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We develop and coordinate transnational studies on:

- Integrated Maritime Policy
- Maritime Spatial Planning
- Blue growth and assessment of future uses
- Innovative and sustainable marine uses
- Integrated management of estuaries

Who are we?
Today is a special day…
Wismar Declaration (21st Sept 2001):

Equally include **offshore** and **landside coastal areas**. Growing **spatial conflicts** in coastal waters like the one between **offshore wind-mill parks** and **disturbed sea traffic** show a need to apply instruments of **spatial planning**.
MSP History - in Baltic and Europe

2001
- VASAB+

2003
- 1st MSP MoU
- VASAB+ Västernorrland

2005
- HELCOM Baltic Sea Action Plan Rec.
- MSP GERMAN EEZ
- VASAB Long term perspective

2007
- Green Book
- Blue Book

2009
- Roadmap for MSP
- HELCOM VASAB WG 3 + MSP Principles
- Adoption of regional MSP roadmap

2011
- MSP directive adopted
- Adoption of MSP guidelines

2013
- MSP in all member states

2015
- Application of MSP guidelines

2017
- Implementation of MSP in the BSR

2019

2021

Projects:
- BaltCoast 2004
- PlanCoast
- Plan4Blue
- PartiSEApate
- PLAN BOTHNIA
- BALTSpace
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MSP Projects - Building on each other

- Introduced concept of sea use planning
- MSP Handbook with Planning Cycle
- 8 MSP Pilots
- BaltSea Plan Vision 2030
- BaltSea Plan Reports & Findings
- Transnational Sector Dialogues
- BSR MSP Governance System
- Transnational Hot Spots
- Planning Forum
- BaltSea Plan
- PartiSEApate
- Baltic SCOPE
- PLAN4BLUE
- BaltCoast
- PlanCoast
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Development of **joint recommendations** for an **integrated coastal zone development strategy**

Integrate them in the overall strategy for sustainable development in the BSR.

This could help to implement the recommendation on ICZD on national, regional and local level leading to institutional and procedural changes.
BaltCoast Recommendations (2005)

**Use the strengths of spatial planning for cross-sector coordination in offshore development:**
- Promote preparation of spatial plans for offshore areas
- Use territorial impact assessment tools for projects

**Introduce tools and methods for spatial coordination of offshore uses**
- Improve availability and accessibility of mapped information
- Define basic national policies for offshore development which are coordinated cross-sectorally
- Improve effectiveness of cross-border consultation for offshore development plans & projects
- Prepare indicative guidelines for content & procedures of offshore spatial planning
- Apply ICZM principles in offshore planning
- Ensure wide involvement of stakeholders in planning for offshore development
BaltCoast Recommendations (2)

**Improve transnational discussion and concertation process**

- Continued dialogue with HELCOM, Baltic 21, VASAB, EU Commission on principles of offshore spatial planning
- Seek continued consultation with the EU regarding recommendations on ICZM, EIA and SEA directive
- Develop transnationally concerted plans for offshore infrastructure corridors
- Promote transnational research & pilot projects
- Promote experience exchange with other regions
1st MSP adopted in German Baltic Sea - (2005)
Defining the Planning Process (2008)

MSP History – in Baltic and Europe

Projects

- BALTIC
- Quest 2004
- PlanCoast
- PlanCoast 2004
- PlanCoast 2012
- Baltic SPACE
- Baltic Scope
- PartiSEApate
- Plan Bothnia
- BaltSpace
- Baltic Times
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What was BaltSeaPlan?

Expert Workshop: Learning from MSP in the Baltic Sea Region.
BaltSeaPlan Vision (2011)

How would we like to see in the region by 2030 - how can MSP help to get there?

Extend our planning horizon - increase sphere of influence rather than wait for things to happen

Pan-Baltic Topics....
- Healthy marine environment
- Coherent pan-Baltic energy policy
- Safe, clean and efficient maritime transport
- Sustainable fisheries
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**Sea fully integrated**

**Actions related to MSP**

**Action 14:** Motorways of the Sea ...

**Action 15:** Intelligent sea transport corridors ....

**Action 17:** BSR Energy Supergrid ...

**Action 20:** Common approach for Baltic Sea MSP

**Action 21:** Demonstration projects for areas of severe use conflicts (e.g. Gulf of Finland, Gulf of Riga, .....)

**Action 22:** Capacity building actions in MSP
A Healthy Marine Environment 2030

> Good Environmental Status achieved; pollution and nutrient inputs substantially reduced / good water quality achieved
> Important biota & habitats protected / high biodiversity achieved

Ecosystem approach as an overarching principle for MSP

Spatial planning implications:
> Habitat connectivity is ensured
> Environmental data translated into spatial information
> Research is more spatially focused; natural science research forms basis for quality objectives
> Transnational evaluation criteria have been developed
> Impacts of uses are evaluated across borders
A coherent pan-Baltic energy policy 2030

> The Baltic Sea Region relies on as much renewable energy as possible

> An allocation has been achieved between BSR countries in terms of which renewables are to be realised where depending on specific conditions; some countries will be net importers / others net exporters of renewable energy

> Offshore wind-farming has been realised in suitable areas

MSP Implications:

> A pan-Baltic energy infrastructure (SuperGRID) is in place
> Land-/ sea-based grids well integrated
> Cable connections / oil & gas pipelines bundled in corridors
> Space set aside for renewable energy aims
> Co-uses promoted
> Locations outside risk areas & sensitive areas, based on environmental pre-screening & risk assessment of sites
Safe, clear and efficient Maritime Transport 2030

> Sea transport is an integral part of wider Baltic Sea Region transport policy with well-planned hinterland connections

> Separation schemes are in place – safe and efficient shipping along designated routes: Faster / less dangerous along these routes

> Ships use clean fuel and ports have adapted to this

MSP Implications:

> Ports and shipping lanes based on integrated view
> Intelligent corridors / routes established; not impeded by fixed installations
> Rearrangement of shipping lanes possible
> Areas where shipping needs to be avoided or compulsory pilotage systems put in place
> Transnational contingency planning
Sustainable fisheries and aquaculture 2030

> Baltic Sea fisheries (incl. mariculture) deliver high quality food AND are managed in such way that sustainable stocks are secured & integrity of ecosystems is preserved

> Established fishing practices in the Baltic are supplemented by extensive sea ranching schemes

> Marine aquaculture (incl. algae & mussel cultivation) has gained relevance, but is only allowed where environmentally sound

**MSP Implications:**

> Blue Corridors for fish are guaranteed
> Spawning & nursery areas are protected
> No-take rules and management practices have been implemented
> Area for marine aquaculture have been carefully selected
> Fisheries management legislation has been revised according to MSP needs
Key messages: From MSP Principles to Planning Principles

> Pan-Baltic Thinking....
the whole Baltic Sea as ONE planning space and ONE ecosystem

> Pan-Baltic Objectives & Targets....
For environment, energy, transport, fisheries

> Spatial allocation based on....
Baltic Sea wide environmental assessment
Socio-economic cost-benefit analysis

> Spatial connectivity....
Linear infrastructure, corridors and patches form backbone of national MSPs

> Spatial efficiency....
Baltic Sea space is used sparingly
Maximize use of "used" space - co-use
Leave as much space ‘free’ as possible

> Spatial subsidiarity....
Spatial challenges are dealt with at the lowest most appropriate spatial level
Important elements of pan-Baltic MSP (2011)

- **Appropriate structures**
  - National MSP Authorities
  - Transnational cooperation
  - MSP coordinating body

- **Pan-Baltic Data management & Monitoring**

- **Transnational Consultation & Stakeholder involvement**
1. Sustainable management
2. Ecosystem approach
3. Long term perspective and objectives
4. Precautionary Principle
5. Participation and Transparency
6. High quality data and information basis
7. Transnational coordination and consultation
8. Coherent terrestrial and maritime spatial planning
9. Planning adapted to characteristics and special conditions at different areas
10. Continuous planning
Suggested improvements to consultation process (2014)
MSP Governance system in the Baltic Sea Region (2014)

Multi-level MSP governance framework

- MSP Expert Groups
  - Develop Recommendations
  - MSP Practitioners Network
    - Exchange Experience
  - provide topics
    - provide input

- VASAB Secretariat
  - (assisted by HELCOM)
  - MSP Dialogue Coordination
  - chair reports
  - endorses guidelines
  - possibly send one observer

- BSR (HELCOM-VASAB) MSP Working Group
  - Decision Making
  - National MSP Contact Points
  - suggest experts, provide mandate
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MSP History – in Baltic and Europe

- Green book: Introduction of MSP
- Blue book: Strategy for the Baltic-Sea Region
- Roadmap for MSP
- MSP Directive adopted
- MSP regulation in all member states
- MSPs in all member states

2001: Verner Declaration
2003: Mecklenburg-Vorpommern Declaration
2005: HELCOM Baltic Sea Action Plan
2007: MSP in the German Bight
2009: MSP in the Exclusive Economic Zone
2011: Adoption of regional MSP guidelines
2013: Adoption of MSP guidelines
2015: Application of MSP guidelines
2017: Implementation of MSPs in the BSR
2019: 
2021: 

Projects: BaltCoast 2004, PlanCoast, Baltic Scope, Pan Baltic Scope, PartiSEApate, Plan Bothnia, Baltspace, Baltic Times
Hot-spot areas for planning

Cross-border MSP (countries A & B)

Transboundary focus-areas identified by the Southwest Baltic Case

Conflicts:
- (Potential) Conflict: Shipping vs Offshore Wind Energy
- Nature Protection vs Sand and Gravel Extraction
  - Possible Conflict: Land use and Leisure Sailing
### Hot-spot area matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS AREA</th>
<th>Middle Bank</th>
<th>Adlergrund</th>
<th>Kriegers Flak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST / COUNTRIES participating</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offshore Wind Energy (planned/existing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Cables (planned / existing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Cables (planned / existing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipelines (planned/existing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other physical Infrastructure (Tunnel etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ship Traffic / IMO Routes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand and Gravel Extraction (planned/existing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Nature Conservation and Managing Interests</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Restrictions/ Regulations existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territorial Sea (TS) / Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ)</td>
<td>EEZ</td>
<td>EEZ</td>
<td>EEZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes / remarks</td>
<td>there might be NGO interests with regard to nature conservation (harbour porpoise); IBA</td>
<td>need for more information from DK</td>
<td>nature conservation interests in German EEZ with regard to bird migration (cranes) and reef structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for (categorical) information about areas</td>
<td>SE+PL</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- **Strong interest**
- **Minor interest**
- **No interest**
- **No information**
- **Existing planning restrictions/regulations**
- **No restrictions/ regulations known**
Coherent Linear Infrastructure

Energy

Shipping

Transboundary MSP (national & sub-national waters of all countries)
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Where are we today?
An (objective / subjective) assessment
MSP authorities in all EU Member States

Ministry of Business and Growth
Ministry of Finance
Ministry of the Environment
Federal Ministry of Transport and Digital Infrastructure
Federal Maritime and Hydrographic Agency
Ministry of Environment and Energy
Ministry of Housing, Planning, Community and Local Government
Belgian Minister of the North Sea
Ministry of Construction and Physical Planning
Ministry of Transport, Communications and Work
Ministry of Environmental protection and Regional Development
Environment and Planning Authority
Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment
Ministry of Maritime Economy and Inland Navigation
Ministry of the Sea
Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration
Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environment
Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Ministry of Environment and Energy

samples from 23 EU coastal Member States
Baltic Principles => EU Directive Minimum requirements

1. Sustainable management
2. Ecosystem approach
3. Long term perspective and objectives
4. Precautionary Principle
5. Participation and Transparency
6. High quality data and information basis
7. Transnational coordination and consultation
8. Coherent terrestrial and maritime spatial planning
9. Planning adapted to characteristics and special conditions at different areas
10. Continuous planning

Member States shall
- take into account land-sea interactions;
- take into account environmental, economic and social aspects, as well as safety aspects;
- aim to promote coherence between maritime spatial planning and the resulting plan or plans and other processes, such as ICZM or equivalent formal or informal practices;
- ensure the involvement of stakeholders
- organise the use of the best available data
- ensure trans-boundary cooperation between Member States
- promote cooperation with third countries in accordance
MSP processes everywhere – different planning timelines/experiences
Different ways of mapping
ONE approach possible?

- Difference in **maritime & territorial space**
- Different environmental, economic, social conditions
- Political **borders** do not always match ecosystem borders
- Tension between national interests and transnational interests in a given sea-basin
- Difference in maritime **priorities**
- Difference in governance systems
- Difference in planning **cultures**
- Differences in MSP authorities competences
- Communication, data and **information sharing**
- MSP development at different stages
But nevertheless solutions possible
Cross-border planning issues

Case 3: South-East Baltic Sea

Countries: Sweden, Latvia, Lithuania, Russia, Poland

Planning issue: Mismatches between ship corridors of several countries (gaps between, and different widths of corridors)
More and more tools.... used?
Handbooks, toolkits and Platforms
Recommendations on transboundary consultation

1. Review national official procedures of the Espoo Convention for consultation on SEAs for maritime spatial plans.

2. Share information about MSP process in official letters (formal) and/or in person exchanges (informal) to make neighbouring countries aware that process is starting, as well as when they may be asked to submit formal feedback.

3. When appropriate, either as part of Espoo consultation or separately, invite neighbouring countries in writing to formally comment on a draft plan via responsible channels.

4. Build communicating and understanding opportunities into the consultation process:
   1. Establish common understanding of planning frameworks and definitions used in planning documents
   2. Establish good understanding of what is meant / implied by each term used in respective countries involved in consultation and confirm, whether this is correctly understood by all, and document agreed definitions in writing.
   3. Where necessary, identify an acceptable common language of communication or make provision for translation.
   4. Develop visual materials to convey and explain planning information.

5. Prepare planning materials to share with neighbours:
   1. Share draft planning solutions and plan content in appropriate formats. Agree with neighbouring country / countries on whether to translate summaries, specific sections or full versions of draft plans into common and/or language of neighbouring country
   2. On both sides, identify concrete issues for targeted discussions, along with specific questions.
   3. Share geospatial information, either as paper maps or in an interactive online platform or data portal, from both the consulting as well as consulted party.

6. If considered necessary, organise meetings and decide on formats (bi-lateral or multi-lateral exchanges, limited to MSP planners or wider stakeholder groups), and communicate follow-up process to consulted parties.

7. If asked to consult, prepare formal consultation response in writing, including considerations from relevant secondary contacts and stakeholders.

8. Process feedback received as a result of consultation requests:
   1. Categorise feedback: 1) feedback that can be used / accommodated in revising a draft plan, 2) feedback that need to be investigated further or addressed in future cross-border MSP projects, and 3) feedback that can be addressed later in future revisions of plans.
   2. Draft written responses to feedback received indicating appropriate follow up actions if necessary (e.g. formal agreements, adaptations to planning provisions)
Handbook on Multi-Level Stakeholder involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What should be done</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mapping and screening relevant sources of data and information at EU/global land Baltic level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine stakeholder strategy from step 1; i.e. how and when to consult whom, with which method and purpose at cross-border, national, regional and local level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking for relevant data and information at cross-border, national, regional and local level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking opinion on the outcome of the stocktaking phase (accuracy of information, completeness of information) the national, regional and local level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing Baltic level about the main findings from stock-taking (i.e. body of knowledge collected and the way of storage of the knowledge i.e. website, report etc. since such information might be relevant to all BSR countries)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing cross-border level about the main findings from stock-taking with an option to comment if agreed so at the first stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*GOOD PRACTICE: Norwegian way of bringing together science and stakeholders for improving stocktaking (see case)*

PartiSEApate stakeholder checklists for each step e.g. stocktake
EBA Toolbox

The Ecosystem Approach in Maritime Spatial Planning

2. THE GENERAL ECOSYSTEM APPROACH CHECKLIST

- Aim: To assess the extent of implementation of the Ecosystem Approach (EAP) as per the MalMOs Guide. It is essential to ensure that an EAP is fully implemented. This checklist provides a useful framework and allows for the assessment of the extent of implementation of the EAP across different issues.

- Intended use: This checklist is intended for all stakeholders involved in the implementation of the EAP, including policymakers, scientists, and practitioners.

2.1. PRESENTATION OF THE GENERAL ECOSYSTEM APPROACH CHECKLIST

- Checklist format:
  - Yes
  - No
  - Partly

- Questions:
  - Are the measures under review integrated into the broader ecosystem approach?
  - Are the measures under review integrated into the broader ecosystem approach?
  - Are the measures under review integrated into the broader ecosystem approach?

- The checklist is designed to be used as a tool for assessing the extent of implementation of the EAP, and it can be adapted to fit the specific needs of the project.

3. THE PLANNING SUPPORT CHECKLIST

- This checklist is intended to assess the extent of implementation of the Ecosystem Approach (EAP) as per the MalMOs Guide. It is essential to ensure that an EAP is fully implemented. This checklist provides a useful framework and allows for the assessment of the extent of implementation of the EAP across different issues.

- Intended use: This checklist is intended for all stakeholders involved in the implementation of the EAP, including policymakers, scientists, and practitioners.

3.1. PRESENTATION OF THE PLANNING SUPPORT CHECKLIST

- Checklist format:
  - Yes
  - No
  - Partly

- Questions:
  - Are the measures under review integrated into the broader ecosystem approach?
  - Are the measures under review integrated into the broader ecosystem approach?
  - Are the measures under review integrated into the broader ecosystem approach?

- The checklist is designed to be used as a tool for assessing the extent of implementation of the EAP, and it can be adapted to fit the specific needs of the project.
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Pan-Baltic MSP Data infrastructure BASEMAPS
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Cumulative impacts

Mapping of human activities

Map 44: Cumulative impact of current activities on ecosystem components

Source: ADRIFG PLAN D3.1/7

Source: Krasanaki et al., 2015
Connectivity

Figure 37. Proposed regional habitat aggregations for the North Sea lesser sandeel (Blaesbjerg et al. 2009)
Ocean Multi-Use Action Plan

- Definition/Scope of the MU
- State of Development/Future Potential
- Drivers/Benefits, Barriers/Negative Impacts
- Logical Framework
- Objectives
- Actions/Recommendations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning criteria used for MSP shipping area designation</th>
<th>Denmark</th>
<th>Estonia</th>
<th>Finland</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Latvia</th>
<th>Lithuania</th>
<th>Poland</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Width of priority areas + safety zones according to traffic density (AIS data from 2016) and ship sizes on main traffic routes, guidance taken from Nautical Institute paper. Corridor widths between 6 and up to 10 nm.</td>
<td>AIS based shipping density is used for discussing/deciding on multi-use of marine space or establishing spatial constraints (e.g. Ships’ route design).</td>
<td>Shipping density maps based on HELCOM AIS data will be used to determine corridor width</td>
<td>Larger corridors equal widths of TSS; 1nm width for 1000-4900 vessels/year; 10nm for &gt;10,000 ships. Designation in MSP from 2009 based on AIS data from 2005-2009 (national stations).</td>
<td>The areas reserved for shipping are based on main shipping routes (centre line of shipping area) by using AIS data and consulting all Latvian ports. The width of the shipping corridor and safety zones of these areas reserved for shipping is 6 nm to/from major ports or transit routes and 3 nm to/from small ports of Latvia. The width was agreed upon by consulting Maritime Administration of Latvia and taking into account the guidance document of Nautical Institute.</td>
<td>Shipping routes and roadsteads are well defined and strictly respected in the MSP documents and charts. Yearly summary of ship density was taken as a basic information for justification of the corridors</td>
<td>Widths of priority areas not defined in detail yet</td>
<td>AIS data was used to designate national interest areas, which were the basis for later designations of areas in MSP. MSP only covers the nationally important corridors. Smaller routes rely on the “freedom of navigation”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment of legal frameworks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Northern Ireland</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maritime Spatial Planning</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional planning</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Marine Information System</td>
<td>Northern Ireland Marine Mapviewer in development</td>
<td>Marine Planning Evidence Portal</td>
<td>Scotland Atlas, Shetland Clyde As</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Public Participation</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>East Plans 2014, South Plans expected 2017, NW, NE, SE, SW expected by 2021</td>
<td>Draft public consultation expected 2017</td>
<td>Draft consultation</td>
<td>SNMP 2017 Shetland Clyde As</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>East Plans review 2017, six-yearly progress report on English marine planning system to Defra by 2021</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>SNMP review March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coasts Access</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation of seals</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Understanding of different steps in process and timeframe
Monitoring and evaluation of transboundary planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output of transboundary collaboration</th>
<th>Immediate outcome</th>
<th>Intermediate outcome</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement on a transboundary planning solution</td>
<td>Acknowledgement of the transboundary need for national MSP</td>
<td>A change in the national MSP</td>
<td>Improved coherence of planning of maritime activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of a transboundary collaborative body</td>
<td>Naming of national (and sector/interest) representatives</td>
<td>Actual transboundary collaboration</td>
<td>Improved transboundary collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where are we in view of our vision 2030?
Multi-level governance

Transnational organisations

GER  POL  LIT  LAT  SWE  EST  FIN  RUS  DAN

National competent authorities / organisations, NGOs

Regional / local authorities / organisations, NGOs

Transnational / Cross-sectoral dialogue
### MSP cooperation - a long-term process

1. Meeting: Getting to know each other, learning about motivations, interest, needs, skills, expectations, cultural and structural aspects;

2. Information: Delivering (targeted) exchange of information, building basic cooperation structures and trust, shaping common ideas;

3. Coordination/Representation: Creating a joint partnership structure, first allocation of functions and roles;

4. **Strategy/Planning:** Defining joint objectives and developing concrete actions;

5. **Decision:** Binding commitments of partners, partnership agreement

6. Implementation: Joint implementation of actions, efficient joint management, fulfilment of requirements by each partner
Scenarios and strategic choices

Passive MSP: all important decisions are taken outside the MSP planning domain.

Active MSP: the process is used for revealing and aggregation of preferences of different stakeholders with regard to the sea space.

High level of trust: Baltic nations can easily agree on the most beneficial, from BSR point of view, locations of different sea activities & the benefits out of them are shared in a fair way.
A growing MSP community – a new generation of planners
Still a lot to be done:

• Sectors
• Politicians
• Choices
• Knowledge
• Implementation
• Evaluation
• Adaptation
BUT: MSP – an iterative process
Transboundary Collaboration in MSP in the Baltic Sea Region
Thank you!
And continue to share...

Angela Schultz-Zehden
asz@sustainable-projects.eu

info@msp-platform.eu

@EU_MSP_Platform
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