD & WFD alignment
- Culture
- Communication of goals – definition of GES not needed?
- Increasing pressure
- Collaboration in a speedy way – direct lines
- Bumping MSP integration needs time and patience
- Cross-sectoral integration between environmental protection and MSP
- Short-term economic gain
- Science based information availability
- Proper dashboard and digital tools
- Balancing economic, social and environmental factors when environmental constraints should be the basis
- Uncertainty of environmental constraints
- Lack of vision (what can stay and what not)
- Many maritime sectors not dependent on GES
- Scaling up local / regional actions to basin level
- Scaling down the integration to local + regional level
- Different backgrounds of experts -> understand similar language
- More precise environmental impact assessment (revise Espoo convention)
- Better, more precise indicators + missing indicators from current list (migratory fish, migratory birds, bats)
- Potential impacts (e.g. windfarms on property value)
- Balancing the diverse and sometimes conflicting interests of various stakeholders
- GES is often not a central target. DAPSIR sometimes is a mitigation of impact by sector not a return to GES.
- Cumulative impact assessment is very challenging due to the different data sources needed to make the analysis.
- Actually, having a clear set of objectives of the GEs that are being aimed for. Often things can be vague and don't really know what is hope to be achieved other than just "GES"!
- Evidence to support indicators can be unreliable, not standardised and not cover all areas.
- National GES can be broad and give a good overview but do not cover everything in a local regional context.

Stakeholder perspectives in the MSP process to achieve GES

- Data-sharing between stakeholders (wind, fisheries)
- MSP as a chance and a risk. Currently being used to increase activity. Ecosystem should be leading.
- Contribute with solutions
- Stakeholders as a warning bell
- Including stakeholders from the start, and true inclusion
- Including certain stakeholders (e.g. the public)
- Data providers
- “GES-literacy” of key user groups / expert groups
 - What is GES in *my* area
 - How do we work for it
- Ocean literacy & Governance literacy
- All perspectives included in a non-hierarchic round table
- Using “visionary thinkers” as part of the MSP process
- Regulation of new and emerging sectors
- Increase public awareness
- Public reaction delaying adoption of MSP plans
- Reduce pressure in catchment area as well – land sea interaction, agriculture (taking the stakeholders on land onboard)
- Increase stakeholder awareness
- National and regional awareness of the stakes
- Acknowledging the need for “tough choices” -> engagement and communication
- Benefits of GES not realised in short term – so stakeholder discourse often excludes this point seeing GES as a limiter
- Financial markets are not yet incentivising good GES companies effectively (see task force on nature-related financial disclosures)
- Stakeholders who know about MSFD and GES are able to communicate what they want to achieve through MSP. Other stakeholders are often not aware of MSFD and GES and they tend not to engage with the details. Do we need to encourage wider stakeholders to engage with integration of GES-thinking in a wider management through MSP or is it the role of MSP / MSFD practitioners to reconcile all the views put forward?
- GES is complex – targets, indicators, thresholds (bureaucratic)
- Need consideration for all stakeholders from outset of planning processes. Then transparent processes where it is easy for all to contribute
- Improve dialogue and awareness to make GES a priority for all stakeholders

- For stakeholder involvement, in case of Spain and in a formal/ministerial level, use the Interministerial marine strategies commission, this committee has a interministerial working group for MSP and also the monitoring Marine Strategies committees, which also links MSP-MSFD
 - However, a clear definition of “stakeholder” should be addressed to avoid considering only the diverse competent authorities, and moving towards the different actors (e.g. NGOs, academia, coastal communities, associations, etc.)

MSP for spatial protection

Increase awareness about MSP and biodiversity among authorities.

- Regular mandatory meetings
- Awareness raising between sectors
- Ambassadors (for increasing awareness) incl. to high schools
- Increase visibility: presentations, information sharing and public engagement
- Communication between ministries, incl. min. of education
- Visualise ecosystem in the plan -> ocean literacy
- Share knowledge about decision-making (tools)
- Raise awareness of and rally for ocean rights (here was also Lodewijk’s number: in June 13, 2023 there are 2 399 days left to reach the 2030 target)
- Clear legal base
- Need of incentives (sticks and carrots)
- Guidelines: national and international
- Understanding sense of urgency (why)
- Benefits of (??): long-term economic benefits
- Spatially resolved nature data is vital at the early stage. Without having this early in the discussion then first mover socio-economic interests dominate the debate. We need to be clear what and why we need protection otherwise the debate is framed purely as job losses and the erosion of a way of life
- Meetings where specific topics are discussed
- Highlight the conflicts that arise (particularly over resources) from a lack of coordination of uses
- Simplify communication formats. Turn MSP maps into simple schemes, posters
- Showing the affectedness might raise the awareness
- Co-design MPAs with all interested Departments in a given area from the start. This includes site selection and management measures. MPAs work best when they are based on science

but designed to work in the real world. This approach helps to build knowledge and avoid rejection of proposals at the end.

- Promote digital platforms, using online maps for showing the scope of MSP and MPA
- Need quite broad efforts to increase literacy in biodiversity (especially in marine environments where it isn't so easily seen)
- Create a canal for NGOs and authorities to communicate.
- Workshops for authorities
- Marine planning implementation workshops.
- Workshops with MPA managers and their networks.
- Cross borders join up between land Local Planning authorities and sea.
- Make sure everyone knows the relevant authorities. In Finland we had a situation where the organization governing state-owned areas (including marine areas and MPAs) was not known to all who were doing the planning process. State owned areas cover 1/3 of Finland.

Develop stronger political will for integration.

- Responsibilities beyond period of mandate
- Budget funding for planners; keep people and connections “alive”
- Who’s will? Local communities, general public, national states?
- Start with residents - > vote (then things become important)
- Influence public perspectives and awareness
- We need a narrative for seas: nature as a base, important for all of us
- Be aware of cultural differences between national states and also between sectors, incl. MSP and MPA people
- Political will in the EU: Parliament-Council-Commission
- Define drivers
- Increase knowledge on biodiversity
- Political responsibility to assess impacts of activity, incl. cumulative
- Responsibility of long-term perspective
- Help different political stakeholders understand how GES/marine protection underpins sustainable blue economy, with MSP as tool to deliver this — provide examples
- Help stakeholders understand significance of ocean in global carbon cycle and need for protection for resilience
- Encourage a blue economy or ecosystem approach to decision making. Too often activities are managed in isolation. Fishing being the worst culprit
- Better approaches to mapping and indexing natural capital mean there are clearer consequences to decisions/ policies
- Is this the job of MSP officials?

- Annual resolutions among politicians or managing authorities (ministries)
- Political support will come if voters and stakeholders support MPAs in MSP so it's important to demonstrate stakeholder and public involvement has played an important role.
- Establish a role for politicians in the process e.g., chair of MSP MPA stakeholder group.
- Stop saying 30% is protected when this is legal protection.
- Not a victory, it is just a start, when we talk about 10% highly protected? how to proceed?
- Natural capital evidence can be utilised to define limits
- Create a strong evidence base.
- Clear links between ecosystem components, ecosystem services and socio-economic impacts
- Legal constraints
- There would need to be some incentive (e.g., from the European Commission to EU MS) to update the MSP in parallel while planning the implementation of the EU BD strategy. Now MS are doing pledges for protected area coverage, but it is unclear how this will reflect to the MSP process, as we will have plenty of work to "fit" all the upcoming activities with protected area targets in the marine area
- MSP, at least in Finland is not legally binding at the moment. Bringing legally binding elements to the plan would make it stronger. Now we have a plan, but e.g., Offshore Wind Farm projects pop-up everywhere (outside of MPAs)
- Consistent engagement
- Clarify to politicians the needs and benefits of linking both processes so they can push for the integration between competent authorities
- Pressures from relevant stakeholders can encourage political engagement (although risk of only loudest voices being heard)
- Clarify roles and contributions of Regional Seas to this integration

Organise interaction between authorities

- Shared topics and management planning
- Trust needs to be built continuously
- Fit MSP in the established MPA networks
- Active collaboration, not just information exchange
- Maintaining and informed and inclusive forum
- Check legislation and practices; study gap analysis
- Multi-level governance: bottom up meets top down
- Organise interaction to align goals
- Use MSP challenge game for learning
- OSPAR strategic objectives – MSP (LA)
- Clear responsibilities and accountable mandates

- One responsible ministry for MSP (talk to min. of education) (this notion of MPS ministry was also contested)
- SWOT analysis to facilitate understanding
- CoP
- Through lobbying via NGO/industry
- Networking events (e.g. EMD) both international and national
- National organisation WG
- Cross-border cooperatio platform
- Seminars, workshops
- Information material, e.g. maps, incl. biodiversity values and activities
- Use sea basin initiatives like the Baltic Planners' Forum, link to coherence
- Strengthen already existing overarching formats (eg., Blue forum)
- At the local level, make presentations to MPA management councils where government, police and stakeholder representatives are present
- Don't just look at past precedent from "marine" forums only - see what has worked in other policy areas and see how successful coordination has worked so lessons can be transferred to MSP and MPA approaches
- Before starting formal institutional correspondence, establishing an informal MPA/MSP working group to avoid misunderstanding.
- Mechanisms to "open-up" authorities are needed to enable stronger actors' participation in decision making processes.
- Improve policy at national level, in the sense of coordination between MSP and marine conservation (e.g., through interministerial groups)
- Dialogue to clearly link environmental objectives of MSP to national goals and targets on marine protection and restoration. Ideally, linking also to regional and international conservation goals.
- Transboundary MSP and MPA designation: have overlapping entities that bring policy makers together across borders
- Create Memorandum of Understanding on MSP between different countries
- Stakeholder engagement across the board from the outset of any MSP planning/proposals

Clarify regulation for integration.

- Research on the gaps and solutions
- Regulations can be a barrier for collaboration
- Clearer linkages in MSP-MPA processes + MSFD env. assessment, targets and measures
- Precautionary approach for exixting activities
- Cumulative imacts of all activities

- Management plan -> N2K & SEA
- Clear targets for MPA management plans
- Nature restoration law integrated into MSP
- Difficulty in implementing measures, e.g. fisheries
- Integration of EBA in national legislation
- To include guidance in EU, regional sea and national legislation how to integrate MPA (biodiversity values) in MSP
- Have a common vocabulary and definitions
- Be aware of national responsibilities for MSP and/or nature conservation
- At a sea basin scale, for MPAs and activities with transboundary impacts managed through MSP e.g., ORE, seek non-mandatory regulatory alignment where possible e.g., approximate alignment of MSP policies.
- Re-evaluate the measures and clean updated measures within the territorial units before launching cooperative ventures.
- Develop clear programme of measures with clarity on real protection (i.e. Activities are removed)
- Perhaps a bit off topic, but it would be very useful to oblige e.g., wind power companies to provide the survey data they collect for EIA, for other processes as well
- Very difficult when multiple actors/agencies are involved and not always that well-coordinated. Need better open communication between these different authorities
- Improve policy at national level, in the sense of coordination between MSP and marine conservation (e.g., through interministerial groups)
- Clear roles for each competent authority need to be identified, discussed, and agreed
- Define how MPAs are taken into account in MSP, e.g., do we need to set buffer zones around MPAs for certain activities?
- Make very clear the means by which actors can influence decision making, the level of influence/power of the different lobbies, and the degree to which the community voices would be heard (or not).

Other

- Good translation of ecosystem knowledge to policy/decisions
- Shared lunch/coffee/lunchroom
- MSP education at all levels, from kids to planners.
- More regular and task oriented exchange between ministries (i.e., meripolitiikkapäivä)
- Regional seminars for planners on biodiversity value/ongoing research
- National cooperation fora for regulators + sectoral actors, e.g., wind power.
- Synchronising timelines; MSP, WFD and MSFD cycles

- All level cross-sector forum
- Collaboration projects
- Reduce stress of people so they will have more energy for collaboration between the silos.
- Students: Internships and thesis work
- Evening schools for politicians
- Include MPAs as integral tools for protection in MSP processes
- MSP: more communication than planning issue
- Bring language back to basics -> facilitate cross-ministry understanding
- General public; understand existing measures, understand GAP, they drive the policies
- Joint meetings regularly
- Better tools for decision makers (national/regional) on how to operationalize MSP/MPA:s
- Regularly shared meetings and seminars, both online and IRL
- Sharing of good examples
- Increase understanding among politicians
- Information packs/info sessions for new ministers and ministry officials
- Scientific knowledge
- Capacity building
- Funding opportunities
- All that works together
- Should MPAs/OECMs be a mandatory constituency (representing ocean as a stakeholder) for MSP? E.g., reflecting CBD COP15
- Tighten up the terminology around MPAs. Areas on maps are not MPAs in the public's mind and the lack of clarity is used against them.
- Common structure and thematic (layers) among countries and stakeholders. Common data resolution and formats
- coordination between teams that make survey/new study for enlargement of MPAs, and MSP planners/authorities.
- A strong knowledge base about nature values is important in order to make planning and decisions.
- MSP to identify priority area for nature protection, within which MPAs can be established or enlarged.
- MSP, with an inherent transboundary nature, could be used as a platform for transboundary work on MPAs, by e.g., common definitions of valuable nature areas and common understanding of how activities close to MPAs should be regulated
- MSP technical workshops covering policy development, monitoring, indicators, to share best practice.

