

Izola, 5.9.2028

Workshop organised by TSG 3: How to translate TSG 3 projects concepts into concrete actions

Starting-points for TSG 3/1 Workshop for ICZM and MSP joint inter-pillar project

The starting points for discussion at the workshop will be previously defined/agreed activities and outcomes of the proposed project "To promote a sustainable growth of the AI region by implementing ICZM and MSP also to contribute CRF on ICZM of Barcelona convention - ICZM&MSP" (see Project concept amended 20 June 2018). Workshop participants are asked to consider:

- whether these activities and outcomes are adequately defined and can produce concrete/useful results and added value to the implementation of ICZM and MPS, and if,
- of detailing activities and outcomes – the concretization of individual ideas,
- whether the concept of the project should be adapted to the call for "Proposals for EU Grant from EC - Agency for SME - program COSME", under the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund, insofar as the partners are united in terms of a joint application,
- of any other concepts of the project, activities and outcomes, if there are doubts about the existing proposals.

The starting point for the discussion will follow the title of the workshop (and also the goal of the above call for proposals) – how to convert the concepts into concrete actions. The project's premise could therefore be: the final result of the project should not be merely a research report, but tangible spatial/environmental solutions, formalized spatial/maritime strategic or management documents (e.g. spatial/marine plans), which are the basis for the implementation of the solutions to the reality or at least a focused professional basis for their preparation.

Within the project the following activities and outcomes are planned. For each activity/outcome, the starting points for the discussion at the workshop are defined, with a request to the partners (workshop participants), which contents should be prepared or considered in advance for the workshop. **We kindly ask for the answers in advance – till Monday 17 September on email address eusair@izola.si** . You can write your answers/opinions directly in this file (see places marked with ...). We will analyse those answers and try to prepare some conclusions to make workshop more efficient.

WP 1:

Activity:

- **defining gaps in marine and coastal knowledge including expertise needed for ICZM and MSP case studies implementation**

Outcome:

- **list of identified gaps and conflicts in marine and coastal knowledge**

Starting point for discussion: The definition of a list of identified gaps and conflicts of knowledge seems to be a scarcely defined result. We believe that we should not only talk about the implementation of case studies but about the ordinary/formalized implementation of the ICZM/MSP. It is worth considering whether we would define a wide range of problems on the way to the implementation of ICZM and MSP, not only those related to knowledge, but above all to propose solutions to bridge these gaps. Namely, we find that we have a considerable amount of knowledge and planning tools, but we are not able to use this knowledge in concrete cases. Actual problems are somewhere else, e.g. (1) a big gap between high-flying definitions in strategic/policy documents and a reality trapped in partial interest, (2) duplication and incompatibility of the administrative system and documents/procedures that deal with contents related to ICZM/MSP, spatial planning and environmental

protection, (3) sectoral/vertical planning instead of comprehensive/horizontal spatial/marine planning, (4) inclination of ICZM/MSP milieu to analysis instead to planning, (5) inadequate legislation and (6) a gap between the results of research projects and the content of formalized documents. The issue of identifying and searching for solutions to other problems can also be opened in a discussion about activity "identify conflicts and propose sustainable options for action".

We kindly ask partners (workshop participants) to:

- Prepare examples of gaps and conflicts that you have in mind, so that we get a rough idea about the extent and level of this issue:
.....
- Consider expanding the activity and the outcome in a way to offer solutions to bridge the gaps and to identify the levels/systems of society that would require changes in the direction of increasing knowledge in the field of ICZM/MSP:
.....
- Consider extending activities and outcomes in a way to address the entire field of gaps and conflicts in the field of ICZM and MSP implementation:
.....

Activity:

- **mapping and assessment of socio-economic activities and environmental relevant issues**

Starting point for discussion: We have not yet defined the outcome of this activity. Let us ask ourselves what do we want to do with this activity at all. How can results benefit to other activities within this project and to the implementation of ICZM and MSP? Do we know which socio-economic activities and environmental relevant issues are not already mapped and being part of established databases? Is it a problem that data exist but is not accessible and/or not prepared in useful (spatialized) form? Collecting/mapping data is fit to purpose task and assessment always follows the goals of the project - the purpose of this assessment. So what are the purposes and objectives of this activity?

We kindly ask partners (workshop participants) to:

- Consider the expected purposes, objectives and results of this activity:
.....
- Define list of socio-economic activities and environmental relevant issues to deal with, and check if information about them may exists and are collected/mapped in existing databases and in a useful form:
.....

Activity:

- **identify conflicts and propose sustainable options for action**

(It could be considered also the pertinent deliverables from the SUPREME Project)

Outcome:

- **list of sustainable options for action**

We need to define what kind of conflicts we have in mind. Shall we deal with concrete spatial/environmental conflicts or systemic conflicts as well (indicated within starting point for discussion about activity "gaps in marine and coastal knowledge")? At the workshop, let's try to formulate a set of these conflicts and typologize/aggregate them into thematic groups. Let's talk about the desired form/content of the outcome of this activity. We probably want a more ambitious result, not just a list? Are we trying to create some kind of catalogue/guidelines? How are

we going to develop proposals of sustainable options for action? Let's try to define some examples of sustainable options for action and consider what information could be defined for each option (e.g. description, approach to implementation, competence ...).

We kindly ask partners (workshop participants) to:

- Prepare examples of conflicts and try to typologize them into thematic groups:
.....
- Think about how to develop sustainable options for action and what kind of options you have in mind (related to conflicts):
.....
- Consider the desired structure and more detailed content of the outcome:
.....

WP 2:

Activity:

- **facilitate adoption of National Strategies on ICZM (ICZM Protocol), including consideration on maritime spatial planning (MSP Directive) and in line with the UNEP/MAP Common Regional Framework on ICZM**

Outcome:

- **identification and implementation of methodologies and tools to facilitate the adoption of ICZM national strategies, including MSP where appropriate and taking into account the UNEP/MAP Common Regional Framework on ICZM.**

We should consider whether we really need the development of methods and tools to facilitate the adoption of National Strategies on ICZM. It is an obligation and has to be prepared. Can we, in the framework of our initiative, help partners who have not yet approached the adoption of the National strategy in a different way? Should we change this activity, e.g. in a way to deal only with MSP – to facilitate adoption of marine plans and development of the methods/tools to prepare marine plans? In any case, at the workshop let's try to create a framework set of methods/tools that might be the subject of the project.

There is also another idea to discuss. Should we define/propose the coverages of ICZM strategies (national/regional) along the AI region coast? The idea is not to have strategies for national/administrative areas but for functional/geographical ones.

We kindly ask partners (workshop participants) to:

- Consider if the activity as defined in the current project proposal make sense and about possible reorganization/alternatives to this activity:
.....
- Consider methods/tools that could be tested in the project:
.....

Outcome:

- **Case studies to testing ICZM and MSP on different scales (ex. Large or small areas, regional-local level...)**

Starting point for discussion: Let's consider whether ICZM testing (at least national strategies) makes sense. Should we rather analyse already made strategies and prepare suggestions for the optimal concept (coverage, structure, content, precision) of strategies at different scales?

Preparation of MSP case studies at different scales should be the core of our project. Let's consider whether we can upgrade the case studies to formalized documents. The case study has usually higher value and usefulness if it is accepted through the formal process, in cooperation with stakeholders (local communities, public institutions, public, investors). This cooperation is an aspect that can also be given to research – testing and development of methods. The problem of case studies is often that they are not burdened with real interactions, so they are idealized and then turn out to be unrealistic. On the other hand, the drafting of acts is often limited to time and financial frameworks and does not allow the testing/use of creative planning methods/tools and doesn't content "thinking out of the box". The potential is therefore seen in the integration of research work and the actual preparation of documents in the field of spatial planning and protection of the environment. A lot of work needs to be done in the preparation of the case study, and it would be a shame that the work is not completed with social verification, for example, in the form of the adopted spatial/marine plan.

In any case, in the workshop let's try to define an indicative list of case studies in such a way that the range of the discussed areas and hierarchical levels will be representative - comparable between partner countries and at the same time varied (allowing simulation of solving various spatial/marine planning problems).

We kindly ask partners (workshop participants) to:

- Prepare proposals of case studies to be considered within the project – in our opinion these examples should especially be marine plans and detailed spatial plans that regulates conclude coastal/marine areas on implementation level, but also might be regional ICZM strategies, spatial plans at different hierarchical levels (regional, municipal), operational programmes, management plans or any other documents that can contribute to the implementation of ICZM/MSP:
.....
- Consider the possibility of upgrading these case studies into formalized documents:
.....